



1991

Priestly Poetics: George Herbert and the State-Ecclesiastical

Douglas J. Swartz
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Swartz, Douglas J., "Priestly Poetics: George Herbert and the State-Ecclesiastical" (1991). *Dissertations*. 2926.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2926

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1991 Douglas J. Swartz

PRIESTLY POETICS:
GEORGE HERBERT AND THE STATE-ECCLESIASTICAL

by
Douglas J. Swartz

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

April

1991

Copyright by Douglas J. Swartz, 1991
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very happy to acknowledge the expert and enthusiastic contributions made by the members of my committee. The Director of this dissertation, Professor Suzanne Gossett, read successive drafts with care, genuine concern for my progress and, most importantly, an intellectual curiosity that helped me both to find my focus and to gain confidence in the direction my work was taking. Professor David Loewenstein played an essential role in the development of this dissertation, supervising its earliest stages and providing encouraging and challenging comments in response to later work. Professor Allen Frantzen's intellectual and editorial rigor, and his moral and emotional support, have been a great help in shaping, improving, and completing this dissertation. Professor Christopher Kendrick's participation in this project was generous, encouraging, and altogether gracious. For enduring my frequent absences and ill-humor, I owe a special debt to Elizabeth Schmidt, my wife, and to Jeremy Cotton-Schmidt and Benjamin Schmidt-Swartz, my children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Herbert's Speaker(s): Experience and Expression, Person and Office	1
Patterns and Boundaries	50
II. DISCOURSE AND DIRECTION: <u>A PRIEST TO THE TEMPLE</u> AND THE ELABORATION OF SOVEREIGN RULE	79
III. PRIESTLY POETICS: "H. SCRIPTURES II," "PROVIDENCE," AND "THE WINDOWS"	158
IV. "THE CHURCH PORCH" AND THE CONFIRMATION OF HIERARCHY	205
V. "ALL DISPUTES CONTROL": HERBERT'S HEART, THE ESTAB- LISHED CHURCH, AND SET FORMS	245
"Singular Sincerity"	250
"Obedience" as a Set Form	257
"The Familie" and the Imposition of Peace and Order	275
VI. CONCLUSION	312
WORKS CITED	322
VITA	331

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Herbert's Speaker(s): Experience and Expression, Person and Office

Most of the ever-burgeoning number of studies on Herbert, his poetry, his religious experience and positions, share this common assumption: that Herbert had a definitive position and kind of experience, and that it can, even must, be discovered, detailed, and defined, its evolution traced, its essence isolated. This position is then used to interpret, order, and evaluate the lyrics of The Temple, the personae of those lyrics, and the person behind those personae.¹ Participants in the debates about Herbert's writing have for many years identified this position as either, at the one end of the spectrum, a virtually unqualified attachment to the Protestant belief in the sole sufficiency of grace, faith, scripture, and personal experience of God; and, at the other, an intimate and sincere dedication to the historical, doctrinal, and communal continuity and cohesion provided by the Church of England. In the former view, Herbert emerges in the speakers of his poems as an individual and an individualist, whose writing at its most

essential reproduces the experiences of grace and faith mediated by what Richard Strier has called "Reformation theology, fully apprehended" ("Sanctifying" 57). In the latter, Herbert is said to have found genuine spiritual experience within the structure of the Church of England, celebrated in his poems and served in his eventual choice of vocation, and to have held its rites and offices essential and indispensable to the individual's ability to seek and serve God. In both cases, the particular kind of experience of a particular individual is both the point of departure and the conclusion of historical argument and literary interpretation. These studies aim to show how Herbert can best be understood in connection with a particular type or pattern of religious experience and expression, and at the same time to show how he is a unique, even ideal example of that type.

I begin by placing the attempt to define Herbert's unique or typical kind of religious experience and expression to one side. I do so in order to pursue what I take to be prior questions concerning the conditions governing, or at least attempting to govern, religious experience and expression itself. I locate these conditions in the aspirations to comprehensive social, political, and discursive regulation of religious practice as articulated by the institution of the state-ecclesiastical,² the national state-church ruled by a hierarchy of priests and prelates

with the monarch as canonical and constitutional Head, Supreme Governour and Defender of the Faith. Hooker famously defined the Church and State of England as having coextensive jurisdiction in each individual native inhabitant of England. I have followed elaborations of that definition as they appear in various manifestations of what I will call official discourse: discourse which has or claims to have a certain kind and amount of power and authority because of the office from which it is issued. This discourse relies but does not depend upon the activity and character of a person; that is, its official authority and power are enhanced and made effectual but are not constituted by the personal eloquence, dignity, rectitude, competence, or other moral or spiritual traits of the individual occupying the office. Prominent in Herbert's writing, I argue, is an attempt to found authority on an ideal union of person and office. If I place what may be taken to be overmuch emphasis on the official character of his poetry, it is partly in order to stress the scope and the force of official attempts to restrict and refine access to the personal. Although I identify Herbert with these official attempts, I do not wish to be understood to be arguing for his identity with them.

My approach to Herbert involves a reversal, though I hope not a mere inversion, of the priorities that have governed Herbert scholarship, whether it has emphasized those features of Herbert's writing that can be labeled

"Protestant individualist" (Strier 151) or whether it has attempted to claim Herbert as a "specifically Anglican poet" (Asals 5). In both cases, an appeal is made to Herbert's fundamental kind of experience, underlying and giving shape to his expression; whether it is the "inward, private, and emotional experience . . . central to the Christian life" (Strier 143), or "Herbert's own personal commitment to Anglicanism" (Asals 3)³ to which the critic appeals, the argument is inevitably circular: the form of expression reveals a certain kind of experience, which in turn accounts for the form of the expression.⁴

While I do not intend to suggest that Herbert was a mere officeholder, one of the main reversals upon which my argument turns is its initial emphasis on the official rather than the personal aspects of Herbert's writing. The result is that I focus on the determining effects of official forms of expression on experience. "Determination" here is used in the sense of the word drawn by Raymond Williams "from the experience of social practice": "a notion of setting limits, exerting pressures" ("Base and Superstructure" 32).⁵ Using this term in this way, I will question critical treatments of Herbert's poetry which are grounded too simply in the implicit or explicit assumption that the shape and substance of Herbert's poetry is determined by his experience of God. For my purposes, what this understanding of the shaping of Herbert's poems by spiritual

experience most conspicuously omits is the intense contestation and attempts at regulation and control that centered on claims to give expression to spiritual experience in the early seventeenth-century. As I will explain, the expression of spiritual experience was not a theological issue only; it involved problems of the government of Church and State, and of "social practice" generally. A tendency to treat Herbert's poems in the "naked simplicities"⁶ of their representation of the experience of God has too often led to their removal from the "world of strife" of religious culture and politics.⁷ The claims that certain forms of expression and government had been determined by God were at the very heart of social, religious and political contention and the attempts of the established Church and State to quiet and quell contention.

Most particularly, I focus on Herbert's position as a priest of the Church of England, and argue that a significant amount of power is invested in that office. This focus entails the selection of and emphasis on two kinds of text.⁸ First, I look at those texts in which the mediating power of the priesthood and the institutional church, setting limits and exerting pressure, is clearly present, such as A Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson, or "The Priesthood." Second, I turn to those poems that appear to articulate fundamental Protestant positions about faith, the individual's interpretation of Scriptures, or efficacious preach-

ing. I argue that the lack of an evident priestly or institutional presence in the poems is an absence that requires explanation. In both cases, I argue that the position of the speaker of the poem is priestly: it directly claims or indirectly assumes a special and specialized capacity and authority to deal in matters of religion.

This can perhaps be made clearer by looking briefly at an obvious example. In "The Priesthood," priestly "power" is located in a "Blest Order" of particularly selected individuals: individuals who are in fact intimately connected to God by virtue of the Apostolic Succession. Invested in an individual, the priestly vestiture brings with it the capacity to make "just censures" regarding the eternal fate of individuals, to mediate between God and individuals, and "to deal in Holy Writ" authoritatively. Occupation of this office depends upon, and transforms, a sense of incapacity and unworthiness, and a proper hesitation before its magnitude. The individual's hesitation and acknowledgement of his incapacity--"should I presume/ To wear thy habit, the severe attire / My slender compositions might consume"--is transformed into a disavowal of individual will: "Wherefore I dare not, I, put forth my hand to hold the Ark . . ."⁹ (9-11, 31). The repetition of 'I' here both effaces the individual person and asserts it as a potentially necessary "vessel" for the communication of God in the world. But the determination of this individual's capacity for office is

transferred entirely to God.

The priest exercises the power of his office through the simultaneous effacement and culmination of his person. But here, whatever personal humility we might attribute to Herbert, the power concentrated in the priestly role as office is immense and unquestionable. The personal cancellation of "slender compositions" underwrites and authorizes the official role, so that the acts and words that are produced thereafter are not based on personal authority, but on a unique and divinely endowed office. Rather than directing attention towards the personal aspects of the poem and its version of the priesthood as the conveyance and earthly representative of the transcendent, I would instead focus on the official exercise of the priest's power in a system of government as it is located in a particular institutional site: the state-ecclesiastical.¹⁰ In this context, the authority and power sought in the poem have a range of effects, and the domain of many of them is decidedly this-worldly.

In my attempt to analyze this domain, I have drawn on the work of Michel Foucault, and in particular his work on what he calls the "government of individualization" ("The Subject and Power" 212); this was a part of his objective of writing "the history of the government of individuals by their own verity" ("Politics and Reason" 71). This form of government operates through "the privileges of knowledge"

and the occupation of a select office, and the power is that which enables some human beings not only to assign tasks to or secure benefits from individuals, but also to assign and structure the very individuality of individuals. This he calls "pastoral power," and it is exercised by a privileged individual who is enabled by his position and his possession of knowledge to produce and manage subjectivities through and in the production and management of discourse.

The conjunction of pastoral power and state power, Foucault argues, characterizes the operations of power in modern Western societies: "If the state is the political form of a centralized and centralizing power, let us call pastorship the individualizing power." Though they were originally distinct, Foucault maintains that historically, they have merged in institutions concerned with promoting the general welfare of the state and the welfare of individuals ("Politics and Reason" 60.) While it has had a direct bearing on my view of the state Church of England as both a centralizing and individualizing institution, I do not want to claim too much for the applicability of his theory to Herbert, the state Church, or the religious culture of seventeenth-century England. Along with other recent critics of the use of Foucault in new historicist scholarship and criticism, I doubt the historical accuracy or the political usefulness of suggesting that an all-pervasive network of power manages to gather up everything into its meshes, or to

preempt resistance by its pervasive disciplinary efficiency.¹¹ Nonetheless, the concept of pastoral power is a promising point of departure for trying to arrive at an understanding of the aspirations and the program that the state-church set for itself. As we shall see, an all-encompassing and seamlessly elaborated extension of its authority was a vital part of the Church of England's self-definition. Further, and again, ideally, this authority was not to function by exerting power over individuals, but by ruling within them. To note that Herbert's country parson is enjoined to make his children "first Christians, and then Commonwealths-men . . . having no title to either, except he do good to both" (Works 239) is not to suggest that the Church Herbert served managed uniformly to shape subjects with simultaneous and entirely coincident political and religious loyalties, but to emphasize that it was a part of its ideological and institutional aspiration to do so.

While the concept of "pastoral power" provides a useful means of analyzing the mode in which Herbert's texts authorize and exercise a certain kind of immanent power, it is perhaps less useful within the particular historical and discursive instance of the seventeenth-century state-church of England, in trying to account for the principles of selection and access involved in determining who could assume power and the ways in which it was distributed. My conception of the distribution of power and authority in and

and through the Church of England is probably more hierarchical than Foucault would allow. My use of this concept has therefore been modified by the work of two theorists who emphasize the connections between hierarchical social structure and the application of power through discourse, Edward W. Said and John Frow. Said in particular has criticized Foucault and Foucauldians for moving too quickly from the analysis of a particular case to a projection of a social and discursive field in which power is distributed in an apparently even and comprehensive way. Said argues that "a great deal of power remains in such coarse items as the relationships and tensions between the rulers and the ruled, wealth and privilege, monopolies of coercion, and the central state apparatus" (221). In the Church of England, the principle governing the selection of some men in whom the power of religious discourse is invested involved, again certainly as a theoretical aspiration if less surely in practice, the control from above of who could speak of religious matters, in what way, and even where and when.

Moreover, this aspiration was coupled with a range of sanctions, penalties, and punishments for misappropriating speech or mispeaking, including systems of licensing, Church courts, the Court of High Commission, and other means designed to ensure the centralized, monopolized control of religious discourse. Official discourse in this sense pertains to something like the "official culture" described by

Bakhtin as static, serious, unmoveable, exclusive and authoritarian.¹² Here we need only look at the Church canons, with their suspicion of strangers, their exclusion of foreign voices, their denunciation of "private conventicles" as a fundamental threat to order, and their litany of ipso facto excommunication of "impugners" of various aspects of official discourse, in order to grasp the kinds of concentration and control written into the constitution of the Church. But one need only look at the continued push for unrestricted preaching, and the hierarchy's fear of and vigilance over "the explosive, the anarchic possibilities of unlimited preaching" (Hill, Society 46), to recognize that the canons and the Church were a site rather than the settlement of struggle and resistance. They represented the publicly authorized and instituted position in a wider cultural and religious debate.

As such, they restricted access to the expression of religious belief and experience, and did so in part by drawing a firm line between private men and their experience, and public forms, offices and officials. Divergent expression was surely voiced, but it was private, secret, forbidden by authority and regarded as both illegitimate and a threat to legitimate order. The Canons of 1604 stipulated that

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that it is lawful for any sort of Ministers and lay persons . . . to join together, and make Rules, Orders, or

Constitutions in Causes Ecclesiastical without the kings authoritie, and shall submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them

must "publickely repent of their wicked and Anabaptistical errors," or be excommunicated ipso facto (Canon XI). Here both act and intention are condemned--organizing an alternative Church and submitting oneself to it--and access to the name and notion of a Church is denied to any but the established order.¹³ The restriction of access also applies to those within the Church who would presume to publish their private opinions or pursue their own modes of expression. This, as with many things, was performed in the name of decency and order:

Let all things be done among you, saith Saint Paul, in a seemly and due order. The appointment of which order pertaineth not to private men, therefore no man ought to take in hand or presume to appoint or alter any public or common order in Christ's Church except he be lawfully called and appointed thereunto.

(Book of Common Prayer 18)

An ill-regulated Church service, Jeremy Taylor believed, would allow the intrusion of "Heresie and Blasphemy, Impertinency, and illiterate Rudenesses" into public view, and disrupt the "the most solemn Dayes, and the most Publick Meeting." Horton Davies summarizes: "In short, private men are not to be entrusted to represent the people before God in public," because the people, along with the God and the King, are already represented in what Taylor calls "the

Publick prayers of a whole national Church" (195-196). This official attempt to restrict access to religious expression, which also in effect was an attempt to control the kinds of religious experience that were acceptable, verifiable, and publishable, should be taken into account when interpreting, evaluating, and placing Herbert's writing.

In the foregoing discussion, I have referred primarily to the established order's expressions of the ideal extension of its authority. Also limiting access were the operations of licensing and censorship, the latter of which held up the publication of The Temple, presumably because lines from "The Church Militant" were read to imply the impermanence of God's residence in the Church of England.¹⁴ But what I most wish to establish here is a principle of selectivity and access that operates on and through Herbert's writing: personal expression requires official authorization, and particular persons installed in particular offices are given the authority both to speak and to rule the speech of others. These persons, however, are not acting on their own authority--to "deal in Holy Writ," for instance, for which the speaker of "The Priesthood" confesses he is "most unfit"--but as the representative of an "Order" which acts as a channel of divine authority. To take this into consideration is to place Herbert not in a religious tradition or in the institution's ideal assessment of its activity, but in a discursive formation, the purpose

of which is to define, refine, and regulate uses of language and claims to authority. John Frow's definition of a discursive formation as an asymmetrical and hierarchical system for the distribution of authority is helpful here, insofar as it defines the formation as unified but not all-encompassing or "homogenous." This formation includes "a complex unity of semantic material, rhetorical modes, forms of subjectivity and agency, rules of availability, specific discursive practices, and specific institutional sites." Frow's description of a discursive formation can therefore help assess both the principles of selection and the concentration of authorized discourse in the institution of the Church:

What binds [a discursive formation] together, more or less, is the normative authority it wields as an institution, an authority which is more or less strictly exercised and which is always the attempted imposition of of a centralizing unity rather than the achieved fact of such a unity. Institutional authority, which by definition is asymmetrically distributed between "central" and "marginal" members, is deployed in particular to maintain the purity and solidity of boundaries, and this involves both defining appropriate and inappropriate practices of and restricting access to these practices to certified or qualified agents.

(178)

Much of Herbert's writing can be understood in these terms: the attempted imposition of the authoritative norms of an institution by a qualified agent; even or perhaps especially in the words and deeds of the humble country

parson, whom Christopher Hill has described as expressing "the unchallengeable opinions of the accredited expounder of Christianity" (Century 64). This attempt operates, simultaneously and separately, on the official level, as in the work of a country parson in "the reducing of Man to the Obedience of God," or on the personal, as in the many lyrics in The Temple which attempt to reduce the self to the obedience of God by, in effect, disqualifying or disowning inappropriate forms of expression from the experience of the speaker, and the reader, of the poem. In many important ways, the institutional site determines writers, speakers, readers and hearers, and the relationships between them. Most importantly, I focus on the way Herbert's writing can be understood in terms of the relationship between the priest as public officer who is authorized to speak, and the people, whose role is to receive and not actively to respond to the speech.

I have placed an analysis of A Priest to the Temple, Herbert's treatise on the roles of the country parson, at the beginning of my discussion. I reverse the usual practice of reading the treatise to gloss the poems or as means of ascertaining Herbert's personal opinions, and I use this reversal to foreground the official.¹⁵ Subsequent discussions of the poems frequently refer back to that chapter to raise questions of access that are not raised in the poems as directly, or in some cases appear not to be raised at

all. I mean to suggest that these questions are missing, rather than irrelevant, and also that their absence can be accounted for. My objective is to subject Herbert's writing to what Said has called "secular criticism," which, as does Frow's analysis of discursive formations, looks at the uneven distribution of authority in a culture and raises questions about the interests that that distribution serves: culture, he argues, can be understood as "a system of values saturating downward almost everything in its purview; yet, paradoxically, culture dominates from above without at the same time being available to everything and everyone it dominates" (9).¹⁶ Working in concert with these positive values is a

system of exclusions legislated from above but enacted throughout its polity, by which such things as anarchy, disorder, irrationality, inferiority, bad taste, and immorality, are identified, then deposited outside the culture and kept there by the power of the State.

(11)

This sort of criticism, according to Said, deals rigorously with what Said terms the "worldliness" of a text or a writer in immediate and material circumstances and interests; with the enabling and constraining conditions which makes texts possible and "permissible;" with writing as the performance of the kinds of cultural work that Said argues is often vitally connected to the State's dominant authority. Again, as with Frow, Said stops short of describing that work as an

uninterrupted extension of a monolithic hegemonic apparatus. Said calls for an analysis of "the ways in which authority is carried historically and circumstantially down into a society saturated with authority," and as a working model proposes the study of a writer's and a text's "affiliation, that implicit network of peculiarly cultural associations between forms, statements, and other aesthetic elaborations on the one hand and, on the other, institutions, agencies, classes, and amorphous social forces." To study affiliation is to "recreate the bonds between texts and the world . . . to make visible, to give materiality back to, the strands holding text to society, author, and culture;" Said charges the scholar and critic with the task of "historically recreating or reconstructing the possibilities from which the text arose" (174-175). By and large, critics have presented Herbert as a writer in retreat from the conflicts of power and authority that surrounded him; recently, several studies have begun to suggest this is not the case.¹⁷ Said's argument is that this cannot be the case for any writer, least of all one as powerfully placed as Herbert was. It is not a question of whether writing is involved in or affected by questions of authority, but how.

The implications of my shift in focus can perhaps be made clearer by looking at a number of versions of the "Protestant" and the "Anglican" constructions of Herbert in

and through the critical constructions of the "speaker" or speakers of his poems, and by beginning to measure the ways in which they exclude practices of social determination. The notion of a "speaker," of course, is a piece of critical shorthand used to denote the individual or the person whose utterance we imagine a given poem--a lyric in particular--to be. Despite its often silent assumption by readers of poems, much is at stake in the use of this convenient but often misleading (because oversimplifying) term. Critics versed in Lacanian and Althusserian theory have adopted the term "subject position" to suggest that a poem is in fact a complex instantiation of the intersections of linguistic forms and ideological categories.¹⁸ Much is to be gained from the use of this term--the consistent reminder that a poem or any form of language is not the unmediated expression of experience chief among them--but for the sake of its more obvious connections to the regulation of religious speech by the state-ecclesiastical, I will retain the word "speaker." However, the imbrication of the personal and the official, the "subject" and the pre-established "position" it is encouraged to occupy, will be implicit in my use of it. Among the broad questions that I wish to raise in connection with the notion of a speaker are: Who can speak of, to, and for God? How? On what terms? Within what "limits" and under what kinds of "pressure"?

At issue in the different constructions of the speak-

er(s) of Herbert's poems is the kind of experience of which their forms of expression are said to be fundamentally representative. This, in turn, involves placing the speaker(s) in the appropriate context, within which he belongs and can be best understood. For instance, Joseph Summers several decades ago set the basic direction of the course of Herbert scholarship by arguing that it was "the life of man within the Church [of England] which formed the principle of organization for Herbert's volume" (87). This life was lived, by Summers' account, "within" a broadly latitudinarian Church in which, in exchange for minimal conformity and a willingness to be "not too singular" in one's conduct, a "wide latitude of belief and action was allowed" (53). The poet "within" this Church found it his "duty" to "perceive and communicate God's form" (93). The performance of this duty, as Summers presents it, was to be evaluated (by whom he does not indicate) by its correspondence with the Church's sense of decorum, "decency and order"--to be observed "whether a church, an ordered poem, or an ordered life" is the object--and received religious knowledge "established by the Bible and by the Christian tradition" (84, 124). Herbert's poems are in this context objects of beauty created by and for a consensual and capacious Church, and for the modern critic, they represent both ideals of aesthetic and religious order and "psychological realism" (87).

In Summers' account, the limits set for expression are wide. Though in his presentation of Herbert's life, Summers regretfully acknowledges the religious contentiousness of the English Church, Herbert is not really party to the strife; his writing represents, by virtue of Herbert's sincere and circumspect relationship to them, the Church, the truth of the Bible, and the tradition. Summers' placing of Herbert removes him from the center of conflict and installs him at the center of genuine religious culture. Repeating a pattern begun by Nicholas Ferrar and Izaak Walton, Summers rusticates Herbert and removes him from the Court and its vain striving for power and advantage, Herbert having discovered that "for a person of his connections and convictions, a 'life based on divinity' and 'great place' were then incompatible" (44). This enabled him to discover both his true calling and his place in true English religious culture: "It was, perhaps, by forgetting the Court and retiring to the realities of English rural life that one could retain a belief in the good old ways" (48, emphasis added).

While Summers emphasizes the importance of the Church's continuity and cohesion, he nonetheless insists on the value Herbert placed on the individual. In his account, there is no conflict between the official and the personal, or between the institutional and the individual: "Herbert nearly always represents the institutional as a hieroglyph

of the individual rather than vice versa." The institution, that is, exists for and facilitates the personal. Subsequent critics--Barbara Lewalski, Illona Bell, and Strier--have gone further than this and all but discounted the importance of the institutional by devising a Herbert whose Protestantism placed the crucial emphasis on the individual's direct experience of God. Herbert's speaker(s) are thus representative Protestants, and his poems express the experiences typical of Protestantism: anxiety, unmerited grace, praise, assurance, intimacy with God. Herbert's Protestantism is measured by Lewalski against "the Protestant-Pauline paradigm of salvation," and the lyrics of 'The Church' follow "the internal spiritual life of the speaker, who is a particular individual recounting personal experience" but also one who "exhibits through that experience" typically Protestant patterns of both experience and expression. (285). Herbert's expression of this experience is in turn "founded on" the generic and figurative resources made available to him by what Lewalski calls "Protestant poetics" (283).

In addition to reliance on spiritual topoi provided by this paradigm and the rhetorical richness of the Bible and biblical literature, the potential gap between individuality and typicality is closed in Lewalski's account of Herbert's poetics by appeals to the authority of Scripture. Citations from the Bible speak in Herbert's poems with the force--

often italicized--of God himself. Thus, for instance, in the poems concerned with the making of poetry "the speaker often finds the divine voice providing a resolution of his poetic problems through the medium of scripture: a few words of a scripture text are quoted in the poem as a means of relating God's voice and God's art to the poet's own art" (298).

Such "divine perfecting of human art" is also the theme of Bell's description of the development of Herbert's poetry, a development guided by "a maturing Protestant faith" ("Setting Foot" 224). Bell, however, stresses the particularly English version of Herbert's Protestantism. Features of Herbert's writing--"style, imagery, wit, point of view"--are tied directly to Herbert's increasingly lively faith: "As he becomes more committed to the Reformation and Protestantism, Herbert discovers that religious poetry will be more fruitful if it is fresh and unconventional" (221). Earlier critics such as Louis Martz and Rosamond Tuve had mistaken Herbert's subversive parodies and critiques of medieval meditations and icons for the real thing. As in Lewalski's account of Herbert's Protestantism, Bell concludes that God himself cooperated in and confirmed this protestantizing process: "With God's help, Herbert soon learns to make his voice, with its flickering, variegated reflections of Scripture, a pathway for the saving light of the Anglican Reformation . . ." (241).

Like Summers, Bell grants Herbert access to the heart

of genuine religious culture and, though in an even more remarkably triumphant way, raises him above all contention. In "Herbert's Valdesian Vision," Bell--again like Summers--tells the story of a poet who "withdrew to an uncontroversial life as country parson and poet, writing (but not publishing) poems for God and God's chosen" (303). Using Herbert's responses to the Spanish theologian Valdes' Considerations as evidence, Bell attempts to create an "index to the ways in which Herbert's religious beliefs triggered his imagination, defined his sense of himself, and shaped his poems" (307). Chief among these is Valdes' emphasis on the inauthenticity of "relations" of the knowledge of God, of merely external ceremonies, and the importance of first hand knowledge and personal experience. The career of The Temple's speakers represents a progress towards direct spiritual revelation. This of course is achieved, and Herbert, along with Valdes and Nicholas Ferrar, are described as martyrs who withdrew "from a public life of politics and religion to live in piety and seclusion . . . content to observe God's kingdom within" (328).

The "within" of Herbert's writing is also the focus of Richard Strier's Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry. At the heart of the book is the claim for the "centrality" of the doctrine of justification by faith to Herbert's poetry. Like Lewalski and Bell, Strier maintains that the Protestant emphasis on the genuinely

inward experience of God in Herbert's poetry places him at the center of a broad Protestant consensus:

The extraordinarily strong stress on individual inner experience in Herbert's poetry--together with his presentation of experience in both its positive and negative forms as independent of his own--volition helps us to understand the appeal of Herbert's poetry to Puritan and Dissenting readers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and, more generally . . .the continuity of the Protestant tradition as a whole.

(143)

Strier's forceful focus on the individualism of Herbert's poetry leads him to devalue and dismiss the importance of institutional factors as, ultimately, valueless and of no central importance to Herbert. Though certainly with greater restraint than Bell, Strier also speaks on behalf of a Herbert who speaks on behalf of genuine psychic and spiritual health.

This emphasis on the ultimate, the interior, and the soteriological in Herbert strikes me as a kind of premature closure, and insufficiently grounded in the conditions of possibility of seventeenth century religious culture--conditions which were as much the locus of contention and debate as a consensual resource. In the analyses of those critics who emphasize Herbert's personal experience of God as the expressive source of his poetry, something that is essentially pre- or post-discursive plays a vital explanatory role. In other words, the speakers of the poems are merely the vehicles or the record of something beyond

speech. It is, as in Herbert's "Prayer I," "something understood," capable of various figurative renderings but not capturable by them. Kenneth Burke has written that, even if we grant the possibility, as in the case of mystics, of communication with the "ultimate speechless ground of things," we should yet "ask ourselves how much of 'divinity' can be explained neurologically, how much linguistically, and how much 'socioanagogically.'" Having thoroughly pursued these investigations of the immanent, "Then God, genuinely transcendent, would be sought in the direction of whatever was still unaccounted for" (Rhetoric 298). Several recent articles have begun to study the less otherworldly aspects of Herbert's writing. But the possibilities certainly have yet to be exhausted; the truly transcendent has not yet been discovered by a process of elimination.¹⁹

Particularly problematic is the use of a Protestant consensus and the isolation of the Protestant emphasis on the internal as a means of dismissing the importance of the institutional in Herbert's poetry. This in turn reinforces an image of Herbert in retirement from the world and removed from the struggles and conflicts of Jacobean and Caroline culture. The notion of an "essential Protestantism," as Janet E. Halley has argued, is used to override political and cultural differences. Insofar as it is "understood to transcend ecclesiastical conflicts," the Protestant consensus "identifies the individuals and groups from which

it was abstracted," and implies "that this identity can be assigned to all English believers except recusants." As a result, "questions of church order and discipline are omitted;" they are treated as accidental differences that do not affect the essential identity of an individual or a text (305).

The critical assessment of Herbert's Protestantism has overlooked the political consequences of Protestant doctrine, and has underestimated both the institutionalization of Protestantism and the institutional limits placed on individualism. If, for instance, persons were no longer defined by their office, by their place in a static and God-given order, they were yet confined within the order itself. If Luther's The Freedom of a Christian freed the individual internally from unappeasable anxiety of conscience, externally he was subjected to an intensified control and demand for obedience to rulers and betters. Holding to this doctrine had both theological or experiential consequences, and political ones. Quentin Skinner argues that Luther's fierce denunciation of the Peasants' Revolts in 1525 and his unhesitating support of its violent suppression was a necessary element of his theological emphasis on the sole value of inwardness: "The stance he took was a direct outcome of his key theological belief that the whole of the existing framework of social and political order is a direct reflection of God's will and providence" (18). Things of

ultimate value and importance--salvation, God's justice and love--are deferred in Luther's theology to the ultimate of his two kingdoms; all things else are indifferent, merely matters of order and discipline. But because only a few are genuinely chosen, authentically Christian believers, the importance of maintaining order--by force if necessary--is increased, as only Christians can be expected to observe order and morality without coercion. The existing order is not God's ultimate order, but it is nonetheless instituted by God for the preservation of orderliness, the punishment of evil-doers (chief among whom Luther ranked rebels against authority), and restraint of the non-elect, likened in his treatise on secular authority to a wild beast.

The inevitable political consequences and institutional complications should play a part in how we read Herbert's most Protestant poetic statements. In Lutheran theology, the ultimate identity of a person is separated from the fulfillment of his office. Those who occupied offices of authority could exercise that authority according to worldly, not ultimate, standards. The maintenance of these worldly standards, however, is still an expression of God's will and not to be resisted: "If the State and its sword are a divine service . . . that which the State needs in order to wield the sword must also be a divine service" (Luther "Secular Authority" 381). With the emphasis on "private autonomy," Herbert Marcuse wrote, "person and work were separated

(person and office) with the resultant double 'morality'; actual unfreedom and inequality were justified as a consequence of 'inner' freedom and equality" (57).²⁰ The distribution of God's grace does not correspond with the distribution of authority or of material goods in this world, insofar as, according to Herbert's "Faith," "A peasant may believe as much/ As a great Clerk, and reach the highest stature" (29-30). Through the distributive justice of faith alone does "grace fill up uneven nature" (32), without transforming it as a natural order. According to Marcuse, "The authority system of the existing order assumes the form of a set of relationships freed from the actual social relationships of which it is a function; it becomes eternal, ordained by God, 'a second nature' against which there is no appeal" (62). The soteriological collapsing of the distinction between peasant and Clerk reifies their social distinction. Social distinctions based on office, on worldly estimations of "stature," do not affect or express God's evaluation of the person, but this evaluation carries no worldly currency. Only in the realm of private autonomy, Luther wrote, "God can and will let no one rule but himself" (383).²¹ In the private realm of "Faith," God distributes "all things" without respect to persons, and the power of faith endows the individual with a spiritual autonomy. The power of faith allows the speaker instantly to satisfy hunger:

Hungrie I was, and had no meat:
 I did conceit a most delicious feast;
 I had it straight, and did as truly eat,
 As ever did did a welcome guest.

(5-8)

The logic of the poem, and of the theology on which it is based, requires us to discern only the spiritual sense in this.²²

If the Protestant emphasis on the essentially inward nature of the worth of a person reinforces, and in functional terms absolutizes even if it does not morally legitimate the existing order and its distribution of goods and authority, then a criticism which emphasizes, isolates, and evaluates the inward as the essential focus of Herbert's writing would seem to reproduce this reification, if only by not subjecting the implications of inwardness to more searching and broadly historical scrutiny. In other words, the claims made in Herbert's poetry to genuine inwardness need to be measured against competing claims, and before labeling them as consensus positions, their potential for controversy and contestation must be assessed. In essential and inward terms--in the realm of the personal--the speaker of Herbert's "Faith" can be said to represent a typical Protestant in his belief that "Faith makes me anything, or all / That I beleeve in the sacred storie" (17-18). The suggestion that each elect individual's direct and faithful encounter with Scripture defines that individual is a signal

Protestant belief, as is its emphasis on the decisive effects of imputation.²³ But to interpret the poem as such leaps over the problem of interpretation that its doctrine raised for Protestant churches and for the Church of England, and that it raises still. The problem is that certain people may claim to be "anything, or all" on the basis of what they believe to be in the Bible, and this claim may tend to disorder. This in turn calls for new mechanisms of control, ones based on Scripture and devised for producing a certain variety of inwardness. Christopher Hill has noted that, after the Peasants' Revolts of 1525, Luther sought to "replace Bible-reading by the use of catechisms," and that "In England the protestant emphasis on the importance both of preaching and a learned clergy testifies to a similar anxiety to have qualified experts ready to undertake the ticklish job of interpreting the Bible" ("The Problem of Authority" 41). This is also a typically Protestant problem, "the problem of the Church," as Paul Tillich called it: "Does not the Church have to be a community, organized and authoritarian," and does not the "Protestant principle," which is "anti-authoritarian and anti-hierarchical" remove the possibility of a Church? (251-252).

To place Herbert's writing in a broad continuum of Protestant thought and belief, "the continuity of the Protestant tradition as a whole," to use Strier's phrase, is

in a sense to remove it from any determinant or determining context, one that can set limits or exert pressure on kinds of experience or on forms of expression. It is, in short, to separate theological doctrines from the political and social problems and effects that they produced, and religious expression from the interests that it served in this world.²⁴ Contextualizing Herbert's poetry in this way confirms and re-enacts the story of Herbert's withdrawal from the public world into a private world of the self, ruled and determined, as in Luther's account of the kingdom of God, by God alone, inviolable by the kingdom of the world and not, in any essential way, governed by its imperatives.²⁵ (As we shall see below, however, the story of Herbert's withdrawal from the world is a component of the effective presence of his writing in the world.)

To assert simply that Herbert, as a part of the Protestant tradition, emphasized such doctrines as election or the importance of the kingdom of God within is to stop halfway; what also needs to be considered are the social struggles and political consequences that the expression of such doctrines could produce, and the attempts made by the established Church to govern and manage those consequences. For instance, Hill has drawn attention to the simultaneity of the emphasis in Protestant churches on the freedom of the elect with the Protestant state's stringent exercise of control over the "unregenerate," and noted the "tacit

assump-tion, never clearly stated, still less theoretically justified . . . that the elect roughly coincided with the ruling class" ("Sin and Society" 122, 126). Further, as Hill's work detailing the explosion of a range of Protestant opinions and belief with the Civil War and the breakdown of censorship suggests, at issue was not only whether one emphasized inward experience or not, but the capacity and access to outward writing and speech, the possibilities of making what Raymond Williams calls "an effective contribution," about that experience, and the implications one attached to the notion of freedom from external constraints (Williams, Writing 4).²⁶ To take an example, Gerrard Winstanley writes of the human soul and all creation

lying under types, shadows, ceremonies, forms, customs, ordinances, and heaps of waste words, under which the spirit of truth lay buried, now to enlighten, to worship in spirit and in truth, and to bring forth the fruit of righteousness in action.

Here he is sounding all the right Reformation notes, but he is appealing to "The great leveller, Christ our King," and calling for an end to a system of property and a hierarchy which functions through "kingly power" by "hedging some into the earth, hedging out others" (320, 330). Winstanley insisted that a world governed by faith would indeed bring "all things" to all persons, and that it would enable the believer to "truly eat" food.²⁷

Approaches to Herbert that highlight his allegiance to

Protestant modes of experience and forms of expression, then, fail to take into account the unevenly distributed authority to use its doctrines as a means of self-discovery and self-expression, and in particular institutional attempts to govern how individuals will interpret and apply the scriptures or express the action of the spirit. In short, it could be said the struggles produced by Reformation doctrines involved not so much the relative stress on personal experience and inwardness as the dangers of unregulated expression of inward experience. In particular, the doctrines of the Reformation must be brought up against the limits placed on them by a Church, specifically what G.W. Bernard has called the "monarchical" Church of England. Bernard's comment on the perplexities surrounding attempts at establishing the religious identity of the Church of England can also be said to apply to Herbert; and his caution to both Protestant and Anglican critics:

Any view of the Church of England that fails to give due weight to its 'monarchical' element is . . .misleading, and especially when attention is paid to just those theological controversies that rulers were so intent on muffling. Before any theology can be claimed as the norm . . .it has to be set in the . . . context of a church controlled to the limits of their power by rulers with an obvious and consistent interest in promoting comprehensive, eirenic, politique policies in order to hold together a religiously divided society and church.

(191-192)

In my placing of Herbert's writing in its official capacity,

he is the agent rather than the object of these policies.

Those critics who have claimed Herbert as an "Anglican" --and I will take Heather Asals and John Wall as my examples --stress the shaping influence of institutional life on Herbert's writing and thus locate him in a "world of strife." But they have also underestimated the political entanglements of Herbert's religious writing. While stressing, as I do, that it is part of the nature of Herbert's peculiar office to represent and model the personal in the manner of a parson or priest, these critics take these conditions and effects of Herbert's filling this office to be spiritual, literary, and persuasive.

Placing Herbert's writing in an institutional context, Asals and Wall argue that it is representative by virtue of its rootedness in community, tradition, and consensus--not, as with the Protestant critics, a transnational consensus of theologians, but a local consensus located in the offices, texts, and history of the English Church. In an early essay, Asals identifies the voice of the speaker with that of Christ speaking not in or through a particular individual, but through the voice of his Body, the Church (Asals "Voice"). Later, she argues that the presence of God's voice in Herbert's poetry is best understood in connection with English liturgical practices, which she claims is the "locus of his own poetic." Rather than unmediated inwardness as the key to genuine religious expression, Asals argues, Herbert

found the structured and outward order of the liturgy necessary both to adequate expression and authentic experience. Thus, instead of grouping him with figures like Bunyan or Baxter, as do Lewalski and Strier, Asals maintains that

Herbert's demonstrable belief in the validity of set forms as expression not of individual but of whole self in Church aligns him . . . with Lancelot Andrewes and those who were later to uphold the need for 'set forms of Liturgy' and outward expression in the 1660s.

(Equivocal 70)

Asals emphasizes the important effects of external expression on inward experience, and re-places Herbert in the context in which he had been located by Summers: "within" a Church ideally governed by order and decency, historically continuous and socially communal, the source of genuine religious culture.

Wall similarly stresses the communal aspects of Herbert's practice, and he more directly confronts attempts to place Herbert in a too broadly Protestant context:

". . . the English Reformation possessed a distinctive character which affected religious writing of the age in profound ways and which prevents us from importing continental writing wholesale to explain it" (3). Wall sees the function of religion and religious writing not as primarily or solely the realm of the inward individual, but in a neo-Durkheimian sort of way as the promotion of social cohesion

and gradual transformation. As does Asals, Wall argues that for Herbert the individual is only fulfilled within a corporate structure, and that Herbert's writing is guided by a generally Anglican "persuasive poetics." Again in concurrence with Asals, Wall sees Herbert enabling and encouraging self-realization within the Church through 'The Church'; the liturgy is "that activity with words where the people as the people of God become themselves and recognize what they become . . . as enabled by the Prayer Book;" The Temple is "not a replica of the Church of England but a text in conversation with it; Herbert's intent is to enable richer participation in Anglican worship" (170, 223).

For Wall and Asals, the Church as an institution and Herbert as a representative of that institution are all-inclusive, capable of settling and accommodating both whole selves and whole societies. The official and the personal, as in Summers, are in no way at odds; in fact, it is only through the ideal union of them that selves and societies can find fulfillment. The tradition upon which Herbert depends preserves the identity of the community, and by integrating individuals into it, the poet or the priest helps to realize both individual identities and moves the community as a whole towards a future realization of its ideal identity.

Locating Herbert thus within this institution, however, removes him from conflict (in a different way but as surely

as an emphasis on Protestant inwardness): it renders institutional limits and pressures both necessary and natural, and makes tradition an organic and self-reproducing totality, the essential identity of a given culture or society. As with Summers, it is implied that anyone can find a place--or, perhaps, a place can be found for anyone--within the institution provided that he or she is not "too singular." Like those who claim Herbert as a primarily Protestant writer, this view underestimates the political and social inequality of place. After referring to the "anti-ceremonialist" position as "humorously irrational" and applauding the "judiciousness" of the Anglican view, Asals cites with approbation the characterization by Henry Hammond of set forms as a "necessary hedge" against formlessness, "the no-form being as fitly accommodated to the no-Church, as the no-hedge, no-wall to the Common, or desert, the no-inclosure to the no-plantation" (70). In citing this passage, Asals does not mean to be taking up a social or political argument: she uses it as a means of establishing the judicious position that order and "plainness and truth" were not incompatible, "according to Anglican theory at that time." But the passage suggests the vital connections between religious order and social order, between the regulation of the distribution of forms of expression and the distribution of rights and of wealth. Such a connection depends on interrelated patterns of division and exclusion,

as noticed by Winstanley as he pushed beyond the dissolution of the established Church after the Civil War: churches "in the Presbyterian, Independent, or any other form of profession . . . are like the inclosures of land which hedges in some to be heirs of life, and hedges out others." Hill comments: "So in a single phrase he linked, and dismissed, landlordism and the tradition of the 'particular churches'" ("The Religion of Gerrard Winstanley" 231-232). Just as much as Protestant critics with their focus on the interior life of the individual, Anglican critics who focus on activities and beliefs within the institution remove Herbert's writing from conflict by overlooking its socially and politically exclusive nature and function.

Like the religious beliefs that they would highlight in his writings, critical accounts of Herbert inevitably have political implications; these are treated either as incidental or accidental to the real experiential core of Herbert's expression, or not acknowledged at all. Theologically or ecclesiastically based scholarship locates Herbert's writing within one tradition or another, claiming that it is within that tradition that Herbert most naturally belongs, and, with greater and lesser degrees of explicitness, identifying that tradition as the genuine religious culture, freed from conflict or debate. In the case of both the Protestant and Anglican readings of Herbert, an appeal is made to a consensus. We should first of all acknowledge

the political, "hegemonic," effects of building and maintaining traditions. As Williams has argued:

What we have to see is not just 'a tradition' but a selective tradition: an intentionally selective version of a shaping past and a pre-shaped present, which is powerfully active in the process of social and cultural definition and identification.

(Williams, Marxism 115)

Taking this selectivity into account, the vocabulary of the integration of human beings into a Church, a social order, or even a particular kind of religious experience based on an inward sense of election and God's presence, by an enabling form of expression needs to be confronted with its exclusions. Traditions in this sense are not merely available resources, accessible to anyone and capable of including anyone, whether by theological "election" or communal acceptance, but also active processes of "incorporation"--the word Williams proposes to replace the more apolitical "socialization"--of persons by offices, the shaping and defining of experience by forms of expression; The question of who shapes and defines, and how, is crucial. As Williams' work as a whole has attempted to demonstrate, literary and discursive forms are neither universally accessible nor universally applicable. Despite its ostensibly anti-institutional emphasis and its stress on the individual's direct encounter with God, Protestantism in general and in England in particular was institutionalized and was accompanied by institutional problems and effects.²⁸

We need, then, to be conscious of religious discourses and traditions not simply as a pervasive, persuasive, and generally available ways of looking at the world and discovering identity, but also, as Frederic Jameson has maintained, of "religious and theological debate" as "the form, in pre-capitalist societies, in which groups become aware of their political differences and fight them out" (39).

The suppression of theological debate, then, could also be said to be the form in which political identity is asserted, and the all-incorporating nature of the state-ecclesiastical maintained, "whole selves" being brought into "whole societies." Bernard has suggested that central to the "monarchical view of the church lay a desire that was essentially political, but which could be expressed without insincerity in more idealized language (and would be in the poetry of John Donne and George Herbert): a desire for comprehensiveness, for a church that would embrace all her subjects." This led to a strategy of "the monarchical containment of religious passions," the curtailment of ideas and groups that would disrupt or disunify the state and its church (Bernard 187, 189). The desire for a Church that would encompass all the subjects of the realm was given its most famous formulation by Hooker, who of course identified all English subjects as de facto and de jure members of the Church of England. This view, repeated and elaborated by

royal proclamations and decrees over the next decades, embraced not only subjects and their outward conformity, but defined legitimate subjectivities as well by their willingness to comply with the "definitive sentence" of publicly authorized pronouncements on religious matters. Because God is "the author of peace and not of confusion," then he "can not be the author of our refusal, but of our contentment" to abide by the definitive sentence of authority, for without some such authoritative pronouncement, society, religious and civil, would not be sustainable. To enable social and communal life, Hooker argues, private conviction must be overridden by public determinations; again

that God being the author of peace and not of confusion in the Church, must needs be the author of those men's peaceable resolutions, who, concerning these things, have determined within themselves to think and do as the Church they are of decreeth, till they see necessarie cause enforcing them to the contrary.²⁹

(31, 34 emphasis added)

In Hooker, accession to a "shaping past and pre-shaped present" underwrite the individual's conformity, the "resolution" of which is authored by God, written "within" the individual.

Expression, in this sense, precedes and legitimates experience; private experience is subjected to public expressions of order, authority, and tradition. Indivi-

duals, of course, had to be taught to read this inward writing, and one of the essential methods of instruction was the catechism. Luther had written, in response to Erasmus's "Sceptical" reliance on the decrees and judgment of the historical Church, "what can the Church settle that Scripture did not settle first?" The right interpretation of Scripture, Luther maintained, was assured by the unmistakable presence of the Spirit in the true believer: "The Holy Spirit is no Sceptic, and the things he has written in our hearts are not doubts or opinions, but assertions--surer and more certain than life itself" (Bondage of the Will 170-171). This, of course, is the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, the unmediated contact between God and the believer. But as Hill has pointed out, this theological belief translated into social practice leads to anarchy--a possibility that Luther, subsequent reformers, and the leaders of the English church were keenly sensitive to.

Catechisms were among the means by which Protestants sought to regulate the external expression of the writing on the heart.³⁰ Stanley Fish's The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing, identifies the speaker(s) of Herbert's poems on the basis of what he sees as their "strategy," a strategy based on catechistical patterns and driven by catechistical intentions. I have saved Fish for last because he does not fit clearly into the "Protestant" or "Anglican" camp; instead, his analysis attempts to bring

together genuinely inward and individual experience and official forms of expression. In addition, the catechism can be seen as the form through which the institution and the individual most directly confront one another. As with the earlier critics, however, Fish's analyses place Herbert's poems outside the realm of social determination. The "strategy" he discerns in Herbert's poems is designed to gain "the involvement of the reader in his own edification" (27)--that is, the enabling of any reader both to experience spiritual enlightenment and become a part of the trans-historical Temple of God. The strategy, according to Fish, is a Socratic drawing out of the truth "within" the individual by means of posing and prodding the reader to self-discovery. He suggests that Herbert transcends the methods of rote memorization applied by most of his contemporaries by giving "the pupil a large and necessary role in his own edification" (48). Citing Herbert's A Priest to the Temple, or The Country Parson, which he contrasts with contemporary work on catechistical practice, Fish maintains that Herbert's technique in catechizing was "dynamic," that rather than following a routine set of prescribed questions and answers, it raised unpredictable questions as a means of producing within the catechumen self-realization: "when one is asked a question, he must discover what he is" (cited by Fish 21). This technique is even more effective in that it operates on the catechist's knowledge of the catechumen's

condition, knowledge, and state of spiritual maturity. Fish emphasizes the element of surprise in this technique, and suggests that it can be used to understand the poetic strategy of the lyrics of The Temple.

Implicit in Fish's account of Herbert is the notion of the speaker as almost pure office, a position in a strategy.³¹ As such, the person implied in the strategy is supremely assured of his position in the mastery of spiritual truth. He describes the transaction of the poems and the catechism of Herbert as "situation" in which the reader/catechumen's experience is both unpredictable and "controlled and assured because the artificer of that experience knows exactly what he is doing" (47). While this may indeed account for Herbert's strategy, what it does not account for--and indeed, what most theological readings of Herbert do not account for--are the questions of authority and access to authority implicit in the speaker's position. That is, while the form of this technique may be unpredictable, its result is completely predictable, and it is the catechist/poet who is in the position of assessing both the needs of the catechumen/reader and determining when satisfactory results have been reached. The position assigned to the reader is similar to that in Bakhtin's description of "official monologism, which pretends to possess a ready-made truth." Whatever the form of this monologic discourse, the truth to be arrived at will have been determined from the

outset. Bakhtin describes the historical process by which Socratic dialogue "entered the service of established, dogmatic worldviews . . . transformed into a simple form for expounding already found, ready-made irrefutable truth" (Dostoevsky 110). While the form may not be simple, in Herbert's catechism as in his poems the position of truth is always already present, waiting for the reader's discovery, and decisively, albeit often gently or tacitly evaluating the quality of that discovery.³² By Bakhtin's definition of the dialogic construction of the truth, the process described by Fish as "dynamic" is only apparently so, insofar as one member of the verbal exchange is granted a prior access to the ideal outcome of that exchange: "Truth is not to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for the truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction" (110).

Fish's theory also greatly underestimates the institutional determination of this process, setting limits to and exerting pressure on the possibilities of "self-discovery." While the pupil/reader in this process may have a "large and necessary role," that individual also "must discover" himself under the institutionally authorized questioning of a superior. "Must discover" here implies both the sureness of the technique employed in the situation, and the coercive pressure and discursive limits of that situation. A Priest to the Temple could hardly be

clearer about this: the parson "useth, and preferreth the ordinary Church Catechism, partly for obedience to Authority, partly for uniformity sake, that the same common truths may be everywhere professed . . ." The parson "exacts all the Doctrine of the Catechisme" from all members of the parish, both "the very words" and "the substance." Individuals shaped and subjected by this catechism will be able to travel in the realm and "give the word," and so identify themselves as acceptable members of the state-ecclesiastical. As we shall see in Chapter IV, the "ordinary" catechism also implicates the catechumen in the hierarchical social, political, and ecclesiastical government (Herbert, Works 255). The contexts in which an individual "must discover" himself, that is reveal himself to Authority, extend beyond the bounds of his own self-discovery.

In short, the intra-and inter-personal relationships and situation described by Fish, and in most accounts of the relationships between reader, speaker, and poet in Herbert's poetry, are also governed by official concerns; kinds of experience are produced and evaluated by pre-determined forms of expression: the only expressive role vouchsafed to the reader or the catechumen is to make erroneous conjectures, and eventually to make a confession of the true experience provided by official expression.

We should, then, be able to "re-situate" this relationship, to locate it not in any simple or exclusive way in

the personal experience of the catechist or the catechumen, but in the positions assigned to each by official discourse, and to describe this discursive and institutional transaction as a relationship of power. In A Priest to the Temple, Herbert advises that, insofar as the choice of a particular "Method" for inquiry into "Divinity" is a "thing indifferent"--i.e. all other things being equal--"Catechizing being a work of singular, and admirable benefit to the Church of God, and a thing required under canonical obedience, the expounding of our Church Catechisme must needs be the most needful form" (230). This combination of a system of knowledge, institutional imperatives, and the exercise of power over subjectivity, has been described by Foucault as components of "pastoral power."

Foucault describes the exercise of power as the application of a technique, the working out of a strategy, in a determinant situation. But whereas Fish would understand the operations of that strategy as the enabling of the individual's self-discovery, Foucault maintains that it is a "form of power" that assigns an individual an identity, an identity governed by rules that function both within the individual and externally in a system of recognition, approval and integration, or delegitimation and exclusion:

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others must

recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word subject: subject to somebody else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to.

("The Subject and Power" 212)

Foucault emphasizes that one of the objectives of power is to make effective a "combination in the same political structures of individualization techniques and totalization procedures" (213). This combination is achieved through the development of "pastoral power." This form of power is located specifically in the institution of the Church, and is effected by the "principle that certain individuals can, by their religious quality, serve others" not by occupying other powerful political or social offices, but "as pastors." As pastors, certain individuals have access to "a very special form of power" (214). It is in this sense, though perhaps not this sense alone, that Herbert's poetic may be labeled priestly: it is composed from and through a privileged position, a position granted special access to the truth, and it uses this position to exercise power by defining and delimiting individuals. My thesis is that the texts of Herbert's that I examine can be said to be attempts to make that person and office cooperate in the creation and management of religious and political subjects who 'fit' the requirements of the state ecclesiastical. In A Priest to the Temple, the parson's right to exercise authority depends on

his commitment to producing individuals who are both "Christians" and "Commonwealths-men." To procure attention, he relies both on a "Holy Life," an internal condition that his life makes manifest, and recourse to the institutional authority that comes with his official position, "the examination and punishment of those who are in Authority" (228, 269).

Patterns and Boundaries

I have been arguing that we read Herbert's writing, and the religious discourse of the early seventeenth century altogether, with a double awareness. On the one hand, we see the forces determining expression by limiting access to the pulpit or to print, or by official public determinations of the personal qualifications required for authentic and authorized religious discourse; on the other, we see the ways in which that writing is aimed at governing the experience of individuals. I mean to focus attention on the conditions for writing within a governmental system deeply suspicious and vigilant of "private men's" intervention in publicly authorized discourse. This government nonetheless required something more than a simple repetition of its core documents--the Homilies being read in the absence of an politically or doctrinally approved preacher, for instance. In its desire to create subjectivities in accordance with a governmental and discursive regime, it aspired to an overall determination in religious matters of who could speak, where, when, and of what. Still, it needed individual--though not originating--speakers, and not merely readers, to achieve this.³³ Those who emphasize the importance of individual experience overlook or exclude the subtle but decisive presence of the institution through which the

individual is "always already" shaped--in the catechism, for example--or through which individuals are allowed or denied the authority to speak as individuals. Those who emphasize the institution as enabling community overlook that institution's exclusive practices and too readily accept the institution's definition and subsumption of the individual.

From its beginnings in separation from Rome, the Church of England sought to establish itself, under royal rule, as a governing authority based on law and consensus that would regulate and control the experience and expression of "private men." It instituted forms of "divine service" as established in the Act of Uniformity of 1558, which designated the Prayer Book as the sole form for use "openly or privately," by "any manner of parson, vicar, or other whatsoever minister," and provided penalties for clerical non-compliance and lay non-attendance. (The Canons of 1604 required both attending Church and attending to the Priest.) Those who pushed for further reform--which often meant a greater though by no means wide distribution of the right to preach or pray--were regarded by the official documents of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church not only as disorderly Christians but, and perhaps more importantly, as disloyal subjects, who by their dissent from lawful consensus revealed a politically illegitimate and socially unseemly "singularity."

In his Proclamation for the Use of the Book of Common

Prayer, issued following the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, James reiterated this principle as he inveighed against "some of those who misliked the state of religion here established," who consequently

began such proceedings as did rather raise a Scandal in the Church than take offense away. For both they used forms of public service of God here not allowed, held assemblies without authority, and did other things, carrying a very apparent show of sedition more than of zeal.

(Gee and Hardy 514).

The complaints heard, by James and the "gravest bishops and prelates of the realm," against established forms and practices at Hampton Court were supported, according to the proclamation, "with so weak and slender proofs," that they were substantially rejected, and the Prayer Book reissued with some "small things . . . explained" rather than changed. The proclamation forbids subjects to raise the question further, affirming the necessity of a central public body for the preservation of order against the excessive innovations of troublesomely singular "private men":

And how necessary it is to use constancy in the upholding of public determinations of States, for that such is the unquietness and unsteadfastness of some dispositions affecting every year new forms of things as if they should be followed in their inconsistency, which would make all actions of States ridiculous and contemptible, whereas the maintaining by good advice established is the weal of all Commonwealths.

(515).

The position articulated in this document reveals much about

the peculiarities of Reformation and Protestant doctrines in the Church of England. It places and limits the possibilities and program for reform within the structure of a commonwealth, and stresses the central government's need for prestige, a prestige threatened by the radical, though logical, implications of central Reformation doctrines. Reform aims at change--though reformers would argue that their changes would only reverse centuries of innovation--but the health of states depends on continuity and a duly authorized consensus and uniformity of practice and belief.

There are also clear implications in this public decree for individual and private conviction; these are found in the implicit but vital distinctions between "public and common order," which is good, sound, and reasonable, and the "dispositions" of those who question its legitimacy, which are disobedient, unruly, and passionate. James contends that the arguments of those opposed to the Prayer Book in its present form, which he found "weak and slender," were put forth as "mighty and vehement informations." James represents himself, as Head of the Church, as the dispassionate, impartial, and self-authenticating arbiter of all disputes, settling the affairs of the Church in the paternal fashion for which he wished to be known: ". . . what our pains were, what our patience in hearing and replying, and what the indifferency and uprightness of our judgement in determining we leave to the report of those who heard the same, con-

tenting ourself with the sincerity of our heart therein" (514). Public pronouncement and private conviction are conjoined in the king's rhetorical ethos, and private persons--subjects--are enjoined to conform and submit themselves to his public determinations. As a statement of public policy, James' proclamation rules out even private dissent as a legitimate option, because it is both disorderly and insincere. The "explanations" he orders appended to the Prayer Book are intended to free "the public form . . . not only from blame but from suspicion," to fix the meaning of the Prayer Book so as to exclude "other sense than the Church of England intendeth," and to ensure that "no troublesome or ignorant person of the Church" will "be able to take the least occasion of cavil against it" (514). James' sincerity and seriousness have both exemplary and legal force to determine not only what individuals will say, but the possible meanings assigned to the words and forms.³⁴

The same attempt at fixing and regulating form and meaning is also evident in the royal vigilance over preaching. In his Directions Concerning Preachers of 1622, James stipulated that no preacher below the degree of bishop or dean of a cathedral or collegiate Church was "to take occasion, by the expounding of any text of Scripture whatsoever, to fall into any set discourse, or commonplace (otherwise than by opening the coherence and division of his text) which shall not be comprehended and warranted, in

essence, substance, effect, or natural inference" from the Articles of Religion or the Homilies "set forth by authority in the Church of England." The purpose of this edict, James continues, is "not only for the help of the non-preaching, but withal a pattern and a boundary, as it were, for the preaching ministers" (Gee and Hardy 516). James' pronouncement complexly mixes hermeneutics, homiletics, and politics; it assumes that a preacher's "opening" of his biblical text--the choice of which is already established by the Prayer Book--will produce a sermon acceptable in the terms set forth in the official documents of the Church, and also that these sermons will be acceptable in the terms of the text's own "coherence;" the opening of a text is predetermined by a closed system. To further ensure that preacher's expounding of the Bible does not conflict with the publicly authorized discourse of the Church of England, preachers are advised to "peruse diligently, the said book of Articles, and the two books of homilies."

Directions Concerning Preachers is a prime example of the negotiation between the principles of the Reformation and the requirements of the State Church. The ultimate goal of the Directions was to prohibit discussions from the pulpit of matters of State--in particular, James' foreign policy--doctrines of secular authority, and the politically problematic doctrines of election and predestination.³⁵ In a letter to Archbishop George Abbot, James underscored the

historical precedent of his control of the pulpit: "the abuses and extravagances of preachers in the pulpit have been in all times suppressed in this realm by some act of council or state, with the advice and resolution of grave and learned prelates" (cited by Hill Society 37). This institutional control is exercised through and on a hermeneutical principle: the "coherence and division of the text." In other words, the proclamation aims at both enforcing this principle of expounding Scripture and defining the patterns and boundaries the exposition must remain within to obtain the approval of the State.

An emphasis on preaching was one of the essential marks of the Reformation church; differences between "Anglicans" and "Puritans" were likely to center on differences of emphasis and degree. James' Directions attempt to preserve this focus, both as a religious conviction and a political expedience, and to maintain control over the production and circulation of religious discourse. In order to square political control and Reformation principles, the "coherence and division" of the text must be seen either to support or not explicitly to challenge the established church. So a hermeneutical and theological principle became the object and the means of political contention. The hermeneutic circle was used to set limits to discussion and debate about theology, politics, and church government. For the assumption was that if the text's own limits were observed, if

preachers restricted themselves to the "two heads of faith and good life" which the Directions claimed to be the only proper exposition of Scripture, then dissent and disagreement would be no more (518).

Thus the frequently heard complaint was that preachers introduced matters into the text that had no proper place in it, and that their doing so was not a truly spiritual act but a mechanical and trouble-making "innovation." For example Issac Casuabon attributed the cause of all dissension to

. . . men, devoid of Gods Spirit, [who] commonly and promiscuously did dispute of spiritual things, and convert theology into technology . . . a matter of learned or artificial discourse. . . From this license, which now almost eveywhere beareth sway, rise so many new termes, and such diversitie of forms of speech, and sentences which daily breed dissention in the Church of God.

("The Epistle Dedicatorie" emphasis added)

As does James, Casaubon implicitly applies a test of sincerity on these "new termes" and "diversitie of forms of speech;" because they arise from men "devoid" of genuine religious experience, they are as forms of expression unwarranted and not comprehended by the plain truth of a simple and edifying exposition of a text, and therefore produce only dissent and disunity.

This same concern for legitimately simple and authentic forms of theological expression is the focus of Herbert's

"Divinitie." As do James and Casaubon, the Herbert's poem inveighs against the merely "technological" exposition of religious discourse. Just as astronomers create cosmological maps which have no real connection to the actual behavior of the stars, and are in fact evidence of human construction willfully imposed,

Just so the other heav'n they also serve
 Divinities transcendant skie:
 Which with the edge of wit they cut and carve.
 Reason triumphs, and faith lies by.

(4-8)

Such activity is merely witty, and serves only to disunify and obfuscate doctrine that "Was cleare as heav'n, from which it came." The poem then invokes the standard of "faith and good life," the adiaphora of essential Christian belief: "At least those beames of truth, which only save" are clear; even if much else remains obscure, these matters are not worth discussing, and a hindrance to true spirituality. The necessary forms of expression can, by the application of this standard, be narrowed to a minimum, none of them by any means "New termes": "Love God and your neighbor. Watch and pray. / Do as ye would be done unto."

The issue is not whether or not Herbert sincerely believed in this principle, but that both sincerity and the principle itself were essential to the establishment of certain kinds of authority and the limitation of discussion and discourse. The Directions Concerning Preachers establish

a system of authority which attempts to regulate from above the production of religious discourse, by fixing the limits of that discourse in terms of what can be "comprehended and warranted" by the essence of the Church, which in turn fixes the essence of true "Divinitie." In James' Directions, this authority is hierarchically distributed through the centralizing system of licensing: licenses will be issued "only upon recommendation of the party of the bishop of the diocese under his hand and seal, with a 'fiat' from the Archbishop of Canterbury and confirmation of the great Seal of England . . ." (Gee and Hardy 518). The expression of sincere and edifying religious discourse is thus marked by institutional regulation. Herbert's poem too tries to bring religious discourse back into the concentric orbit of a few, fundamental principles, and to invalidate the perihperal and tangential: "Then burn thy Epicycles, foolish man . . ." (25).³⁶

And so, perhaps, at the level of discourse does a poem about the intimate personal relationship between an individual and God: "The Collar"--or, indeed, many of the poems in which Herbert's speaker is recalled to simplicity and sincerity from meandering and erroneous spiritual and poetic paths by the italicized voice of God. The poem is familiar enough, I trust, not to require extensive quotation, and indeed I am not offering a new reading of it. Instead, a brief look at it in the context I have been developing might

suggest the ways in which that context would reconfigure Herbert's poems.³⁷ For indeed, what does the poem do but impose patterns and boundaries on the speaker's verbal, spiritual, and emotional horizons, and reassert the vertical control implied in the roles of Lord and Child? The poem's language, ostensibly, is generated by the speaker's act of rebellion, and as in Casaubon's account of the coining of "new termes" and "diversitie of forms of speech," follows phrase upon phrase "commonly and promiscuously": "My life and lines are free; free as the road, / Loose as the wind, as large as store" (4-5). The speaker seems to be drawn to a somewhat tame version of what Bakhtin's described as carnival: verbal inventiveness unimpeded by conventional forms, physical abundance, and a suspension of the "cold dispute/ Of what is fit, and not" (20-21). In his attempt to depart from patterns and boundaries, the speaker produces images and metaphors which exemplify wit, but because of their leaving behind of conventional categories, they also stymie interpretation: "Forsake thy cage, / Thy rope of sands, / Which pettie thoughts have made, and made to thee, / Good cable, to enforce and draw, / And be thy law . . ." (21-25). The figurative and syntactic "license" of the lines is issued by the monologic intentions of the author, and the speaker discovers that within his attempts at verbal self-creation is a (pre-)determining voice, "At every word": the voice of "one calling" him back to a preestablished identity

and a fixed role. As in "The Forerunners," in which the Herbert describes his poetic as the transformation, by washing and providing proper attire ("Brought you to Church well-drest and clad"), of a previously "promiscuous" "diversitie of forms of speech," "The Collar" is carnival-in-reverse, the centrifugal in the service of the centripetal, a discussion over before it begins. In this, it could be said, it resembles the system of government established in the state-ecclesiastical.

The objectives and regulations of this system of government, I suggest, can be implicated in the frame of The Temple. The use of the term "frame" here is taken from Frow's Derrida-derived notion of the ways in which aesthetic objects are delimited, which he takes as "a metaphor for the frame structures of genre and literary system." It defines a literary text's "particular distribution of the 'real' and the 'symbolic,'" and designates "appropriate degrees of fictionality and figurality and the kinds of use to which [a text] can be put" (220). In general, the frame specifies what kind of discursive entity a text is, what kind of authority it bears and the bases of that authority, and implicit directions for use. It both points to space "inside" the frame and limits access to and appropriations of that interior and privileged space. While one of the functions of a frame is to deny its own functionality, the "frame is potentially what disrupts the 'interiority' of the

work, betraying the interest by which it is delimited and the operation of valuation by which it is rarefied" (219). The frame is "both material and immaterial, literal and figurative;" in the case of a literary text the material frame is composed of "the covers of a book, or of the lines enclosing a poem . . . of the title page, signifying genre and the expectations created by the date, by the signature, by dedicatory material, by the title, perhaps by the publishing house" (220-221).³⁸

Frow's development of the idea of the frame suggests a complex and virtually limitless process, but a process whose purpose is to set limits, to rely on and develop familiar patterns and to establish interpretive boundaries. Accounts of a text's frame will be framing activities themselves, and partial and political. Like Said's description of "affiliation," Frow focus on the frame means to "make visible" a text's connections to variable political and historical circumstances by reading in the frame a text's "signification of itself with a differential relation to reality" (224). This will entail an avowedly political approach to the text:

Rather than reproducing a text's official value, the reader must undertake a negative revalorizing by "unframing" it, appropriating it in such a way as to make it subversive of its own legitimacy, and so useful in the class struggle. The possibility of doing this is not inherent in the text, but it is possible to construct the moment of intertextual productivity as an image of such a possibility.

(228-229)

These elements of "intertextual productivity" I have tried to develop above, in the relationship between the patterns and boundaries set by the official discourse of the state-ecclesiastical, and a preacher's sermon or a poet's lyric. To conclude the introduction, I will focus on the presence of these patterns and boundaries in some aspects of the frame of The Temple, first in Nicholas Ferrar's preface to the volume, and then in "Lent," a poem from the inside of The Temple which points to and relies on the framing--as in "fashioning" and limiting--of the individual in the institutional Church.

In Izaak Walton's biography, Herbert is said to have committed The Temple to Nicholas Ferrar's care with the characterization of it as "a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have past betwixt God and my Soul," and to have offered it to any "dejected poor Soul" for whom it might hold consolation. By this account, as a picture, as a literary representation, The Temple is a model of private, spiritual submission. The reader can follow the author as he comes to "subject mine to the will of Jesus my Master" (Walton 276).

Within the frame of The Temple, however, this is no simple private transaction, and a reader wishing to gain access to a "perusal" of it will encounter material subtly urging a less than direct subjection to Christ, in particu-

lar Ferrar's preface and its stress on Herbert's devotion to the established Church. The text itself, however, is presented as a rare production, and the direct expression of Herbert's immediate contact with God. Ferrar forgoes the conventional invocation of the Muses as an inappropriate framing gesture for that which Herbert "himself was confident to have been inspired by a diviner breath than flows from Helicon." Because of its inspired immediacy, The Temple is a text that needs no introduction, and the frame denies its functional intentions:

The world shall therefore receive it in that naked simplicitie . . .without any addition either of support or ornament, more than is included in it self. We leave it free and unforestalled to every man's judgement, and to the benefit he shall find by perusall.

The Temple is the thing itself, the essential matter unadorned by "support or ornament," and so clear, simple, and accessible by a mere "perusall." Like the Word of God, Ferrar implies, The Temple can be read by every individual who is likewise inspired by the Spirit who breathed the poems. This is an extraordinary claim, and confers on The Temple a degree of authority for a poetic production unmatched before it and not to be rivaled until Milton's more grandiloquent claims to divine visitations and dictations.

But if The Temple can be issued into the world complete in itself, not requiring the external authority of the

testimony of the Muses or the ornament or support of, perhaps, the encomiums of other poets, Ferrar nonetheless feels the need, "for the clearing of some passages . . . to make the common Reader privie to some few particularities of the condition and disposition of the Person." The authority of the poems of is founded solely on the private and personal, and this authority is enhanced in the preface by Herbert's self-aware and willing departure from the common sources of poetic authority--the court, birth, and privilege--in a self-denying forsaking of his highest opportunities, pursuit of which in themselves "could make relation farre above the ordinarie": "Quitting both his deserts and all the opportunities that he had for worldly preferment, he betook himself to the Sanctuarie and Temple of God, choosing rather to serve at Gods Altar, then to seek the honour of State-employments" (emphasis added). The poems of The Temple attest to the genuineness of this choice, a genuineness that, how- ever (and I mean, "how ever"), is produced by the experience of inward compulsion. This makes Herbert's choice of vocation, like his inspired poems, the expression of God in him. In this rather circular process, the Person and his poems authenticate each other through the mediation of his cooperation in being placed at "Gods Altar":

As for those inward inforcements to this course (for outward there was none) which many of the ensuing verses bear witness of, they detract not from the freedome, but adde to the honour of this resolution in

him. As God had enabled him, so he accounted him meet not onely to be called, but to be compelled to this service . . .

In this account, the position of Herbert's Person is merely the local habitation of an all-determining--compelling--divine will. None of Herbert's nobility, birth, education, achievements, least of all, "that knowledge which the Kings Court had taken of him," have any bearing on the choice or exercise of his calling. Only "inward enforcements"--in Lutheran theology, the realm of private autonomy and Christian freedom--are decisive. In Ferrar's account, as in Walton's, Herbert's vocational choice--realized only at age 37, we should remember--is the overcoming of the accidents of his birth and individual attainments by the essence of his vocational identity.

This denial and disavowal of self-determination, which is at the same time an assertion of self-realization, confirms and is confirmed by the poems of The Temple, both theologically and poetically. "The Dedication" returns the poems to God, "for from thee they came;" others call for and claim completion by God. "Affliction I" presents the speaker's feeling of being duped and trapped in his choice of vocation, only to discover God's love guiding the process; "The Priesthood," as I suggested above, fulfills the requirements and obtains the power of the "Blest Order" by its very hesitation to assume them. The theology of these self-denying moves is suggested in "The Holdfast," in which

the speaker discovers, after being chased out of every possible position of self-determination by an unnamed interlocuter, "That all things were more ours by being his" (12).

But this theological or spiritual transformation and fulfillment of an individual Person can also be seen as a element of a discursive pattern and an ideological mystification, aimed at reinforcing the institutional authority of an Office.³⁹ Said has maintained that Foucault's work supports a criticism that can "see the text as a process signifying an effective historical will to be present, an effective desire to be a text and to be a position taken" (221). But in Ferrar's telling of Herbert's choice of vocation, enabled and compelled by God, and in Herbert's presentation of his poems originating with and completed by God, this will is effectively denied. Herbert thus becomes, in Ferrar and in theological criticism, removed from the world, and canonized by both: Herbert's performance of his duties and his production of his poems "make him justly a companion to the primitive Saints, and a pattern or more for the age he lived in" (3).

Having established Herbert's Person, the private details of his calling and election, and his place among the Saints, Ferrar installs him in his office, and his "inward enforcements" make his outward exercise of his duties to the Church both unique in their punctilious dedication and the

fulfillment of the institutional ideal:

His obedience and conformitie to the Church and the discipline thereof was singularly remarkable. Though he abounded in private devotions, yet he went every morning and evening with his familie to the Church; and by his example, exhortations drew the greater part of his parishioners to accompanie him dayly in the publick celebration of Divine Service.

Here is my argument in miniature: Herbert, developed as a pattern himself, conforms to the pattern provided by the Church; in his conformity to an institution and its discipline, he is singular; his abundance of private devotions give way to his participation in the public: the personal underwrites and informs the official. Herbert is atypical in the degree to which his Person fulfills a type.

And as such, as an official pattern of the personal, this combination enables the individual to secure the conformity of others. As a pattern, Herbert and Herbert's exercise of his office sets limits and marks boundaries. Before detailing the ways in which the country parson of Herbert's A Priest to the Temple enacts this role, I would like to look briefly at "Lent," an infrequently discussed poem,⁴⁰ as an example of the attempt of Herbert's writing to frame the individual in accordance with a pre-determined pattern.

The presence of official Church feasts and fasts was a source of conflict between those whom Patrick Collinson calls "formalists" and those who pressed for further reform.

It was one of those elements of religious practice regarded as a thing "indifferent" by supporters of the established Church and as a non-scriptural innovation and vestigial Catholicism by opponents. A radical such as Henry Barrow "found no warrant in the Bible for fasting on ember days, the eves of Saints days, or in Lent" (Hill, "Authority" 40). Moreover, as Horton Davies argues, conflict centering on the church calendar was symbolic of different concepts of the Church's relation to the State and the nation (221). Feasts, fasts, and Saints days were part of the tradition of a national Church, and those who were committed to an international Protestant order were likely to be less than impressed with the authority of this tradition.

Herbert's poem enters this debate with contemptuous dismissal not only of the institutional loyalty but also of the personal and spiritual legitimacy of non-conformists. In the context of the disagreement over the calendar, Herbert's bidding "Welcome" to the "deare feast of Lent" is a provocative assertion of the universality of the official standard for personal conduct, at least for English people; if it also seems to strive, as do many of Herbert's poems, for quiet, order, and harmony, we must still acknowledge that it does so by the exclusion of dissent as a legitimate option, or of discussion as a mode of communication. In priestly fashion, the poem assigns the reader a passive role as the speaker assumes the position of a master of truth.

The poem quickly wears out its welcome and gives way to enforcing the exclusion and de-legitimation of dissent. By defining those who do not observe the institutional forms as individuals lacking in spiritual virtues of "Temperance" and as posing a threat to "Authoritie," the poem valorizes the established Church by denying such persons legitimate subjectivity: they are "compos'd of passion."⁴¹ The poem implicates the reader in a network of institutional, social, and familial obligations as a means of achieving assent to a particular spiritual regimen and institutional regimentation. Key to this process is the Church's authority to determine interpretations and applications of the Bible, identifying the Scripture's meaning with the Church's saying: "The Scriptures bid us fast; the Church sayes now: /Give to thy Mother what thou wouldst allow/ To every Corporation."⁴²

The rhetorical balance achieved in the poem between the Scripture's bidding, the Church's say-so, and the "composition" of individual subjects can be tied to the defense of the established and accepted practices, traditions, and public determinations that we saw in the royal proclamations, and which runs from Hooker to Hobbes as a means of justifying the private individual's subsumption by the public institution. In Hooker, the extension of this principle is vast, and in keeping with natural law: ". . . the act of a public society of men done five hundred years

saying of the Church, and the speaker of the poem, speaking for the Church, composes a form by which the essential composition of the individual can be measured and tested. The individual composed in this fashion is then numbered among "True Christians." The "Power" and "Authorite" required to make this application of the knowledge of individuals and the means by which they can be identified as legitimate and loyal subjects is concentrated in the institution of the Church: the official Church provides an essential channel for the expression of divine power. "True Christians" are said to take every opportunity for the experience of self-denial when it is "seasonable," "Unless Authoritie, which should increase/ The obligation in us, make it lesse,/ And Power itself disable" (16-18). The poem establishes a kind of magisterial austerity, in which those in "Authoritie" manage for "us" the ways in which we should experience divine "Power" through self-denial. The poem then shifts its focus to the general benefits of fasting as a spiritual exercise and, in imitation of Christ, the fasting individual is more likely to encounter him "then one/ That travelleth by-ways" (38-39). In the overall argument of the poem, those "by-ways" are defined as any that depart or are excluded from the patterned and bounded ways of the Church.

In A Priest to the Temple, it is the parson's task to ensure that none within the bounds of his parish travel any but the established route. Here, as in "Lent," the aim and

effect of Herbert's priestly perspective is deeply authoritarian and austere, representative of the "one-sided and gloomy official seriousness" which Bakhtin saw as the opposite of carnival, and which "seeks to absolutize a given condition of existence and a given social order" (Dostoevsky's 160). In Chapter II, I make a detailed examination of the ways in which the putative parson of the text uses his institutionally shaped knowledge of "divinity" and his institutionally derived definition of "What he is" to govern the lives of individuals in his parish according to the principles and purposes of the state-ecclesiastical.

NOTES

1. Foucault, in "What is an Author?", defines this procedure as an interpretive protocol based on what he calls an "author function." For a more detailed account of this, see Chapter III, note 1.
2. The appellation is a contemporary one, and as Christopher Hill has shown, is not necessarily an indicator of theological orientation. In "The State-Ecclesiastical," Hill describes the wide consensus on the necessity of a national church for, among other things, the inculcation and the enforcement of order.
3. Asals continues that "Protestant" critics also overlook ". . . the story told in Walton of Herbert turning to Edmond Duncon on his deathbed" and requesting that only the prayers of the Church of England be used to provide him comfort. Asals in turn overlooks the politically interested and possibly apocryphal nature of Walton's use of this anecdote, and indeed, according to David Novarr, much of Walton's late biography of Herbert (Novarr 301-361). What is at stake here is not evidence as such, but the issue of what counts as evidence, and the kinds of things evidence makes evident.
4. Some version of this interpretive circle is probably inevitable, as Stanley Fish would certainly argue.
5. See also 'Determine' in Williams' Keywords, 98-102, and Marxism and Literature, 84.
6. The phrase is from Ferrar's preface to The Temple. See below.
7. The phrase "world of strife" is from "Affliction I," and refers to the speaker's being "entangled" in an academic position (41-42).
8. I discuss selection and emphasis more fully in Chapter III.

9. Quotations from Herbert's poems are taken from Hutchinson's edition of his Works, and are cited by line number in the text. Quotations from A Priest to the Temple are cited by parenthetical references to page numbers in Works.

10. Critics have tended to focus on the poem's representation of Herbert's humility rather than the institutional role it projects. Michael Schoenfeldt has recently read the poem's expression of humility as parallel to courtly modes of dealing with authority in an article devoted to the ways in which Herbert's speakers negotiate a world ruled by authority. My own emphasis is on the poem as an assumption of authority. Herbert may use humility as a means of earning the favor of authority, but having obtained it--i.e. having gained entrance into the "Blest Order"--he takes on, "puts on," in the terms of the poem, a great deal of authority himself.

11. See Lentricchia and Holstun.

12. See Rabelais, 90.

13. Canon X confronts the problem of separatists, and even in this most monological kind of document the voice of opposition emerges, as the Canon excommunicates those who "dare presume to publish" their belief that "their pretended church hath for a long time groaned under the burden of certaine grievances imposed upon it and upon the members." This is fine writing, and fairly catches the rhythm and voice of many oppositional groups.

14. See Chapter V, note 5.

15. Christian Malcolmson's essay is a recent and welcome departure from this practice, regarding the "text in itself as worthy of attention." It is, she writes, a "major biographical event;" my own focus on the text is more on the ways in which this event is connected to a means to fashion others and a whole culture rather than Herbert himself.

16. As with Foucault's definition of power, Said's description of culture probably tries to cover more territory than it is able to. Still, for my purposes, it more or less corresponds to the official religious culture's own definition of its activity.

17. Most forceful is Christopher Hodgkins: he argues that it is "impossible to view Herbert's entry into the priesthood as a retreat, either in a positive or pejorative sense" (457). See also Schoenfeldt and Gottlieb.

18. See Anthony Easthope, Poetry as Discourse, for an introduction.
19. See the essays by Gottlieb, Schoenfeldt, Hodgkins, and Goldberg.
20. Marcuse regards this as the founding moment of a "specifically bourgeois articulation of authority" (57).
21. This also meant for Luther that enforcing uniform religious belief was not part of the State's function. The Church of England, and Herbert's parson, are decidedly un-Lutheran in this.
22. Luther's attack on the peasants viciously takes them to task for assuming that his doctrines should have worldly consequences
23. Imputation is the word for the means by which justification by faith is accomplished: those who by faith trust God are imputed righteous by God's action.
24. For instance, see Lake, "Calvinism," for a discussion of the politically problematic doctrines of election and predestination.
25. See Deborah Shuger's chapter on Herbert, which takes a more sophisticated psycho-historical approach to this theme.
26. For instance: "The breakdown of ecclesiastical authority in 1640 saw the emergence from underground of lower class groups who had long been beyond the pale of respectable protestantism" ("A Bourgeois Revolution?" 99).
27. See A New-Yeaeres Gift 331: "For I tell you and your preachers, that Scripture which says the poor shall inherit the earth is really and materially to be fulfilled, for the earth is to be restored from the bondage of sword property, and it is to become a common treasury to whole mankind . . ."
28. In the entry on 'Reform,' for instance Williams notes that the "religious Reformation of C16 had a strong sense of purification and restoration, even when it needed new forms and institutions to achieve this" (263).
29. While this last clause would seem to open the way to the real possibility of debate and dissent, the procedures for establishing "necessarie cause" are left quite vague. In Hooker, the great weight of consensus and continuity puts a significant amount of drag on change.

30. This in large part was a consequence of the fact that "the original protestant hope that all men would agree in their interpretation of the Bible proved unfounded" ("The Problem of Authority" 37).

31. Fish however suggests that his approach "makes it possible to acknowledge [Herbert's] art"--that is, the formal manoeuvres of a strategy--"and his sincerity"--the personal investment in those forms.

32. That position often appears in Herbert's poems as a bystander, a "friend," who Socratically leads the speaker, and at one remove, the reader, to the truth that it already possesses. In Fish's analysis of "Love-joy," for example, "One standing by" gently questions and corrects the speaker's admittedly hasty and overingenious "judgement" (27). See also "Love Unknown." That this unknown bystander is meant to represent Christ's presence only complicates the question of how that presence gets into the poem.

33. This is nearly the same as to say that the system's assertions of a need for unified and centralized control of religious language acknowledges the presence of disunity and decentralization. Compare Bakhtin, "Discourse and the Novel": A "unitary language . . . at every moment of its linguistic life . . . is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia" (270). Here, and throughout, I am discussing an aspiration to comprehensive control.

34. On the issue of the force of sincerity, which is developed further in Chapter V, compare the following: "And I can say it clearly and truly, as in the presence of God, I have done nothing as a prelate, to the uttermost of what I am conscious, but with a single heart, and with a sincere intention for the good government and honour of the Church, and the maintenance of the orthodox truth and religion of Christ, professed, established, and maintained in this Church of England" (Kenyon 164). So spoke Laud, at the condemnation of Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne, for speaking against the Church's episcopal government, to have their ears cropped. According to Laud, "No man can libel against our calling (as these men do), be it in pulpit, print, or otherwise, but he libels against the King and State, by whose laws we are established" (166, emphasis added).

35. See Lake, "Calvinism."

36. Hutchinson defines 'Epicyle' as "smaller circles having their centers in the circumference of a larger circle" (524).

37. For the approach to which I am implicitly responding, see Bell, "Valdesian," 323: "If we take a worldly point of view, we will applaud the speaker's energetic determination to better his lot, but if we reread his word in the light of faith, the whole poem becomes a revelation of Christ." This of course skips over, among other things, issues of authority and selectivity: the light of faith?

38. For an example of a rigorous, if a bit obscure and perhaps overingenious, reading of this framing material, see Goldberg, "The Dead Letter: Herbert's Other Voices."

39. See William Walwyn's The Compassionate Samaritane, discussed in chapter III.

40. It is not dealt with by Strier or Lewalski, or Wall, and only rather perfunctorily by Asals. It is also omitted from The Essential Herbert. Sidney Gotlieb calls it, as a part of his essay devoted to the need to "re-contextualize Herbert," a "bold piece of public argumentation" (113)

41. Practices of exclusion as a necessary part of the constitution of authority is one of the main themes of Foucault's work.

42. Milton saw the appeal to the "Mother" church as an explicit ideological ruse on behalf of a paternalistic prelatical government: ". . .they endeavor to impresse deeply into weak and superstitious fancies the awful notion of a mother, that hereby they might cheat them into a blind and implicite obedience to what soever they shall decree, or think fit" (728).

CHAPTER II

DISCOURSE AND DIRECTION: A PRIEST TO THE TEMPLE AND THE ELABORATION OF SOVEREIGN RULE

As the discourse and direction flows from the head, and the execution thereunto belongs to the rest of the members, every one according to their office, so it is betwixt a wise prince and his people.

James I, The Trew Law of Free Monarchies

In this chapter, I argue that the country parson of A Priest to the Temple, Herbert's manual for the personal enlivening of the public office of the priesthood, is positioned "betwixt the wise prince and his people," extending the reach of a hierarchical "discourse and direction" into a rural parish, and applying it so as to govern a rural parish and its inhabitants. Like the king in the realm, the parson in the parish stands "in Gods stead." In this position he is authorized to wield an almost absolute and comprehensive power, a power that both resembles and directly descends, through the institutional apparatus of the state-ecclesiastical, from the King, Supreme Governour of the Church.

As an officer of the state church, the parson's aim is

to shape and govern individuals in accordance with its publicly authorized forms of worship, the canons of the Church, and the frequently cited "Church Catechisme." He also keeps watch over a large number of matters that are said to "concern the commonwealth," matters which seem to extend beyond the cure of souls to the care of the state. A Priest to the Temple is a text that draws on and develops a system of discourse, knowledge, and power, extending the government of the state-ecclesiastical over a wide range of individual and parochial detail. Various commentators have suggested that the text is an ideal, even idyllic, representation of rural pastoral practice. My analysis detects in it the aspirations of a total institution. The country parson is a master of an institutionalized religious discourse and, basing his practice on the definition of "What he is" provided by that discourse, he exercises the power to approach an individual rural parishioner in order to define "what he is" (226, 257).¹ In the exercise of his office, I will argue, the country parson exemplifies what Foucault has called "pastoral power," a mode of power that operates through the simultaneous knowledge of a ruling discourse and of the details of individual lives. Foucault maintained that power in general operates through

the production, accumulation, circulation, and functioning of a discourse. There can be no exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operate through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power

and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth.

(Power/Knowledge 93)

In A Priest to the Temple, the parson himself is subjected to this discursively mediated production of truth insofar as he depends upon publicly authorized discourse of the definition of "what he is": a master of the general discourses of truth, scriptural, scholarly, canonical, ethical, social and political, on the one hand, and "all the particulars of humane action, at least all of those which he observeth are most incident to his parish" (Works 230). This knowledge in turn endows him with the power--which at least in the terms of the text he exercises with a relative autonomy--over all the particulars of his parish.

For Foucault it is the precise imbrication of the general discourse and the particular case that constitutes "pastoral power." This is the form of power that confronts an individual with his particular truth, a truth that is defined and delimited by a discourse. This form of power Foucault first distinguishes from state power, but he goes on to argue that it has been the two working in concert that characterizes the functioning of power in Western societies. He writes, "If the state is the political form of a centralized and centralizing power, let us call pastorship the individualizing power." While the latter differs from the sort of power exercised by the king, Foucault's ultimate

objective is to "show how this pastorship combined with its opposite, the state" ("Politics and Reason" 60). He suggests the general applicability and significance of this combination: "Our societies have proved to be really demonic since they happened to combine these two games--the city-citizen game [centralizing power, concerned with the health and cohesion of the state] and the shepherd-flock game [individualizing power, concerned with the production of the "truth of the individual"] in what we call modern states" (72).

Though one hesitates to label a text attributed to Herbert "demonic," we could hardly find a more telling example of this combination than A Priest to the Temple. To demonstrate the ways in which the text works to produce subjects who are simultaneously governed by the individualizing power of the pastor and the totalizing power of the state, I will first show how it is shaped by and positioned within the regulatory system of the state-ecclesiastical. I will begin by describing the tightly controlled access to official Church discourse, access which was determined by the interests of the state-church and the Royal Supremacy. Having established the totalizing aspirations of the state-church, I then turn to Herbert's text as an individual and individualizing instance of that aspiration. I show how Herbert's parson is to make himself available for and responsive to the imperatives of the state. Next, I detail the ways in which he individualizes and enlivens official

forms and practices of the Church, taking care to be seen as an authentic and representative image of its inward truth, and to see that his parishioners both attend to him and internalize the forms of the Church. Finally, I look at the ways in which the parson works to make the parish a cohesive and productive social and political unit within the State and Church of England.

In his Church History of Britaine, Thomas Fuller recounts the case of Richard Mockett, chaplain to Archbishop George Abbott, who in 1617 published his translation of certain chief documents of the English Church into "pure Latin." These included Bishop John Jewell's "Apology of the Church of England," "the greater and lesser Catechism," "the nine-and-thirty Articles," "the Common Prayer," "the Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," and "the Polity, or Government, of the Church of England." The Homilies, "too tedious to be translated at large," Mockett "epitomized . . . into certain propositions, by him faithfully extracted." Fuller comments on the official reaction to this arcane endeavor:

Some accused him of presumption for undertaking such a task without commission from the King [Fuller's note: "Yet cum privelegio is prefixed on the first page"]; it being almost fatal for private persons to tamper with such public matters as for a subject to match into the blood-royal without leave of his sovereign.

Fuller's account of Mockett's indiscretion suggests much of the kind of vigilance which the state-ecclesiastical wished to maintain over its discourse: even so apparently innocent a "tampering" as translation is potentially a "fatal" offence.² In addition to taking a presumptuous initiative, Mockett also was found to have "enlarged the liberty of a translator into the liberty of a commentor, and the propositions out of the Homilies by him collected were made to lean to the judgment of the collector." Private judgments are not to intervene, without "commission," into matters established by public authority.

By Fuller's account, this incident is a telling instance of the interaction of ecclesiastical discourse and state power in the English Church. In addition to the King's objection, James Montagu, "bishop of Winchester, a potent courtier," also found the power of his bishopric impinged upon by Mockett's "method" of "marshalling" of the Homilies, "as put after any whose bishop's a privy counsellor." The main objection to Mockett's work was political rather than linguistic or doctrinal: he was accused, Fuller says, of being a "better chaplain than a subject, contracting the power of his prince to enlarge the privilege of his patron," Archbishop Abbott. His error was in attributing "confirming power" over bishops and ministers to the Archbishop, citing "the sixth canon of the first Nicene Council established by imperial authority." Mockett's "high offence" was to elevate

canon or civil law; both of which, if crossing the common law of the land, are drowned in their passage as they sail over from Calais to Dover; and King James, justly jealous of his own prerogative, approved not such a confirming power in the archbishop, which might imply a negative voice, in case he disliked such elects as the king should recommend unto him.

(267)

What we see here is the principle of the government of discourse in the English Church: bounded by national borders under the jurisdiction of English common law, the King maintains the jurisdiction of his prerogative. Under the auspices of that prerogative, the king claims the right to appoint ecclesiastical officers and to override any dissenting "negative voice." Authority from outside this system is discounted, and the introduction of private judgment into official Church discourse is treated as dangerously transgressive. As a result of its unwarranted "innovations," Mockett's book was ordered to be burned. Fuller concludes:

Now, although the imperfection and indiscretion of this translation might be consumed as dross within the fire, yet the undoubted truth of the Articles of the English Church therein contained, as flame free and perfectly refined, will endure to eternity.

(267)

It would appear that while official Church discourse is susceptible to mischievous tampering, it is impervious to any real harm.

Fuller's narrative ends on an decisive note, as his

description of Mockett's "fatal" tampering with public matters turns out to be more than hyperbole:

The doctor took his censure so tenderly, especially so much defeated in his expectation--to find punishment where he looked for preferment; as if his life were bound up by sympathy in his book, he ended his days soon after.

(267)

Fuller suggests that the bulk of Mockett's endeavor was sound: he drew on documents of "undoubted truth," and his propositions from the Homilies were "faithfully extracted." His offense was to have inserted his own private judgment into his handling of official discourse, and by the introduction of "foreign" authority, to have interfered with the King's position as Supreme Governour of the Church. But this apparently minor and minute deviation from acceptable Church politics (small enough to have taken Mockett seemingly by surprise), in terms of the conditions governing access to the production of religious discourse, was a "high offence." The Royal Supremacy was given preeminent place in the order of discourse comprising Church canons, constitutions, liturgy, and homilies. "Impugners" of the Royal Supremacy are the first to be named in the litany of censure in the preface to the canons of 1604, and "whosoever so shall hereafter affirme or maintain" anything contradicting the supremacy are to be excommunicated ipso facto. License to produce the canons themselves is granted, in James' preface, through the King's "special grace, certaine knowledge, and meere motion

. . . by virtue of our Prerogative Royal and Supreme
 Authoritie in cases Ecclesiastical . . . by our severall
 letters patent under our Great Seale of ENGLAND." The "title
 and tenor of them" appear "word for word as ensueth" in the
 edition published by Robert Barker, "Printer to the Kings
 Most Excellent Majestie." The first of the canons estab-
 lishes the King's "ancient jurisdiction over the State-
 Ecclesiastical," and requires that all ministers proclaim it
 "to the uttermost of their wit, knowledge and learning,
 purely and sincerely (without any color of dissimulation) .
 . . foure times every year (at the least) in their Sermons &
 other collations and lectures" (Sig. C). And, naturally, the
 ordination of ministers depends upon their subscription to
 articles establishing the royal supremacy, the Book of
 Common Prayer as the sole form of divine service, and the
 Articles of 1562 as "agreeable to the word of God," attested
 by the "hands and Seales" of the archbishop and bishop. In
 these very particular ways is the presence of the King
 established in the government of the Church of England.

The aspiration of the Canons is to govern religious
 expression and experience in the realm in a thoroughly
 totalizing fashion. In Fuller's transcription of the
 exchange at Hampton Court between James and the Puritans Dr.
 Reynolds and Mr. Knewstubbs, James makes this objective
 clear: he responds to a plea for toleration of differences
 in ceremonies, saying "I will have none of that; I will have

one doctrine, one discipline and religion, in substance and in ceremony. Never more speak to that point--how far you are bound to obey." The canons aim to regulate who produces religious discourse, what is produced, and how and where it is to be produced, in accordance with that one "substance and ceremony." When Reynolds attempts to introduce and revive the less centralized system of "propheysings" once advocated by Grindal--the archbishop of Canterbury suspended and sequestered by Elizabeth for refusing to suppress them--into the discussion, raising the possibility of allowing the informality of local councils of clergy, James answers,

If you aim at a Scottish presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchy, as God and the devil. Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, shall meet and censure me and my Council. Therefore I reiterate my former speech, Le roy s'avisera.

(188)

Even from Fuller's transcription, it is apparent that the king was making the barest pretense of considering the positions of Reynolds and Knewstubbs. His opening remarks indicate that "we have not called this assembly for any innovation," regarding religion "well-settled" by Elizabeth. When Bancroft rudely interrupts Reynolds, James rebukes him for having "taken his liberty," though "I think you have just cause to be moved, in respect that they traduce the well-settled government" contrary to "the intent of this meeting." James closes the second day of the meeting by

forcefully reiterating the semper eadem of his predecessor, and further reinforces the impression of the conference as a show trial: "If this be all your party has to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse" (189). It was a procedure which, in the opinion of one dissenting voice, aimed at putting on merely a "show of dispute," at the close of which the King would "reiterate my former speech" (cited by Collinson 463).

In this way, challenges to the centralized, totalized order of discourse and practice are met by the fiat of the Supreme Governor: they are bidden to silent obedience, threatened with banishment from the realm, cowed with a hint of violence. Just as in Mockett's case, the regulation of discourse is a function of the exercise of state power, an exercise which the king claims to be solely his. The principle by which that regulation is most frequently justified is the maintenance of the church in peace and unity. Thus, on the third day of the conference, in response to Knewstubs' continued application for exemptions from the wearing of the surplice and the use of the sign of the cross, James says: "We have here taken pains, and, in the end, have concluded on unity and uniformity; and you, forsooth, must prefer the credits of a few private men before the peace of the church" (192). The conference began and concluded with unity and uniformity, and so the "credits

of a few private men" are excluded by power from what Foucault calls a "discourse of truth." And in this particular discursive regime, the link between truth and peace, understood as obedience to hierarchical order of the church, is vital. Furthermore, to be within a discourse of truth, dans la vrai, in Foucault's phrase, is to be constituted as a legitimate subject, in both senses of the word. Joseph Hall, in his tract "A coommon apologie of the Church of England," directed against the separatist group the Brownists, argues that "while some have sought Truth without Peace, they have at once lost Truth, Peace, love, and themselves" (Sig. A2). This discourse of truth in turn "settles" an institutional order:

The form of 'Divine Polity' is order, which order is requisite in all actions, and Administrations of the Church, as the Apostle sheweth, and specially in the constitution thereof. So that next unto faith in God, it is to be esteemed most necessary for all holy societies.

(Hall 21)

Order here is of course identified with the existing order, the party of peace with the established Church and its adherants.

The examples of Mockett and of the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference illustrate the dangers of private meddling with the publically authorized discourse of the Church of England, particularly though not exclusively in

matters touching the king's prerogative. The Priest to the Temple, or the Countrey Parson, Herbert's most public text, is clearly and thoroughly determined by publically authorized discourse and recourses to public authority in its establishment of the "Character and Rule of Holy Life" for a Country parson of the English Church. But from the seventeenth century on, it has been considered almost exclusively as an expression of Herbert's private ordering of his vocational life, his principles and practices. Thus for instance, Izaak Walton locates the genesis of the text in the extension of "rules to himself for his Christian carriage both to God and man" which he had adopted ("Doubtless" according to Walton) "before he entered into Holy Orders." The Countrey Parson by Walton's testimony is an aide-memoire for the conscientious performance of his duties:

And that Mr. Herbert might the better preserve those holy rules which such a priest as he intended to be ought to observe, and that he might not insensibly blot out of his memory, but that the next year might show him his variations from this years resolutions; he, therefore, did set down those rules, then resolved upon, in that order as the world now sees them printed in a little book called 'The Country Parson' . . ."

(257)

Modern critics have continued to read the text as a means of access to Herbert's personal theology and ecclesiology. My focus in this chapter is less on the sort of priest Herbert intended to be than on the kind of priest he was required to

be by the institutional structure and order of discourse of the Church of England.

Herbert's treatise begins with the following "evident" definition "Of a Pastor" : "A Pastor is the Deputy of Christ for the reducing of Man to the Obedience of God" (225). Less than evident in Herbert's text is the institutional regulation of this Deputy and the process of his deputation. For example, there is the provision of Canon xxviii for "The qualitie of such as are to be made ministers": he is to be 23 years old, educated at Cambridge or Oxford, able to yield an account of his faith in Latin, "according to the Articles of Religion," and able to secure "letters Testimoniall of his good life and conversation under the Seale of some Colledge in Cambridge or Oxford." These prerequisites immediately situate Herbert's text, as the product of a duly ordained minister of the Church, within the regulatory system of the state-ecclesiastical. Having met these prerequisites, the pastor would then be nominated to the charge of a parish, an institutional appointee.

Thomas Fuller, in his "Character of the faithful Minister" in The Holy State, written in 1640 when Puritan attacks on the university system had become acute, felt it necessary to specify these requirements before proceeding to more directly pastoral matters. He says in "To the Reader" that "The characters I have confirmed to the then standing

laws of the realm," and as to the minister, we are to "suppose him not brought up by hand only in his own country-studies, but that he hath sucked of his mother University," and to

Conceive him now a graduate in arts, and entered into orders, according to the solemn form of the Church of England, and presented by some patron to a pastoral charge, or place equivalent; and then let us see how well he dischargeth his office.

(73)

These suppositions of a pastor's education, confirmation, and nomination, though not present as such in the text itself, are essential to the case I want to make for the representation of authority in The Priest to the Temple. Herbert's text is in a number of ways conformable to "the laws then standing;" as we shall see, Herbert frequently translates the stipulations of the canons into his own text, comments and enlarges upon them in terms of "canonicall obedience," and, on the whole, works in compliance with what I have been calling the official discourse of the Church of England.

And yet, in ways similar and related to Nicholas Ferrar's connection of "the peculiarities and disposition of the Person" to the authority and authenticity of the poems of The Temple, the text of A Priest to the Temple constructs its authority on the basis of a personal authority predicated upon "inward enforcements." This is true both for the putative parson of the text itself and in terms of the

creation of an author function within the text and in its seventeenth century reception, most significantly in the hands of Bernard Olney, who brought the text "to public light" as a part of Herbert's Remains in 1652, and Izaak Walton in his Life of Herbert of 1670. The main premise of my argument for this chapter is that Herbert's text, subsequently held up as a "pattern" by Olney and Walton, is itself shaped by publicly authorized patterns and the insitutional requirements of the Church of England, which Herbert's text attempts to inhabit and inspirit. As a corollary of that premise, A Priest to the Temple will be seen as a manual for imposing those patterns and requirements on a rural parish and its inhabitants.

Herbert indirectly indicates the principle for the production of his text in the chapter entitled "The Parsons Accessory Knowledge." The text asserts³ that the country parson has made an extensive study of "Fathers," "Schoolmen," and "later writers,"

out of all which he hath compiled a book, and body of Divinity, which is the storehouse of his Sermons, and which he preacheth all his life; but diversely clothed, illustrated, and enlarged. For though the world is full of such composures, yet every mans is fittest, readiest, and most savory to him . . . This Body he made by way of expounding the Church Catechisme, to which all divinity may easily be reduced.

(230)⁴

A Priest to the Temple, in many ways, can be seen as the official discourse of the Church of England--canons,

constitutions, catechism, specific royal decrees touching ecclesiastical matters--"diversely clothed, illustrated, and enlarged," not simply equivalent to that discourse, but nonetheless "easily reducible" to it. As it concerns the parson, A Priest to the Temple both individualizes--the book he compiles is of his own choosing, his "composure" is of his own making--and totalizes--his "composure" is assumed to be consonant with a prior, publicly authorized text. It provides, in nearly equal measure, principles for the country parson's governing of his parish, his own life, and the lives of his parishioners drawn from Scripture--the frequently cited "Apostles' rule[s]" that are, in most protestant formulations, marks of the true church and biblical church government--and from rules and prescriptions "appointed by authority." (And indeed, the former are presented in terms that are consonant with the latter.) It takes for granted, and takes advantage of, the hierarchical structure of coercive power of the the institutional church, and describes the most minutely particular applications of that structure and power. It is not a polemical text: Herbert describes the country parson's "choosing texts of Devotion, not of Controversy" in preparing his sermons (a position that is in compliance with James' Directions for Preachers of 1622). And yet, in many of its positive prescriptions for overseeing an "exact" and "exacting" discipline (words that recur often in the text), it can be

seen as a response to one of the chief negative assessments of the established Church by "puritan" critics: that the Church was not rigorous enough in maintaining both spiritual and social discipline over its members. A Priest to the Temple is not a text designed to "reform" the Church by altering or challenging its structure, practices, or discipline, but it does appear to be an attempt to vitalize it by carrying out its principles in a very immediate way, by elaborating its principles at the parochial level.

"Elaboration" is a cultural principle that Said has taken from Gramsci, and it refers to the "insight that thought is produced so that actions can be accomplished, that it is diffused in order to be effective, persuasive, forceful, and that a great deal of thought elaborates on what is a relatively small number of principal, directive ideas." One of the meanings of elaboration is "to refine, to work out (e-laborare) some prior or more powerful idea, to perpetuate a world view" (168). Herbert describes the country parson's intellectual labor in terms that suggest this process: his studies are performed "by way of expounding the Church Catechisme," with the ultimate aim of instilling the principles of the catechism in very "particular" ways in the hearts, minds, and lives of his parishioners. "The Country Parson is full of all knowledge," Herbert writes, and he goes on to make it clear that his knowledge is gained in order to render persuasive the world-view of

the Church Catechism. The Country Parson is in this sense a kind of meta-discourse, elaborating the "directive ideas" of the official discourse of the church in order to guide and govern the "production, accumulation, circulation and functioning" of that discourse at the level of the parish, and even more specifically, at the level of the individual.

Foucault has suggested that we ought to "study power in its more regional and local forms and institutions;" Herbert's text is ideally suited for such study, as it conveniently localizes the scope of its authority and function, though without severing it from the larger structures of authority and power. After his fundamental delineation of "Pastoral Duty and Auctority" as the "Deputy" of Christ, he adds parenthetically that he is "intending mine own Nation only, and also therein setting aside the Reverend Prelates of the Church, to who this discourse ariseth not" (225). Within these bounds, however, the country parson's power is nearly boundless: like the king in the realm, the parson serves "in Gods Stead" in the parish, "wherfore there is nothing done, either for good or ill, whereof he is not the rewarder, or punisher" (254).

The Priest to the Temple thus attributes to the parson an almost absolute power; but before looking at the more specific and local effects of this power, we need briefly to situate it in the context of the larger structure of sovereign rule and power of the state-ecclesiastical, of

which, as I will show, Herbert's parson is a local agent. Despite its ostensible emphasis on an individual's "lively faith" (in the phrase of the Homilies), one of the main effects of the English Reformation was the centralization of authority. "If anything," Patrick Collinson has written, "the Tudor state . . . by placing both Church and state in the same royal hands, laid a greater and more enforceable stress on religious unity than had been associated with the medieval Catholic polity" (26). G.R. Elton has similarly observed that "as supreme governor of the Church of England," the monarch "commanded a wide and well articulated system of rule," and that "The government of England, secular and ecclesiastical, was very monarchical in its fundamental principles; everything derived from the king, and all lines led back to him" (9, 11). Christopher Hill has also emphasized the church's function as an extension of sovereign rule. With what he terms the "twin birth" of the English Reformation and royal supremacy,

the machinery of the church, now entirely at the disposal of the crown, offered itself as an instrument of government independent of parliamentary control, with a long history of prestige and authority behind it.

("From Grindal to Laud," 64)

Elsewhere, Hill has written that, as a country parson was likely to be the most educated person in the parish, "we can scarcely exaggerate the influence of the parson in

forming the political, economic, and moral outlook of his parishioners;" in very intense and individualized ways, Herbert clearly indicates his awareness of and obligation to exercise such influence. Many incidental references also reveal the country parson to be a functionary of the state-ecclesiastical. In "The Parson on Sundays," the parson prepares himself for "the duties of the day," considering, among other things, "if there be any extraordinary addition to the customary exercises, either from the time of the year, or from the State. . ." Having "discharged the publick duties of the Congregation," by preaching in the morning and catechizing in the afternoon (in compliance with canonical regulations), the parson turns to various pastoral visits: "This way he finds exceeding usefull, and winning; and these exhortations he calls his privy purse, even as Princes have theirs, besides their publick disbursements." Having thus acquitted himself of his public and private callings, at night

he thinks it a very fit time , both suitable to the joy of the day, and without hindrance to publick duties, either to entertaine some of his neighbours, or to be entertained of them, where he takes occasion to discourse of such things as are both profitable and pleasant, and to raise up their mindes to apprehend Gods good blessing to our Church, and State; that order is kept in the one, and peace in the other, without disturbance, or interruption of public divine services.

(235, 236)

In large and small things, in public and private

discourse and practice, the country parson works not only to encourage but to ensure his charges' participation in the prescribed forms and required duties of the state ecclesiastical: the parson's church is and must be the state church.⁵

"The Parson in his house" (Chap. X) "is very exact in governing his house, making it a copy and modell for his Parish." From the governing principle for the rearing of the parson's children in this "copy and modell"--a phrase which suggests the mutually constitutive nature of the public and private, in that the private life of the family is both a copy of the government of the parish and a model for it--we discover the parson's aim for the individuals of his parish:

"His children he first makes Christians, and then Commonwealths-men; the one he owes to his heavenly Countrey, the other to his earthly, having no title to do either, except he do good to both" (239). The parson's aim is thus simultaneously the production and government of religious and political subjects. His authority, his "title," to do so depends upon his endeavor to make the individualized Christian and the totalized "commonwealths-man" coincide in the subject. Appropriating one of James' and Charles' most favored metaphors for kingship, "the style of pater patriae" (from James' The Trew Law of Free Monarchies), Herbert's parson "elaborates" it at the parish level. In a brief chapter called "The Parson as Father" the text generalizes the principle implicit in the "copy and modell" of his

family: "The Countrey Parson is not only a father to his flock, but also professeth himself thoroughly of the opinion, carrying it about with him as fully, as if he had begot the whole Parish. And of this he makes great use." A public style of representation, metaphorical and political patriarchalism, is internalized and individualized so as to make it effective as a technique of government: the country parson rules "as if he had begot the whole Parish" by thoroughly convincing himself and consistently behaving as if it were so. As a result of this internalization, political coercion becomes intermixed with fatherly solicitude.⁶

We can see the significance of this resemblance by comparing Herbert's representation of the country parson as a father with James' The Trew Law of Free Monarchies. The former appears to be a more individualized, pastoral version of the latter. James' text focuses primarily on the concern for and care of the political body, though also implicitly with "everyone according to their office." He moves from the metaphor of the father to that of the head, from which "being the seat of judgement, proceeds the care and foresight of guiding, and preventing all evil that may come to the body or any part thereof. The head cares for the body; so does the king for his people." In the event that any of the body's "members . . . be affected with any infirmity," the head "must care and provide for their remedy, in case it be curable, and, if otherwise, gar cut them off for fear

of infecting of the rest;" "even so," James of course concludes, "is it betwixt the prince and his people." The king values the health of the whole over the life of any individual. James returns to the paternal metaphor in order to emphasize the "monstrous and unnatural" nature of rebellion (99).

Herbert's Parson as Father proceeds with the same kind forbearance and hope for a cure, in this case repentance, though with a greater measure of reluctance before cutting off the offending member, and with a focus on the spiritual health of the individual. But as with James' text, the parson's actions are not treated as the exercise of power, but in terms of a more "natural" relationship. The parson makes "great use" of his internal transformation into the father of his parishioners, "For by this means, when any sins, he hateth him not as an officer, but pityes him as a Father." The parson is reluctant to regard any infirm persons as "incurable" and so to "gar cut them off": his paternal metamorphosis causes him to act not with the political expedience and entitlement of an "officer" (the only specific wrong Herbert mentions concerns tithing) but the patient solicitude of a Father: ". . .when, after many admonitions, any continue to be refractory, yet hee gives him not over, but is long before hee proceed to disinheriting, or perhaps never goes so far." To proceed too precipitously to disinheriting would be unfatherly, and it

would be to "determine the Gods houre of coming." Nonetheless, and this is a subject to which I will return, the punitive measure of disinheritance remains a part of the parson's rule, and it is one which other places in the text show less compunction about implementing.

"The Parson in reference" also reveals the responsiveness of The Priest to the Temple to the needs of state power and its function as a discourse of the state-ecclesiastical. "Reference" here seems to carry the sense of "Relations, relationship, respect, regard to some thing or person" (O.E.D. 3): "The Countrey Parson is sincere and upright in all his relations." To recall a theme I briefly developed in the introduction, "sincerity" in the discursive regime governing the church and state of England is defined in terms of compliance with the determinations of public authority. And so, the "thing or person" that Herbert's text is in relationship to and has respect for is the state-ecclesiastical. The first principle of sincerity and uprightness that the text stipulates is that the country parson is "just to his Countrey." The example that is provided is the parson's willingness to provide military service,

as, when he is set at an armour, or horse, he borrowes them not to serve the turn, nor provides slight, and unusefull, but such as are every way fitting to do his Countrey true and laudable service, when occasion requires. To do otherwise is deceit . . .

The country parson observes military as well as church discipline in the state-ecclesiastical, but he does so not only as a citizen but also as a part of his title as a "Deputy of Christ" (225), "as being the servant of him, in whom there was no guile." Spiritual and moral virtue thus is bound up with political obligations to the requirements of the State. This principle is made explicit as the text continues: "Likewise, in any other Countrey-duty, he considers what is the end of any Command, and then he suits things faithfully according to that end." In this passage, Herbert's parson is clearly, if willingly, subjected by power and authority, compelled by an obligation that is at once spiritual and political to respond, without question it appears, to the "Command" of the State. His sole consideration is how to match the "end of any Command" with suitable means for achieving it in his Parish.

The chapter also situates the parson in reference to the system of authority in the ecclesiastical government, a system based, from the king on down, on a kind of fathering forth. Reversing the priority of spiritual over political used in the bringing up of children (first a Christian, then a commonwealths-man), having first done his "Countrey-duty," the country parson "Secondly . . . carries himself, very respectfully, as to all the Fathers of the Church, especially to his Diocesean, honoring him both in word, and behaviour, and resorting to him in any difficulty, either in his

studies or in his Parish." Here again we see the simultaneous and interrelated operation of knowledge, discourse and power in an institutional setting. The parson submits himself to his hierarchical superior both in the pursuit of religious knowledge in his "studies" and in the application of that knowledge as power "in his Parish."

The administrative structure of the Church also provides for regulation of discourse and practice in mutual surveillance of inferior clergy, which are reported upon at the "Visitations" of bishops and archbishops. The country parson "observes Visitations,

and being there, makes due use of them, as of Clergy councils, for the benefit of the Diocese. And therefore he comes, having observed some defects in the Ministry, he then either in a Sermon, if he preach, or at some other time of the day, propounds among his Brethren what were fitting to be done.

(253)

The phrase "among his brethren" suggests an admirable kind of collective self-correction, but this action is performed in a thoroughly hierarchized setting, with the bishop performing his function as an overseer and the country parson exposing defects to his sight; he "propounds" possible solutions in the presence of hierarchical authority.

The third and fourth of the parson's references are aimed at coordination and mutual help among neighboring parishes. The objectives set forth in "The Parson in reference" are to provide mutual encouragement for ministers

and to relieve distress in the parishes. But what is crucial here are the ways in which the common good is defined, controlled, and made use of by the hierarchical structure of the state-ecclesiastical. In other words, in order for the good to be effected, the "economy of discourses of truth" and institutional administration must be effectively implemented; the good of the state-ecclesiastical and the good of the parish and the individual must be seen as coincident in all "particulars." The Priest to the Temple is a text designed to enable the simultaneously individualizing and totalizing application of power, and the parson is authorized not simply as the prohibitive judge but as the productive agent of the state's resources.

In his description of the king's headship over the political body in The Trew Law of Free Monarchies, James wrote that "discourse and direction flows from the head, and the execution according thereunto belongs to the rest of the members, every one according to their office" (99). James expresses an aspiration for the seamless elaboration of his government, with all the parts responsive to the "discourse and direction" of centralized authority. The Countrey Parson functions in the terms of that system of elaboration both by observing the "Command" of authority and suiting "things accordingly to that end," and in the terms of his own particular "office," by installing the parson in the parish with the power of governing the "discourse and direction"

within it. If, to quote Elton again, in the government of the State and Church, "everything derived from the king, and all lines led back to him," in the parish as envisioned by The Country Parson the parson stands in a like relationship to parochial matters. Unless we understand it simply in terms of a distinction between court occupations and church livings, the opposition Ferrar makes between "State-employments" and service "at Gods Altar" is not an absolute one. The country parson is, by discursive and institutional necessity, a devoted servant of both church and state.

And as such, he represents authority and serves its ends in a number of interrelated ways, which are based at once upon his personal qualities, convictions, knowledge and actions, and "according to his office." His functions as spiritual "Father" and administrative "officer" are mutually constitutive and reinforcing. In "The Church Porch," the Verser advises the "fair youth," "Think the king sees thee still; for his King does," recommending a continual self-surveillance governed by the internalized and presumably coincident requirements of Church and State. In The Priest to the Temple, the parson serves as a representational, and ideally provisional (i.e. with the ultimate aim of producing self-surveillance in his parishioners) stand-in for the king and the King, an intermediary representing the presence of the church and the state to individuals. One of the main functions of the parson is to keep watch over his parish, a

theme which is apparent in the titles of some of the key chapters: "The Parson in sentinell," "The Parson's eye," "The Parson surveys." His purpose is to take notice of all that goes on in his parish: religious observance, speech, economic activity, and so on, down to the smallest detail. (For example, in administering the sacrament of Baptism, "He admits no vain or idle names, but such as are usual and accustomed" 258).

Foucault has argued that this kind of keeping watch is a signal aspect of pastoral power, which he describes in the conventional figure of the pastor as a shepherd:

The theme of keeping watch is important. It brings out two aspects of the shepherd's devotedness. First, he acts, he puts himself out . . . Second, he watches over them. He pays attention to them all and scans each one of them. He's got to know his flock as a whole, and in detail. Not only must he know where the good pastures are, the season's laws, and the order of things; he must know each one's particular needs.

("Politics and Reason" 62).

The key point is that the pastor exercises his power on the basis of a knowledge that is at once general and specific, and that is able to see the connections between the details of individual lives and the governing principles that rule them. The Countrey Parson takes up this theme in precisely these terms:

Now, if a shepherd know not which grass will bane, or which not, how is he fit to be a shepherd? Wherefore the Parson hath thoroughly canvassed all the particulars of humane actions, at least all those which he

observeth are most incident to his Parish.

("The Parsons Accessory Knowledge" 230)

Foucault goes on to argue that "Christian pastorship implies a peculiar type of knowledge between the pastor and each of his sheep," a knowledge that is "particular" and "individualizes" by being cognizant of each individual's material needs, "public sins," and "secret sins" (69). In a variety of ways to which I will return, the parson oversees the material activity and needs of his parish. In "The Parson's eye," the parson positions himself so as to observe the whole of his parish, and uses that position as a vantage point and an occasion for observing the particulars of individual's public sins and the small increments by which they can become secret sins. Implicit in the parson's observations are a knowledge of general codes of behavior by which actions are placed into broad moral and spiritual categories, and a more precise knowledge of the inward lives of individuals that determine the application of those categories; the parson's aim is to use knowledge for the detection and description of vices, and to instill that knowledge into the individual. The parson's activity in "surveying" indicates how thoroughly dedicated he is to the task of keeping watch: "The Countrey Parson at spare times from action, standing on a hill, and considering his Flock, discovers two sorts of vices, and two sorts of vicious

persons." The two sorts are public sins, "whose natures are always clear, and evident, as Adultery, Murder, Hatred, Lying, &c," and secret sins, "whose natures, at least in the beginning, are dark and obscure: as Covetousness and Gluttony" (264). The chapter focuses little on sins that are evident and clear. The main task is to demonstrate how to apply general knowledge of vices to specific cases with individuals who are likely to be resistant to the application. There are those who "abstain not even from known sins," and those "who when they know a sin evidently, commit it not." It is the latter case that proves most difficult, for the trick is to make what is "dark and obscure," "evident and clear," tricky even with those individuals who are amenable to gaining knowledge of their sins in order to desist from them:

It is true indeed that they are long a knowing it [that they have sinned], being partial to themselves, and witty to others who shall reprove them for it. A man may be both Covetous, and Intemperate, and yet hear Sermons against both, and himself condemn both in good earnest; and the reason hereof is, because the natures of these vices being not evidently discussed, or known commonly, the beginnings of them are not easily observable, because of the suddain passing from that which was just now lawful, to that which is presently unlawful, even in one continued action.

(264)

This is indeed a peculiar and very precise kind of knowledge passing between the shepherd and the sheep, able to determine when lawful eating or "storing" becomes gluttony or covetous-ness; moreover, it is a very dedicated pastor who

aspires to the knowledge of individual cases in a survey of his parish.

But what this survey enables him to do is to exercise a very minute kind of power over individuals, a power which is founded upon a very minute kind of knowledge: "Wherefore the Parson being true to his business, hath exactly sifted the definitions of all virtues, and vices; especially canvassing those, whose natures are most stealing, and beginnings uncertaine" (264-265). Thus for covetousness, after laying down a general definition, the parson "exactly" inquires into the smallest possible detail: "Nay, to descend yet more particularly, if a man hath wherewithall to buy a spade, yet hee chuseth rather to use his neighbours, and wear out that, he is covetous." The reason for this close observation is that the King is watching: "there is a Justice in the least things, and for the least, there shall be a judgement." The method recommended by the text is the correlation of general knowledge to the specific instances of country life:

Country people are full of these petty injustices, being cunning to make use of another, and spare themselves: and Scholers ought to be diligent in the observation of these, and driving of their general Schoole rules ever to the smallest actions of Life; which while they dwell in their bookes, they will never find; but being seated in the Countrey, and doing their duty faithfully, they will soon discover; especially if they carry their eyes ever open, and fix them on their charge, and not on their preferment.⁷

This passage describes a method of pastoral oversight in which the official discourse of the state-ecclesiastical is

a necessary but not sufficient source of insight into the crude but "cunning" moral lives of rural parishioners. Parsons must make "observation" of their parishioners' lives but, to use Johnson's phrase concerning Milton's poetry and its relation to human experience, they are to see those lives through the spectacles of "bookes." What they see, certainly, will neither contradict nor in any essential way supplement their book-learning; instead, keeping "their eyes ever open," they will "discover" in their rural charges material for the disciplinary "driving of their general Schoole rules ever to the smallest action of life." In short, by quitting their books and attending to real life, they will find the endlessly minute applicability of those books to human circumstance.

Consistent with Ferrar's account of him and the still-prevalant construction of the shape of his biography, in disregarding "preferment," Herbert's parson eschews ambition for the sake of his calling. (We should not assume that Herbert is implying that his superiors would disapprove of his practice and therefore deny preferment; rather, he seems to be suggesting that parsons hungry for preferment would spend their "spare times" angling for it, looking up the hierarchy rather than keeping their eyes fixed on their "charges.") And yet, he describes an enormously ambitious application of power and knowledge in a very specific institutional setting. Herbert's text may well go beyond

what was typically practiced among country parsons ("The Author to the Reader" calls the text "a Mark to aim at," which was "set as high as I can, since hee shoots higher that threatens the moon, then hee that aims at a tree" 224); and yet if it exceeds the bounds prescribed by official discourse, it is nonetheless an elaborate extension of it, broadening its reach over an array of new material by making "observation" according to its way of seeing and "discovering" new applications of its definitions in the "smallest actions" of country life.

In monitoring and evaluating the members of his parish, the parson's task is keeping watch, on representing official discourse and practice by seeing the ways in which they can be applied; for a parson in the performance of those duties prescribed by canonical obedience, "the publick duties of the Congregation"--reading divine service, preaching, and catechizing--the emphasis falls on being seen. In these public duties, Herbert governs and is governed by the "flow" of "discourse and direction" in the hierarchy; he represents authority both as its representative, in compliance with its prescriptions, and as an immediate image of authoritative religious life, speech, and practice. Here, we are concerned primarily with the parson's representation of the presence of God, manifested by externals which signify "inward enforce-ments;" nonetheless, observing the canons, authorized by James' "meere motion" and issued under the Great

Seal, is inevitably a kind of "State-employment."

"The Parson's Life" establishes a fundamental prerequisite for pastoral power: one who would govern the lives of others must first govern his own. The parson is to have "thoroughly studied" Patience and Mortification, "where-in a Christian is most seen . . . that he may be absolute Master and commander of himself, for all the purposes for which god hath ordained him" (227). But the terms in which Herbert sets forth the bearing and behavior of the parson reveal the passage to be an elaboration of the "directive ideas" of official discourse. Many of its prescriptions in particular correspond to canons LXXIIII, "Decencie of apparrell enjoyned to ministers," and LXXV, "Sober conversation required of ministers." The latter makes the point central to Herbert's concern for the Parson's life: ministers "should bee examples to the people to live well and Christianly."

But this is not simply exemplary encouragement; they are to do so "under paine of Ecclesiastical censures to be inflicted with serverity, according to the qualities of their offences." Herbert's inclusion of a chapter focusing on the parson's "conversation" can be understood without reference to the kind of priest he intended to be, but as a function of official discourse. Thomas Fuller's character of "The Faithfull Minister" is similarly carefull to include the same admonition: "He is strict in ordering his conversa-

tion." Fuller's text relies more on witty aphorisms and anecdotes than Herbert's more expository writing; but like Herbert's parson, whose "holy Life" is "even itselfe a Sermon" (278), Fuller links effective discourse to a circumspect life: "unlike the one who preached very well, but lived very ill . . . our minister lives sermons" (The Holy State 73).

On other matters, The Countrey Parson honors the canons by near-quotation. The canon on sober conversation forbids ministers' "resorting to Tavernes or Alehouses;" so Herbert stipulates that "Neither is it for the servant of Christ to haunt Innes, or Tavernes, or Ale-houses, to the dishonour of his person and office." Canon LXXIII calls for "decent and comely apparell" befitting "the honour and estimation due to the speciall messengers of Almighty God," according to "the ancient custome of the Church of England." The country parson's "apparrell" is "plaine, but reverend, and clean, without spots, or dust; the purity of his mind breaking out, and dilating it selfe even to his body, cloaths, and habitation" (227). Herbert's text elaborates the letter of the canonical law by applying it to a specific situation and making its prescriptions an outward sign of an inward grace. This is certainly implicit in the canons themselves, but the text of the parson/poet gives the equation a lyrical and individual turn.

The chief way in which A Priest to the Temple elab-

brates the canonical stipulations for sober conversation is to relate them specifically to a country parish, adapting the things "wherein a Christian is most seen" to that setting. In consideration of the kind of example he is to set, the parson "labors most in those things which are most apt to scandalize his Parish." Seeing that country people live hard, laborious lives, the parson is therefore "circumspect to avoid all covetousness, being neither greedy to get nor niggardly to keep." In respecting the difficulties of rural life, the parson at once aligns himself with his parishioners and sets himself above them, using his choice of a way of life neglectful of wealth to set them a lesson in accepting their lot: "in all his words and actions slighting and disesteeming it, even to a wondering that the world should so much value wealth, which in the day of wrath hath not one dramme of comfort for us." Similarly, in eschewing "Luxury," the parson simultaneously shapes his behavior out of respect to his parishioners and uses that behavior to enhance his authority to shape their behavior: "Secondly, because Luxury is a very visible sinne, the Parson is very careful to avoid all kinds thereof, but especially that of drinking, because it is the most popular vice. . ."

To a degree, I am belaboring an obvious point here-- ministers should behave themselves in accordance with their positions as moral guides--but in its emphasis on the things

"wherein a Christian is most seen" and on highly "visible" sin, the text reveals its concern with representing authority, with being both a true image and official representative of religious authority. In attempting to set himself apart from his parish in moral rectitude, he also acts to set himself above them, to put himself in a position of authorized power by achieving the necessary synthesis of person and office.⁸ One of the ways Foucault distinguishes pastoral power from sovereign power is that while both operate out of a conception of "duty," the sovereign's power is a "glorious" one while the pastor's involves self-sacrifice and "devotedness." The country parson's pursuit of "Patience" and "Mortification" is an example of this kind of duty, and seeing it as an aspect of what Foucault calls the "strange technology of power treating the vast majority of men as a flock with a few as shepherds" enables us to see how it mixes ethics and politics. ("Politics and Reason" 62-63), and to analyze the parson's government of himself as a part of his authority to govern others. The Countrey Parson is in fact very emphatic about this: if the parson were to fall into the "popular vice" of drinking, "he disableth himself of authority to reprove them." The avoidance of visible sin is a necessary part of the representation of hierarchichal authority, "For sins make all equall, whom they find together; and then they are worst, who ought to be best."⁹ In this way the country parson represents himself as

one of the few empowered to watch over the majority of the others.

The "Duty and Aucturity" of the country parson is to be seen as the image of authorized and authentic religious discourse and practice, and to see that that discourse and practice is observed, respected, and made effective in subjects of the state-ecclesiastical. This he does by first subjecting himself to the prescribed forms of the Church before communicating them to his parishioners. "The Parson Praying" describes the manner in which the parson is to read out the Book of Common Prayer: "The Countrey Parson, when he is to read divine services, composeth himself to all possible reverence; lifting up his heart and hands, and eyes, and using all other gestures which may express a hearty, and unfeyned devotion." Herbert here elaborates on Canon XIII, which stipulates that Common Prayer is to be read "distinctly and reverently," clearly observing the letter and adding details on how the spirit is to be expressed: the parson is to read "first as being truly touched and amazed by the Majesty of God," and

Secondly, as this is the true reason of his inward feare, so he is content to express this outwardly to the utmost of his power; that being first affected himself, hee may affect also his people, knowing that no Sermon moves them so much to a reverence, which they forget againe, when they come to pray, as a devout behaviour in the very act of praying.

Like Hamlet directing the players, the text provides

instruction in the convincing performance of "inward feare" and reverence, down to precise modulations of the voice:

Accordingly his voyce is humble, his words treatable and slow; yet not so slow neither, as to let the fervency of the supplicant hang and dy between speaking, but with a grave liveliness, between fear and zeal, pausing yet pressing, he performs his duty.

The country parson thus becomes a living image of the spirit of official discourse, representing authority by pronouncing its prescribed form and by investing that form with his personal conviction. The parson elaborates and individualizes the duty to what James' Proclamation for the Use of the Book of Common Prayer called "the form of public service of God here established," which James expected "all our subjects, both ministers and others, will receive with such reverence as apertaineth, and conform themselves thereunto, every man in that which him concerneth" (Gee and Hardy 514). The country parson embodies that conformity in voice and gesture, and performs his duty very conscious of the specifics of how well it appears to others whose conformity he wishes to obtain.

But it was precisely the emphasis on reverence as a performance of a predetermined script, as a ceremony, that outraged those who pressed for further reform in the church. It was argued that the Common Prayer gave the hierarchy and the priest too much control over religious expression.¹⁰ Milton, for instance, carried on a heated debate in print

with Joseph Hall over this issue.¹¹ To take what is perhaps an extreme example, The Anatomy of the Service Book, published in 1641 by "Dwalphintramis" (a pseudonym for John Bernard?), argued for the "quite abolishing of the service book, with the Hierarchical maintainers of it," calling it a "rancke Imposter in Gods worship . . . notwithstanding its long possession, and violent Intruder into the House of God." This tract contends that the service book instills "hierarchical awe" with its ceremonies, which are called "the pitchie wings whereon [bishops] flie" (Sig. B). These ceremonies, performed by men who claimed to possess special authority, overshadow the sound teaching of the Word; according to the text, the Prayer Book "has melted away true Religion and Spiritual devotion, and . . . enslaveth the soules of people" (8). The tract sees the Prayer Book as the main "discourse of truth" supporting a whole repressive institution:

. . .the Service or Masse-booke (as they call it) is the main engine, it is the saddle, and we (to speake a homely truth) are the asses; the Hierarchie and their adherants are our riders, the saddle has so pinched and galled our backs, that we know not how to take on the burthen of the Lord Jesus . . .

(10)

The main objection of the tract to the Prayer Book is that it is "this symbolization of Papists and prelatsmen;" since the book is derived from the Catholic mass, "can there come

clean water out of a corrupt fountain"? As such, the Prayer-Book imposes an intermediary person and a mediating text between the individual and God. The tract attacks the hierarchical structure on its claims to represent God to the people in ceremonies, and to represent the people to God in the repetition of set forms pronounced by "adherants" of the hierarchy.

Herbert's parson takes up a posture towards God in the reading of divine service which would certainly provoke the author of The Anatomy of the Service Book, in addition to the ceremonial performance of reverence. As he "composeth himself," he "presents himself before God, "yet not as himself alone, but as presenting with himself the whole Congregation, whose sins he then beares, and brings with his own to the heavenly altar . . ." (231). The parson, person and office, in the reading of the prescribed form of worshipping God, represents his people to God. In taking on a burden, he also takes on a position of spiritual power.

In addition to representing authorized religious discourse as a sort of icon of proper posture in prayer (that is, by being seen), the parson also represents authority by seeing to it that his parishioners likewise "composeth" themselves to reverent behaviour and experience. In this, the parson exercises power in a disciplinary fashion, again in accordance with the requirements of the canons. In short, he elaborates the official discourse of

the institutional church by ensuring that his parishioners are knowledgeable in and obedient to its requirements.

"The Parson Praying" works out the provision of Canon XVIII, "Reverence and attention to be used within the Church in time of Divine services." The canon requires that people behave in church "as it hath beene accustomed: testifying by these outward ceremonies and gesturies, their inward humilitie and Christian resolutions." Its aim is to procure "quiet attendance to heare, marke, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered." In one long, elaborate sentence, The Countrey Parson spells out the manner in which the parson is to enforce the canonical rule (with details that indicate the problems that might arise among rude country people):

Besides his example, he having often instructed his people how to carry themselves in divine service, exacts of them all possible reverence, by no meanes enduring either talking, or sleeping, or gazing, or leaning, or halfe-kneeling, or any undutifull behaviour in them, but causing them, when they sit, or stand, or kneel, to do all in a strait, and steady posture, as attending to what is done in the Church, and every one, man and child, answering aloud both Amen, and all other answers which are on the Clerks and peoples part to answer; which answers also are to be done not in a huddling, or slubbering fashion, gaping, or scratching the head, or spitting even in the midst of their answer, but gently and pausably, thinking what they say; so that while they answer . . . they meditate as they speak . . . ¹²

(231 emphasis added)

The parson exercises a very precise kind of control over

gesture, posture, and speech, in an effort to make these external things produce the internal truth of the service, to make the outward and the inward correspond. What is noticeable in the passage is the activity of the parson, teaching, exacting, and causing appropriate behavior in his parishioners, who are relatively passive. In other words, the parson exercises an enormous amount of power, using his knowledge and his position not only to manage movement and vocal response, but to shape individuals, to control their inward experience. It is of course expected that a minister would want his parishioners to conduct themselves without spitting in church, but in this case the text also governs thought and meditation in accordance with a totalized religious discourse--the divine service of the Book of Common Prayer, the code of self-representation by which both priest and people compose themselves. Parishioners are therefore to affirm themselves as individual subjects by behaving reverently and responding inwardly to the positions it establishes for them. The text underwrites its particular institutional practice with a general scriptural provision: "That is what the Apostle calls a reasonable service . . ."

(232).¹³

The parson, then, "composeth himself" in a reflection of the set forms of the Prayer Book, and then uses his

example and his authority to see that his individual parishioners compose themselves in the same terms. In preaching, he employs a similar mixture of personal exemplarity and official authority.

The purpose of preaching is the exposition of the Scriptures and, as the Directions to Preachers indicates, the state-ecclesiastical wished to maintain a system of control over the expositors. The Directions provided a "pattern and a boundary" for the production of sermons, decreeing that all sermons be agreeable to the Articles of Religion and the Homilies. This system of control aimed not only to govern public religious discourse, but also to ensure that it was only produced in public and was only produced by publicly authorized preachers. Canon XLIX provides for the "Licensing and Regulation of Preachers," and LII stipulates that "The names of strange preachers" are "to be entered in a book." LXXIII forbids ministers from holding "private conventicles," and so

Forasmuch as all conventicles and private meetings of priests and ministers have bin ever justly accounted very hurtful to the state of the church wherein they live, [any meeting] in a private house or elsewhere which may any way tend to the impeaching or the depraving of the Church of England or the Booke of Common Prayer, or any part of the government and discipline in the Church of England

is forbidden. The canon is double-edged: it both disallows "private conventicles" and categorically indicates that such

meetings by their very nature "may . . . tend" to the impeaching or depraving of the state-church. The state wished to maintain control over religious discourse, to ensure that a university educated and officially licensed representative of the state-ecclesiastical would interpret the Bible to the laity. In private meetings, separated from the state church, this control could not be exercised. As Christopher Hill has written, "Separatism signified among other things a rejection of the specialized, educated priests of the established church as fitting interpreters of the Bible or expounders of God's will" ("The Problem of Authority" 43). But if, as Reformers from Luther on claimed, the holy spirit inspired the individual believer to read scripture aright, what need was there for specially educated and authorized interpreters?

The country parson is to be both inspired, educated, and authorized as an interpreter of the Bible. I have already indicated the way in which the parson organizes his accumulation of religious knowledge "by way of expounding the Church Catechisme." But Herbert's parson inserts himself into the system of discursive regulation implied by this method by first founding his understanding of the "storehouse and magazene of life and comfort, the Holy Scriptures" on a "Holy Life." In this hermeneutic and homiletic activity, an authoritative reading of the Bible is grounded upon an authentic spiritual resonance with the

text; the authentic expositor is contrasted with "wicked men, however learned," who "do not know the Scriptures, because they feel them not, and because they are not understood but with the same Spirit that writ them" (228). Herbert sounds here a fundamental reformation note, in accordance with Luther's "twofold" definition of "the perspicuity of Scripture," in which the word of God is held to be externally truthful and consistent but nonetheless unintelligible without internal illumination. Thus, "If you speak of internal perspicuity, the truth is that nobody who has not the Spirit of God sees a jot of what is in the Scriptures" ("The Bondage of the Will" 174). But in administrative terms, this two-fold definition turns out to be a double bind, and religious authorities are forced into circular arguments in the face of competing claims to a Spirit-filled reading of the Scriptures. The range of possible readings must be limited and established in predetermined positions. An authentic spiritual response is required by the discursive order of the state-ecclesiastical, but this response must be made to cohere in a system of knowledge and an institutional structure.

In The Priest to the Temple, this limit is fixed by the Church catechism, to which all the parson's study and meditation on "divinity may easily be reduced." But the coherence produced by this method of religious study is a reflection, an index, of religious truth itself. In coming

to an understanding of the Bible, the country parson pursues "a diligent Collation of Scripture with Scripture." The hermeneutic principle employed in this undertaking is that truth as revealed in the Bible is self-consonant, internally consistent in all its details due to its single origin in the Spirit: "For all Truth being consonant to itself, and all being penn'd by one and the self-same spirit, it cannot be, but that an industrious, and judicious comparing of place with place must be a singular help for the right understanding of Scripture" (229). The political and hermeneutical difficulty with this principle lies in locating the prior principle by which industry and judiciousness cooperate in producing illuminating rather than contradictory cross-references. At this point, the argument becomes circular: when, for instance "Law" and "Gospel" appear to require inconsistent things, "the spirit of both is to be considered and weighed" so that the requirements will be read "as diverse, not as repugnant." A "comparing of place with place" will render a true account of the meaning of Scripture, but only if the person--or, rather, the parson--making the comparison is spiritually astute and rectified enough to perceive consonance in the presence of diversity.

It is my contention that the catechism serves as the prior principle by which this potentially bewildering diversity is brought into order. Representing the "directive

ideas" of the state-ecclesiastical in most basic form, it provides the principle by which the parson organizes his knowledge of "divinity," and by which he in turn communicates that knowledge to his parish. Though Herbert develops a thoroughly and clearly "protestant" hermeneutic, he also develops it in such a way as to thoroughly and clearly concentrate hermeneutic authority in the person of the parson. That authority is justified by his specialized spiritual acumen, and verified by the knowledge which he has organized "by way of expounding the Church Catechisme." Herbert's parson accumulates his knowledge through a negotiation between his own spiritual responses to the Bible and those of others, being careful not to "neglect the grace of God in himself, and what the Holy Spirit teacheth him," nor to deny that God has revealed significant truths to others in "all ages."

While it may be granted that this is a sane and moderate way of arriving at religious truth, it must also be emphasized that this method is the parson's, and the power and privileges it confers are not extended to his parishioners. The protestant emphasis on the primacy of individual spiritual response to Scripture in The Countrey Parson is focused almost entirely on the parson himself. Within the parish, he is the centralized master of the discourse of religious truth from whence flows all "discourse and direction."

"The Parson Preaching" emphasizes the central responsibility of the parson for the production and regulation of religious discourse, and the position of representative power that accompanies that responsibility: "The Countrey Parson preacheth constantly, the pulpit is his joy and his throne . . ." On those rare occasions when he "intermits," he does so so as to enhance his authority, "that he may be heard at his return more attentively." Furthermore, even in his absence he remains present by directing his replacement to follow his lead: "When he intermits, he is ever very well supplied by some able man who treads in his steps, and will not throw down what he hath built." These proxy preachers are to attempt to enforce some points which the parson had had difficulty in bringing home to his auditors, "that so in the mouth of two or three witnesses the truth may be more established" (232).

In preaching, the parson again represents authority both by being observed and by observing, and by applying the general truths of religion to the particulars of his parishioners' conditions. The chapter describes the means by which the parson "procures attention," and prescribes a combination of external artfulness and internal conviction as the formula through which his discourse will be received as authoritative.¹⁴ First, the text argues that it is "naturall" for men to take the appearance of "earnestness" as prima facie evidence that "there is somewhat worth

hearing." Second, by a "diligent, and busy cast of his eye on his auditors, " the parson lets his hearers know that he "observes who marks, and who not." In this way the parson ensures both that he is personally attended to, and that the requirement of the canon for "quiet attendance to heare, mark, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered" is observed.

Finally, the parson matches his knowledge of religion with the "particulars" of his parishioners' lives both as a means of procuring attention and representing the judgements of God to his auditors. By means of "particularizing his speech," the parson is able to "touch and awake" individuals of different qualities more effectively.¹⁵ This principle of Herbert's sermon rhetoric has been frequently commented on by critics. Summers sees it as a part of Herbert's understanding of the "proper language" and a rhetoric which founds its practice on a knowledge of the audience: the parson "should use his detailed knowledge of his parishioners' lives as a source of metaphor" (100). More recently, John Wall has seen this emphasis as a general "method of self-discovery," and finds in Herbert's "particularizing" a "copiousness of approach . . . that will make contact with the particular situations of his parishioners" (184).¹⁶ But neither has questioned the position of power and authority that Herbert's parson assumes, or the basis of his knowledge of "the particular situations of his parishioners."

The parson deploys a wide range of theological, historical, and "empirical" knowledge in order to speak to his parishioners. In order to procure attention, the parson dramatizes the "judgements of God, as of those of ancient times, so especially of late ones; and those most, which are nearest to his Parish; for people are very attentive at such discourses, and think it behoves them to be so, when God is so neer them, and even over their heads" (233). The parson represents an angry God, by interpreting both historical and local events as the judgments of God, in order to "touch and awake" his hearers with fear at the proximity of judgment.

The parson thus functions with an impressive amount of representational power, based on his knowledge and his position, and positions himself over the heads of his parishioners as the representative of God. He further selects and filters religious truth, governing from above both manner and the matter in accordance with his position as an educated, authorized and inspired interpreter in a rural parish. Because country people are "thick, and heavy, and hard to raise to a poynt of Zeal, and fervency, and need a mountain of fire to kindle them," he resorts to "sayings, and stories" as a mode of discourse appropriate to their understanding. He extends this emphasis on moving the emotions rather than making arguments "by choosing texts of Devotion, not Controversie, moving and ravishing texts, whereof the Scriptures are full."¹⁷ Again, the parson is in

the position of making the appearance of Holiness coincide with his own personal experience, "truly affecting and cordially expressing all that we say; so that our auditors may plainly perceive that very word is hart-deep."¹⁸

The text supplies a variety of suggestions for the convinced and convincing performance of sincerity. The parson's rhetorical posture involves self-effacement, representing himself as the channel through which God speaks to his parishioners. By so doing, he also effaces his specialized and educated position in the parish, and the parson's hermeneutic and scholarly expertise give way to the immediate presence of God. This is effected by "turning often, and making many Apostrophes to God, as, Oh Lord, blesse my people, and teach them this point; or, Oh my Master, on whose errand I come, let me hold my peace, and doe thou speak thy selfe; for thou art Love, and when thou teachest, all are Scholers." We have here a rhetoric which denies its own techniques, and a knowledge which seems to undermine its own privileged position by putting the audience on the same level as "Scholers." But it is also clear that the parson mediates God's teaching, selecting the texts and adapting them to his understanding of his hearers' intellectual and spiritual capacities.

The aim of the parson's preaching is to represent teaching rather than to perform it; the chief means by which the parson endeavors "to infuse a competent knowledge of

salvation into every one of his Flock" is the individualized application of the "ordinary Church-Catechism" (255). The catechism is the foundation upon which the parson constructs and makes effective the production of religious discourse in the parish; sermons, by contrast, are designed "to inflame this knowledge, to presse and drive it to practice, turning it to reformation of life, by pithy and lively exhortations." The purpose of the catechism is to bring an individual to a knowledge, and an acknowledgement, of "what he is;" having established this knowledge, sermons can then persuade the individual to function accordingly.¹⁹ But the catechism is fundamental: "Catechizing is the first point, and but by catechizing, the other cannot be attained" (255).

As with sermons, the parson's implementation of the catechism involves a self-reflexive self-effacement: the parson must subject himself to its principles before subjecting others. But whereas sermons are a "kind of state," involving a certain amount of ritual performance in order to "procure attention" and to "show" and "appear" holy, catechizing is performed in "humbleness" as the parson uses it as an occasion "for the advancing of his own mortification." The parson again inserts himself into the order of discourse of the Church of England in order to make that discourse effective and persuasive in its totalizing objectives. The parson "useth, and prefereth, the ordinary Church-Catechism, partly for obedience to Authority, partly

for uniformity sake, that the same common truths may be everywhere professed . . ." 20

The parson's concern for uniformity here extends beyond the bounds of his own parish; in fact, it seems to arise out of an observation that individuals do not remain within those bounds. Uniformity is essential "especially since many remove from Parish to Parish, who like Christian Souldiers are to give the word and to satisfie the Congregation by their Catholick answers." In this way, the parson subtly regards his parishioners as both Christians and commonwealths-men; uniform knowledge of the catechism is not merely a matter of concern for the parish community, but of the national church. It provides the password ("give the word") by which individuals can move from place to place and not be suspected of being a threat to the totalized order of the "Congregation."²¹

"The Parson catechizing" develops most clearly and particularly the parson's elaboration of official Church discourse. In obedience to Authority, the parson applies a totalized standard for individualization, and works to make individual parishioners subject to that standard. He imposes memorization and carefully guided internalization of catechistic doctrine on his parishioners in order to draw the truth of that doctrine out of the individual: "He exacts all of the Doctrine of the Catechisme; of the younger sort, the very words; of the elder, the substance." In this way,

individual subjects are produced in accordance with a totalized and pre-established discursive order, with the parson in the powerful position of exacting progressively the "substance" of the "very words" from individuals. In terms of basic protestant theology, this is, if we are being generous, a paradox; more strictly, it appears as a contradiction. This approach to producing the religious truth of the individual seems clearly to intervene between the individual and the revelation of Scripture illuminated by the Spirit, raising for us Luther's question to Erasmus: "Why, what can the Church settle that Scripture did not settle first?"

Thomas Fuller's comments on the importance of catechizing reveal a sensitivity to this contradiction. He puts it that the faithful minister "carefully catechiseth his people in the elements of religion, noting that "even Luther did not scorn to profess himself disciplum Catechismi, 'a scholar of the Catechism.'" He thus suggests that even the figure most associated with the doctrines of grace, scripture, and faith alone found that he could not do without external means for propagating protestantism, and argues that in fact it was by this means that "the gospel first got ground of Popery" (The Holy State 74). In this, we encounter the tensions engendered by the institutionalization of protestantism: in order to spread its religion of individualism, it was necessary to organize a system by which

individuals are produced. ²²

In The Priest to the Temple, that system is represented for most individuals by the catechism. The parson "requires all to be present at Catechizing," and the catechism functions as the standard by which the government of religious truth disseminates through the parish, as "Parents and Masters" become acquainted with its provisions in order to "either commend or reprove, either reward or punish." His foremost reason for this requirement is "for the authority of the work," implying that the parson does not recognize dissent as a legitimate option within his parish. In "The Parson arguing," this implication is made explicit: "The Countrey Parson, if there be any of his parish that hold strange Doctrins, useth all possible diligence to reduce them to the common Faith." Though the parson approaches dissenters from the common faith prayerfully, indulgently, and with a "sweet usage of them," it is clear that he regards their views as departures from the discourse of truth.²³ He examines the "main foundation, and pillar of their cause" from the security and certainty of his own position within the truth. The "strange Doctrins" that the parson works to reduce are not those of extreme heretics or sectarians, but of "Papists" and "Schismaticks," the one attributing too much power to a centralized Authority, the latter too little. Here the text seems to try to locate the truth between "Papist" absolutism, which regards the Church

as "a rule to it selfe" not to be measured by the rule of Scripture, and the schismatic emphasis on "scandall," which refers to church practices not specifically enjoined by Scripture. Against the latter the text asserts two important "precepts, one of obeying Authority, the other of not giving scandall. . ." The second precept is also supported by an appeal to Authority, and it turns the question of scandal against critics of the church by asking whether "it be in our power to omit or refuse" to comply with "things once indifferant, being made by the precept of Authority more than indifferent." ²⁴

The parson represents authority with his person, "a strict religious life" and by being "unmoved in arguing, and voyd of all contentiousness;" these things combine as "two great lights able to dazle the eyes of the mis-led, while they consider, that God cannot be wanting to them in Doctrine, to whom he is so gracious in Life" (262-263). Arguments for obedience to Authority are less effective, the text implies, than a composed image of its authorization from God. And the implication of that is that to dissent from Authority is to dissent from the discourse of truth.²⁵

The parson conducts and regulates his search for religious truth within the bounds set for him by Authority. The purpose of the catechism is to prevent the possibility of dissent by thoroughly subjecting individuals to its "very words" and "substance" and using them to give each indi-

vidual a sense of "what he is." Once the language of the catechism has been memorized, the parson can elaborate on it in different language according to the conditions of the individual case. The application of this technology of truth becomes a kind of game, "wherein the Catechized will at length finde delight, and by which the Catechizer, if once he gets the skill of it, will draw out of ignorant and silly souls, even the dark and deepe points of Religion" (256). The virtue of this method lies in its capacity for particularizing; unlike sermons or prayers at which, despite the parson's vigilant efforts to procure attention, individuals "may sleep or wander," "when one is asked a question, he must discover what he is."²⁶ The ambiguity of the word "discover" here suggests the relationship of power and discourse in which the parson and the parishioner stand: the Answerer must both recognize his own truth through the workings of the catechism, and in the face-to-face encounter with the "Catechizer," he must confess it in such a way as to convince his interlocutor of the genuineness of his response.²⁷

The centralized and totalizing power of the country parson is not limited to the production, regulation, and application of religious discourse. In "The Parson's Completeness," Herbert writes, "The Countrey Parson desires

to be all to his parish, and not onely a Pastour, but a Lawyer also, and a Phisician" (261). In this function, the parson also accumulates and applies legal and medical knowledge. In what we might call his lay activities, the parson works to ensure that his parishioners are productive members of the commonwealth, promotes social cohesion, and, in general, serves as a local agent of sovereign rule.²⁸ Even in his non-pastoral work, however, the parson strives to use his position of power and knowledge as a means of producing and governing the truth of the individual, in order to integrate social and religious values in the subjects of the state-ecclesiastical. In pursuing this aim, the parson governs discourse and direction within the parish guided by "the Rule, that nothing is little in Gods service;"²⁹ not the least infraction of social and religious discipline nor the most casual of speech. On this attentiveness to minutiae, the parson stakes his claim to pastoral power: "If the Parson were ashamed of particularizing in these things, he were not fit to be a Parson . . ." (248-249).

In addition to overseeing the placement of individuals within the religious discourse of the state-ecclesiastical, the country parson makes it his business to ensure that his parishioners are appropriately functioning as members of the commonwealth in social and economic matters. In justifying this practice, the text adduces arguments that are at once

religious and social, spiritual and economic, and expresses a concern that is simultaneously parochial and national. In "The Parson's Charity," the ne plus ultra of religious virtues is elaborated in such a way as to make it simultaneously a means of pastoral and social control. The chapter begins by asserting that "The Countrey Parson is full of Charity; it is his predominant element," and cites numerous passages of Scripture to demonstrate that it is "the body of Religion." In meditation on how this virtue is to be applied, the parson "first considers his own Parish, and takes care, that there be not a beggar, or idle person in his parish, but that all be in a competent way of getting their living." The parson accomplishes this "by bounty, or by persuasion, or by authority," in the last instance appealing to "that excellent statute," the Poor Law Act of 1601. As he does in many other matters, the parson exercises charity with a suspicious eye on the wayward and incorrigible nature of the poor and country people, arguing that if charity is not dispensed carefully, "it will lose the name and effect of Charity," and the recipients will come to expect it as their due. Having a "double aim" of social welfare and religious reformation, the parson works "by making a hook of his Charity," which "causeth them still to depend on him;" making the poor uncertain of their relief will cause them to be grateful to God and to be more diligent in applying themselves to a vocation. The parson's charity is also

distributed on selective principles: "he distinguisheth" between worthy and unworthy recipients, except in those cases of "evident misery" (244-245).³⁰ In screening the recipients of alms, the parson "obeys Authority;" but within the confines of his parish, he assumes a position of great power; pastorally, by causing the poor to depend on him, and socially, by distinguishing between mere idlers and the truly needy.

"The Parson in Circuit" offers instruction, and an instructive example, on how the parson is to manage the social, economic, and religious lives of his parishioners. As with his charity, the effectiveness of the parson's visits to his parishioners depends on their uncertainty, their inability to predict the hour of his coming: he visits them on weekdays, "now one quarter of his parish, now another." His purpose is to "discover" the true nature of the individuals he visits, "most naturally as they are, wallowing in the midst of their affairs." Ever suspicious, the parson thinks that on Sundays "it is easy for them to compose themselves to order, which they put on as their holy-day cloathes, and come to church in frame, but commonly the next day put off both" (247). As with divine service and the catechism, the parson takes pains to ensure that the prescribed forms of religious behavior are invested with a thorough and genuine response on the individual's part. His rural parishioners are not sufficiently trustworthy to keep

watch over themselves, and so the parson must monitor their lives to see that they are not merely "composed" in order to meet the eyes of Authority in full dress.

The method behind these visits is of course "particularizing": "as he finds the persons of the house employed, so he forms his discourse." His general aim is to discover whether individuals are both "religiously employed" and "busie in the works of their calling," though in a manner that is not too "worldly." He takes a census of the parish in order to determine who is needy, who is idle, and reproves the latter by shaping "his discourse so, that he comes to the point very leasurely, and oftentimes, making them to reprove themselves." "Besides these occasional discourses," he also examines "what order is kept in the house," seeing that the prescribed forms of daily familial devotion are observed.

In "The Parson Surveys," Herbert places the watch that the parson maintains over his parish in a national context, and indicates that the parson's concern is not merely for the cohesion and welfare of his parish, but its integration into the state so as to strengthen it and make it more cohesive. His concern here is not merely with the "particular survey of his own Parish, but a generall also of the diseases of his time." ³¹ A prediction is made of the outcome of this survey: "The great and nationall sin of this Land he esteems to be Idleness; great in it selfe, great in

consequence."³² Idleness leads to moral decay, and so the parson "represents to everybody the necessity of a vocation." He justifies this by describing the nature of man as both a religious and political subject. Man was created with reason and with physical skill, "as engagements of working;" this was true in Paradise, and even more true after the Fall.³³ The text invokes the parable of the talents; what we have been given is to be improved to "our Masters Advantage." This advantage is joined with that of the commonwealth, as "it is also a debt to our Countrey to have a Calling, and it concernes the Common-wealth, that none should be idle, but all busied." Finally, an appeal is made to something like the protestant ethic: "riches are the blessing of God, and the great Instrument of doing admirable good" (274).

Guided by these general principles, the text moves to "descend to particulars," to situate the individual "safe and within bounds" either in a calling or in preparation for one. (But one must take care that pursuit of advantage "exceed not bounds.") The married male individual within these bounds has two general duties: "the improvement of his family" and "the improvement of his grounds." These activities contribute to the cohesion and strength of the social and economic system. If men were to take better care for their families, "to dresse and prune them, and take as much joy in a straight-growing childe, or servant, as a Gardiner

doth in a choice tree," they "would seldom be from home; whereas now, of any place, they are least there" (275). This combination of proprietary and paternal feeling characterize the text's definition of calling.

The ideal progress for the individual "within bounds" moves towards greater public responsibility, and greater integration into the social and political system. Once an individual has adequately improved his family and his land, he is to turn his attention to "advancing the publick Stock, and managing Commons, or Woods, according as the place suggests." But the pinnacle of achievement for the small rural landowner is to become a representative of the King as a Justice of the Peace:

But if he may bee of the Commision of the Peace, there is nothing to that: No Common-wealth in the world hath a braver institution then that of Justices of the Peace: For it is both a security to the King, who hath so many dispersed Officers at his beck throughout the Kingdome, accountable for the publick good; and also an honorable Employment of a Gentle, or Noble-man in the Countrey he lives in, inabling him with power to do good, and to restrain all those, who else might both trouble him and the State.

(276)

Far from disdaining "the honor of State-employments" for the sake of serving God, Herbert's parson clearly takes on the lookout of the state and the King, and serves here as a kind of recruiting agent for elaborating the King's rule throughout the realm.³⁴ He further encourages his parishioners to

serve the State by advising unmarried men to take on the responsibilities of its power, "to frequent Sessions and Sizes," "to go to Court, as the eminent place both of good and ill," to work at surveying "the King's Dominions," and to attend Parliament, "for there is no Schoole to a Parliament." In the absence of these political activities, he is to "either ride the Great Horse, or exercise some of his military gestures" (277). In this way, the parson makes the duties of the Christian and the Commonwealths-man coextensive.

Riding in circuit and conducting surveys, the country parson serves as an agent of the state-ecclesiastical to see that individuals are integrated into its order. In "The Parson in Sentinell," he functions as a roving censor, monitoring and controlling occasional discourse in accordance with his position of authority: "The Countrey Parson, wherever he is, keeps Gods watch; that is, there is nothing spoken, or done in the Company where he is, but comes under his Test and censure." The parson controls both speech and interpretation, determining if something is "well spoken" or "ill;" if it is the latter, he confiscates it and prevents it from circulating: "he presently lays hold of it, least the poyson steal into some young and unwary spirits, and possess them even before they themselves heed it." In order to stem the spread of this potentially toxic speech, the parson assumes a benign attitude, using "mollifying, and

suppling words":

This was not so well said, as it might have been forborn; We cannot allow this: or else, if the thing will admit interpretation; Your meaning is not thus, but thus; or, So far indeed what you say is true, and well said; but this will not stand.

(252)

The parson then cajoles the speaker out of his speech, making fine and authoritative distinctions on what may be said and even the meaning of what was said. This "is to be on Gods side, and true to his party," and it is accomplished by "pleasantness of disposition" in order, essentially, to cheat individuals out of their right to speak: men are "willing to sell the interest, and ingagement of their discourses for no price sooner, then that of mirth; wither the nature of man, loving refreshment, gladly betakes itself, even to the losse of honour."³⁵

Criticism has emphasized the genial nature of Herbert's parson at the expense of noticing the very stringent and minute control he exercises through it. The final chapter of the text, "Concerning detraction" presents a knottier problem for the management of casual discourse within the parish, one not to be solved by recourse to pleasantness or mirth; it causes even authority to balk. Raising the question of how to deal with gossip amongst his parishioners, the parson encounters a dilemma. He discovers that "most, when they are at leasure, make others faults their

entertainment and discourse." Given the fact that this practice may reveal something vital about the conditions in his parish, the parson "finds it somewhat difficult how to proceed in this point." If he forbids the spreading of gossip, the actual evil that it reports may spread unchecked; on the other hand, "we must not do evil, that good may come of it." The problem is an acute and intractable one, for "it seems the very life and substance of Conversation." The text divides the faults that are made public into "notorious" and "private." The speaking of others' notorious faults, made known either by criminal conviction and punishment or by "common fame," is not only permissible, but to be encouraged, so that it is not done "for sport"--though this of course is precisely the motive for gossip established at the beginning of the chapter. Notoriety and ill-fame are part of the punishment for "malefactors," "as is evident by those, which are branded for rogues, that they may be known; or put in the stocks, that they may be looked upon." Anticipating objections, it is suggested that this attitude is in accordance with Law but not Gospel. This is answered by making the distinction between person and office: as the executioner is justified in carrying out the sentence against a condemned man unless he does it with "a tincture of private malice in the joy, and hast of acting his part," so those who spread the infamy of a malefactor are justified.³⁶ This of course still does not deal with the

problem--country people gossip when they are idle, for "entertainment." The chapter finally concludes by valuing the good of the parish and the nation over the good of the individual:

Besides, it concerns the Commonwealth, that Rogues should be known, and Charity to the publick hath the precedence of private charity. So that it is so far from being a fault to discover such offenders, that it is a duty rather, which may do much good, and save much harme.

(287-288)

Strangely enough, the text does not specify what it means by a private fault, under what conditions it may be spread abroad, or question the prima facie evidence of common fame. This may be evidence of an incomplete text; the chapter seems an odd one to end with, and Herbert's prefatory note expresses the hope that his readers will add to the text until it "grow to a compleat Pastorall." At the same time, The Countrey Parson has little regard for the private lives of rural parishioners; it may be that there are no private faults that its discourse and technologies are unable to "discover." Herbert's parson delivers the final word on his parishioners, much as Bakhtin argues the author of the monologic novel confers "finalized" form on the consciousness of his characters.

The country parson is a powerful master of knowledge, discourse, and experience. Too little scrutiny has been applied by Herbert's critics to the nature of the parson's

power, and too few questions have been raised about the authority behind his interpretations of Scripture, the catechism, and perhaps most importantly, the natures of the rural parishioners over whose spiritual, moral, and material lives he aspires to exercise nearly absolute power. The country parson regards his parishioners with a combination of suspicion and condescension. He stands "in Gods stead," but in conducting the business of his parish, is as concerned with achieving social cohesion and control as leading his parishioners to spiritual self-discovery. Moreover, his objectives in providing spiritual guidance are prescribed and predetermined by the bounds set by official church discourse.

The Priest to the Temple is a text that embodies many of the tensions and contradictions of institutionalized Protestantism. It asserts the primacy of Scripture and of a genuine individual experience of grace, but it concentrates interpretive authority for both Scripture and experience in the hands of a centralized figure. Protestantism demands an intense degree of self-consciousness and self-scrutiny; the country parson's emphasis on keeping watch over his flock suggests that he did not regard them as capable of doing so themselves. The parson thus offers them a meaner version of protestantism adapted to their lower capacities: he "endeavoreth to be in Gods stead, knowing that Countrey people are drawn, or led by sense, more then by faith, by present rewards, or punishments, more then by

future" (254). This is not exactly pure protestantism, and it seems to work for the salvation of the individual without the individual's knowledge. The endeavor, however, is grounded in the parson's knowledge, of appropriate rewards and punishments, and of the nature of "Countrey people," and in his power to make the one fit the other.

NOTES

1. The first "what he is" refers to the parson's social status and authority relative to local aristocrats: the latter is not to compromise or restrict the former in the pursuit of his calling. The second appears in the text's description of catechizing, through which--under the parson's watchful eye--each individual "must discover what he is."
2. It must be acknowledged that Mockett's labor was a curious one. For getting the documents of faith out of Latin and into lay-accessible English was one of the signal accomplishments of the English Reformation.
3. While "The Author to the Reader" maintains that failure to comply with the text in all its particulars is not necessarily displeasing to God, it is written in the gnomic present tense characteristic of "Character" texts. For examples, see Thomas Fuller, The Holy State, and Joseph Hall, Characters of Vertues and Vices. In "George Herbert's The Country Parson and the Character of Social Identity," Christina Malcomson argues that Herbert is able to forge for himself a genuine social identity by using the character genre as a guide, "because through it he can fashion a direct correspondence between inner disposition and social signs" (251). My contention is that the fashioning of this correspondence is as much governed by institutional procedures as it is guided by literary genre.
4. In a letter to his stepfather, Sir John Danvers, written in 1617, Herbert complained that he wanted "Books extremely," as he was "setting foot into divinity" and needed them "to lay the platform of my future life." Herbert here insists on the importance of having his "own" books, and seems embarrassed at the prospect of having to be "fain alwayes to borrow Books, and build on anothers foundation." Herbert writes urgently, as the matter of obtaining his own volumes involved "the making good of my former education, of obeying that Spirit which hath guided me hitherto, and of achieving my (I dare say) holy ends." He was writing Danvers with a request for funds, finding that his annuity was insufficient to cover the costs of "those infinite Volumes of Divinity, which yet every day swell, and grow bigger" (Works 365)

5. This is true even, or especially, of the actual church building, which he outfits according to the prescriptions of "decency and order" of the canons, and sees that "all books appointed by authority be there" (246)

6. Fuller's character of "The faithful Minister" similarly connects the minister with the father: "A good minister, and a good father, may very well agree together." (The Holy State 79).

7. Fuller's character of "The Faithful Minister" provides another parallel for Herbert's perspective here: "he counts the success of his ministry the greatest preferment."

8. Malcomson, too, emphasizes this passage's concern with "maintainig a proper distance between the ruler and the ruled" (252).

9. Moral and religious rectitude seem to play for religious rule the role that Norbert Elias suggests that "manners" came to play for the upper class in the social realm: A strict code of behavior is "a prestige instrument, but it is also--in a certain phase--an instrument of power" (313).

10. Horton Davies summarizes: "Eventually, all Puritans, moderate or radical, came to see the Prayer Book as the repressive instrument of despotic absolutism, the symbol of the retention of the 'rags of Popery," and therefore of disloyalty to the Reformation, the sinister emblem of compromise and unreliability" (332).

11. See Animadversions, in Complete Prose Works of John Milton, 677-692. I return to this debate in Chapter Five.

12. Amy Charles describes Herbert's representation of his rural parishioners as "generic . . . as Sir Toby Belch is generic," but no less realistic and recognizable as rude rural bumpkins for that. The parson in turn represents the model of rectitude and patience: "[Country people] are not often lovable; frequently, they are willful, stubborn, even exasperating. The parson for his part is perservering, firm, charitable, patient, but constantly ready to teach his people . . ." (157).

13. Milton's The Reason of Church Government also emphasizes reasonableness in worship, though he stresses rational argument and persuasion to a much greater extent.

14. Joseph Summers anticipates the objections of the "modern sensibility" to Herbert's emphasis on the external representation of authentic and inward holiness: he argues that "we, rather than Herbert, may divorce appearance from

reality: he recommended devices for gaining the appearance of holiness on the assumption that appearance should correspond to reality." This makes the problem of sorting out appearance from reality too simple on a number of levels. First, it assumes that the reality precedes and inspires the appearance, and in terms of assigning this reality to "Herbert," we have no evidence aside from the appearance of Herbert's texts. My own emphasis is on the ways in which Herbert uses appearances to represent reality in accordance with a centralized and totalizing discourse. My assumption is that we have no means of ascertaining the genuineness of the reality of Herbert's experience or intentions. Secondly, we can locate objections to Herbert's stage directions for preachers in "sensibilities" contemporary to Herbert.

15. The principle developed here, as with many others in The Country Parson, is also found more briefly articulated in Fuller's The holy State, Book II, Chapter IX, section ix.

16. Both Summers and Wall emphasize, as I have, the corporate nature of Herbert's text, and the ways in which it assumes an essentially didactic rather than personal identity in accordance with institutional aims. Wall in particular has extensively detailed the ways in which Herbert's objectives in The Country Parson grow out of the Prayer Book and the institutional life of the Church (see especially 183). But while these critics have highlighted this aspect of Herbert's text, they have not investigated with sufficient skepticism the text's claims to knowledge and its ability to produce "growth" and "self-discovery" in the lives of individual parishioners. The questions I wish to raise are in a sense prior to these descriptions of Herbert's practice: How is knowledge of both general things and particulars acquired and regulated, and how is the ability to promote "self-discovery" governed and related to issues of government, both of Church and State? A brief citation from Wall's discussion of The Country Parson will clarify the differences between his emphases and my own. Wall notes that Herbert's parson is "first a Sermon to himself, and then to others" (CP 255); he comments, "By making himself part of the congregation for his own didactic efforts, Herbert thus undermines any claim the parson might have to be a repository of truth to be conveyed to his parishioners" (180). This fails to distinguish between the person and the office; in operating on himself, Herbert merely applies his knowledge as a representative of official discourse to his own person. It also seriously underestimates the concentration of knowledge and its application which the parson takes as his domain. In short, large parts of the text support rather than undermine the parson's position as a "repository of knowledge": he knows

both generals and particulars and the ways in which they fit together.

17. Compare this point with article 3 of James' Directions Concerning Preachers, which forbids any "preacher of what title soever under the degree of bishop, or dean at the least" from dealing with any "deep points" of predestination as inappropriate for "simple auditories" (Gee and Hardy 517).

18. Thomas Fuller coins the word "cordiloquy" for this homiletic process, "for when men draw the doctrines out of their hearts, sure, all would count this lawful and commendable" (Holy State 75).

19. Herbert's language here expresses a rhetoric of persuasion in a vocabulary of coercion, an application of the workings of discourse, knowledge, and power. The aim of a sermon is "to presse, and drive" knowledge into effective practice. Again, it is important to emphasize that educated parsons govern the individual's knowledge from above, on the basis of a superior and authorized knowledge, "driving . . . their generall Schoole rules ever to the smallest actions of Life" (266).

20. That the parson is both to use and prefer the "ordinary Church-Catechism" is typical of the way in which the text functions as an elaboration of official discourse, for it couples external compliance with an internal conviction. The combination of obedience to Authority and the promotion of uniformity as motivations for this use and preference seems to be a distinction without a difference, for the main objective of Authority's prescriptions is the imposition of uniformity.

21. John Wall has argued that Herbert's text is essentially inclusive, that it employs a variety of strategies for integrating various individuals into the Christian community. To a certain extent, Wall is using what Kenneth Burke calls a "eulogistic" vocabulary to describe this process, while I am using a "dyslogistic" one (Rhetoric 90-95). But I also think that Wall overestimates the inclusiveness of the community the text aspires to create, partly by failing to consider the possibility that an individual might resist integration on grounds that ought to be respected. Thus when he argues in preaching and catechizing, Herbert's emphasis is on "suiting the didactic methodology to the situation and to the person" and that "in each case, the goal is to find that approach which will produce the response Herbert seeks," he does not take notice of the implications of his own account: that Herbert has a predetermined idea of the appropriate response for all individuals. This, of course, implies a totalized system of individualization.

22. Christopher Hill has seen this contradiction as central to the history of protestantism in general, and especially crucial in those countries ruled by a state church. He argues that Luther "tried to replace, or to control, Bible reading by the use of catechisms," and that in England, "the protestant emphasis on the importance of both preaching and of a learned clergy testifies to a similar anxiety to have qualified experts ready to undertake the ticklish job of interpreting the Bible" ("The Problem of Authority" 41).
23. It is of course more or less beside the point to reproach Herbert, or any seventeenth century religious figure, for being intolerant. The main focus of my analysis is to show how the parson functions as a powerful figure governing what is and what is not to be tolerated.
24. cf. "Lent"
25. See Barnabas Oley's preface.
26. The elaboration of the discursive technology of the catechism is crucial. Herbert repeats in the chapter on sacraments: "The saying of the catechism is necessary, but not enough; because to answer in form may still admit ignorance; but the Questions must be propounded loosely and wildly, and then the Answer will discover what he is" (259). The parishioner's sense of his own truth is thus produced by the powerful application of a discourse. In their account of Foucault's analysis of technologies of the self, Dreyfus and Rabinow have argued that "At least in the West, even the most private self-examination is tied to powerful systems of external control; sciences and pseudo-sciences, religious and moral doctrines. the cultural desire to know the truth about oneself prompts the telling of the truth; in confession after confession to oneself and to others, this mise en discours has placed the individual in a network of relations of power with those who claim to be able to extract the truth of those confessions through their possession of the keys to interpretation" (Michel Foucault 174). Herbert's parson clearly claims possession of these keys.
27. For a discussion of the relationship between confession of an individual and the "authority who requires the confession," see Foucault The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction, 58-63.
28. The parson, however, performs these activities "like a parson," e.g. "In curing of any, the parson and his Family use to premise prayers, for this is to cure like a Parson, and this raiseth the action from the Shop, to the Church" (262).

29. cf. "The Elixer"

30. For an account of various attitudes toward and the regulation of charity in the period, see "The Poor and the Parish," in Hill's Society and Puritanism. Hill argues that legislation for making provision for the poor increasingly led to the "nationalization" of charity, until ultimately "the ecclesiastical unit of the parish had been completely fused with the administrative hierarchy of the civil State" (270). Herbert's approbation of the Poor Law and his subsequent comments in "The Parson Surveys" suggest that his parson was to be a bureaucrat in this hierarchy.

31. See Fuller, Holy State, 75: "he chiefly reproveth the reigning sins of the time and place he lives in."

32. cf. lines 91-96 of "The Church Porch."

33. For a description of the ways in which the fall was used as a justification for social and economic order see Hill, "Sin and Society." "An Homily against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion" uses the fall to justify the existence of a hierarchical political order to restore "the rule and order of obedience thus by rebellion overthrown."

34. Joesph Summers noted that "the King is important both as fact and symbol throughout A Priest to the Temple," but he argues that the Court, "that symbol of the nerve center of national life, is conspicuous by its absence." He goes on to say that it was "perhaps, by forgetting the Court and returning to the realities of English rural life that one could retain a belief in the good old ways" (48). My own view is that Herbert articulates his parson's activities within a complex and centralized system of rule that has little to do with the "good old ways" and much to do with the totalizing aspirations of the Stuart monarchs, his apparent qualms about "the Court" aside. Summers' view of Herbert's disdain seems to take its cue from Walton's account, or invention, of Herbert's words to Arthur Woodnot: ". . .I can now behold the Court with an impartial eye, and see plainly that it is made up of fraud and titles and flattery, and many other such empty, imaginary, and painted pleasures . . ." (Lives 253). But Herbert calls the Court the "eminent place both of good and ill." Here he seems close to the more courtly Donne, who in "A Litany" prays to be kept "From thinking, that great courts immure / All, or no happiness . . ." For another view of Herbert's life at Bemerton as a retreat from the realities of power politics, see Leah Marcus, Childhood and Cultural Despair.

35. The text frequently recommends mixing mirth with the serious business of managing the lives of parishioners. In his circuits, he "mingles other discourses for conversation sake, and to make his higher purposes slip the more easily." "The Parson in Mirth" makes essentially the same point. "The Parson's Condescending" maintains that the parson should be "a Lover of old Customes" in order to gain favor with his rural parishioners, but the text goes on to establish the celebration of customary holidays as a principle for creating social cohesion, and control: those who refuse to participate, he "presents" to the church courts. For a discussion of holiday sports and pastimes as a means of social control and political rule, see Leah Marcus, The Politics of Mirth.

36. Luther makes a similar argument in "Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved."

CHAPTER III:

PRIESTLY POETICS: "H. SCRIPTURES II," "PROVIDENCE,"
"THE WINDOWS"

The Temple has commonly been regarded as the product of Herbert's departure, in disillusion and/or defeat, from the public world of politics and preferment that was the aim of his "sweet youth and early hopes." With the disappointment of his "court hopes," the story goes (a story begun by Izaak Walton but repeated with mostly minor modifications up to the present), Herbert turned away from the court, the center of state power and prestige, turned his attention toward God and focused his remarkable verbal abilities inwardly on the state of his soul: first, he took to a period of anguished vocational indecision, after which he "lost himself in an humble way"¹ in the rural parish at Bemerton. In these personal circumstances, Herbert is said to have written, revised, and arranged the poems of The Temple, having come to the conclusion that "Perhaps great places and thy praise/ Do not so well agree" ("Submission").²

But as I have shown in my chapter on The Priest to the Temple, or The Countrey Parson, departure from the center of

power, however humbly motivated, does not necessarily imply distance from the governmental aims and practices of that center. Indeed, Herbert's parson works in his parish remote but not removed from the center of state power to represent the authority of that power in very particular ways. He inserts himself and his discourse within an elaboration of a system of government designed to produce, simultaneously, religious and political subjects, and to regulate and benefit from their activities "as it concerns the commonwealth"--and given the parson's thoroughness in intruding on the lives of his parishioners, there seems to be little that does not concern it. In short, the parson, despite or even perhaps because of the the fact that he does not occupy a "great place," is officially designed to work as a vital relay in the reproduction of what Raymond Williams has called the "effective dominant culture" ("Base and Superstructure" 45). Most particularly, he oversees his parishioners' private and public conduct and beliefs, and ensures the state church's monopoly to control interpretive authority and the production of religious truth.

An almost exclusive critical focus on Herbert's personal attitudes toward place and power has obscured the ways in which his poetry is placed within the powerful discursive and institutional systems of the state-ecclesiastical. Herbert's writing is subjected to those systems even as it seeks to subject others to them. Giving attention to

the ways in which this writing is both produced by and reproduces the religious and political imperatives of the state and its church, I believe, forces us to reconsider the terms of the critical debate over the "representative" nature of Herbert's poetry and the kind of "experience" it represents.

Attempts to attach Herbert and his poetry firmly to one religious position or another are ultimately attempts to construct a unitary Herbert, one who had a particular kind of religious vision, outlook, and experience which was essential to him; the critical definition of this experience in turn dictates not only how certain poems should be read but also which poems will be selected for analytical emphasis. Poems or aspects of poems that do not seem to contribute to the shape of the specific kind of experience predicted by a particular critical paradigm are thereby either devalued aesthetically, dated as early work, or seen as early phases in the spiritual progress of the speaker, which were subsequently transcended, or are otherwise excluded from the definition of the "essential" Herbert.³

While the precise definition of its shape, meaning, and theological orientation diverge greatly, critics frequently contend that the individual poems of The Temple cohere as a whole structure, a structure that is to be read in accordance with the definition of the complex interplay of mutual interpretation of biblical texts found in "H. Scriptures

II": "This verse marks that, and both do make a motion/Unto a third, that ten leaves off doth lie" (5-6).⁴ Unfortunately, this approach can hardly be decisive, for precisely the reason that Herbert's method of harmonizing the Bible, certainly a mainstream or consensus Protestant approach, posed tremendous difficulties in the post-Reformation world. Different people, with different theological, social, and political outlooks, will read this interplay differently. As with current critical approaches to Herbert, these differences resulted in and from differences of selection and emphasis. There are always "remainders" or unexplored possibilities that must be ignored or explained away.

For many (Herbert among them, as I will argue) these differences necessitated the presence of some authority to decide among competing and contradictory interpretations: an authority empowered to decide what the Bible said and to whom; to settle the question of what was essential and what not in the Bible and in religious practices based on the Bible; and ultimately, as we have seen, to determine who could say what about the Bible and its application to human lives and institutions. Christopher Hill has written of the frequently radical, heretical, or subversive "process of discussion which the appeal to Scripture unleashed." ("The Problem of Authority" 47) My own selection of and emphasis on poems from The Temple will point to ways in which the poems represent the attempt to control, limit, and even

completely prevent discussion by the assertion of order and authority. At those points in The Temple at which Herbert asserts an unquestioned and unquestionable order and authority, The Temple can be said to function in concert with the hegemonic aims of the centralized authority. To make this particular selection and emphasis is not to reduce The Temple to an aestheticized expression of official state church discourse; rather, as Terry Eagleton has written, "To examine a phenomenon like literature superstructurally is to contextualize it in a certain way--to highlight those aspects of it which act as hegemonic supports" ("Two Approaches" 95). My purpose is not to argue that the central and essential meaning of Herbert's poetry is that it is product of the state church; but looking at The Temple after analyzing A Priest to the Temple, which almost entirely functions on behalf of the hegemony of the state-ecclesiastical, "those aspects of it which act as hegemonic supports" assume a greater prominence.

Often--in "H. Scriptures II," for example--the presence and workings of this authority must be inferred or glimpsed by the effects produced by its ostensible absence. The hermeneutic principle of "Holy Scriptures II," which has attracted considerable commentary, though again with little notice of the controversies and complexities which surround it, is to discover that the "secrets" of Scripture converge on and find concrete expression in Herbert's speaker's

"life":

Such are thy secrets, which my life makes good,
 And comments on thee; for in ev'ry thing
 Thy words do find me out, and parallels bring,
 And in another make me understood.

The poem establishes a signally Protestant approach to the understanding of Scripture and its application to the individual life: the notion that the Bible can be read by each individual (provided he is authentically Spirit-filled) as addressed to him or (although this is problematic) her is a definitive part of Protestant hermeneutics. The reading of Scripture provides the basis for subjective self-discovery ("Thy words do find me out") and objective expression ("And in another make me understood.") Herbert includes both of Luther's two components of "the perspicuity of Scripture": the text applied to the individual by the Holy Spirit, and the objective truth of the text that makes communication of its truth possible.

But the poem is equally definitive of the contradictions of Protestantism in the ultimately evasive way in which it establishes Scripture as internally self-consonant, congruent to the individual's life, and communicable to "another": the problem of interpretive selection and emphasis is not confronted, or even acknowledged. The poem begins with the desire for the knowledge of "how all thy lights combine/ And the configurations of their glory." The knowledge of "all" the combinations and interconnections of

Scripture is inaccessible, so the speaker turns to the specific example of the connections between "This" verse and "that," and their combining to "make a motion/ Unto a third." Significantly, this process is activated by the text, and not by the reader: "This verse marks that;" the two in combination "make a motion" to connect with another. The gap between the real but inaccessible knowledge of "all the constellations of the storie" and the specific but unspecified interconnections between "This" and "that" mark the point at which human selection and emphasis necessarily must intervene; but here the poem attributes hermeneutic activity to the text and not to any particular human reader of any particular text: the text reads itself.⁵

And it reads itself to the passive human subject, whose role is merely to be affected by and not to affect the scriptural text. But in lines 7 and 8, an analogy is drawn which draws attention to what is being suppressed by the representation of the biblical text's self-activation: "Then as dispersed herbs do watch a potion,/These three make up some Christians destinie."⁶ In the vehicle of line 7, it is clear that herbs are not able to combine themselves into a potion, but require the specialized knowledge and skill of an active human agent. So, the tenor of line 8 would seem likewise to require the operation of one knowledgeable and skillful enough to make the right combination of verses for the outcome of "some Christians" life. But again, it is the

verses themselves that "make up" the "destinie" of the individual.

The poem appears to be describing the unmediated and unconstructed interaction between the biblical text and the individual. But it is able to do so only by suppressing human intervention and interpretation, by representing Scripture as self-explicating and the individual as the passive recipient of the application of its meaning: the text applies itself to the individual. To take this poem as final evidence of Herbert's religious experience would be to underestimate its evasions and to fill in its indeterminacies, to close the gap between the total order of truth represented by the "configurations" and "constellations" that are to be found in the Bible as it simply is and the particular interconnections between "This," "that," and "a third," which by implication must be made by somebody in some particular situation.

The third quatrain of this sonnet, quoted above, moves toward a greater specificity, from the statement of this hermeneutic as it applies to "some Christian" to the speaker's own understanding of its operation in "my life." We are told that the "secrets" of the Scriptures are made manifest and intelligible in the speaker's life: "Such are thy secrets, which my life makes good,/ And comments on thee." For this first time in the poem, we see human activity on the text, but it is only the secondary activity

of fulfillment and commentary, activity that reproduces and makes manifest the latent content of the original text.⁷ Further, it is the speaker's "life" that speaks for the secrets of the Bible; this commentary is produced not by the activities of interpreting--selecting, emphasizing, and connecting--but naturally reproduced by the speaker's existence, verified, according to Helen Vendler, in "his lived experience" (198).⁸ That existence is in turn articulated by and made coherent "in ev'ry thing" by its congruence to the Scripture. The entirety of the speaker's life is a commentary on the Bible, "for in ev'ry thing/ Thy words do find me out, & parallels bring;" this congruence in turn makes him intelligible to someone else: "And in another make me understood." Again it is the Scriptures themselves, and not any system or mode of reading them, to which the activation of this process is attributed.

The principle of intelligibility in the poem, that which makes it "understood," is also the principle of its authorization: because the speaker's life is but a commentary on the essential text of the Bible, he is thereby both able and allowed to communicate himself to "another." But as with the specific but unspecified interconnections of the three verses of Scripture, "my life" is both crucial to the poem's meaning and crucially undetermined. (It is also a blank that contemporary readers of Herbert must fill in in order to make the text work in certain ways.) The text can--

indeed, must--contend that the speaker's experience "makes good" the inter-connections of Scripture, and that the verses and not the speaker "make up" these interconnections; it cannot, however, specify that experience because it is assumed to be coincident with the "constellations of the storie" by which it is determined and prefigured.

I have resisted the apparently obvious reading of the poem as the expression of an individual's encounter with the Scripture because, in what I see as its central evasiveness and incoherence, it points us to the connections and conflict between Protestant theology and the government of the English Church and State. Both relied on claims of naturalness and necessity, on the givenness of their positions, on the denial that their ways of reading the Bible or looking at and governing the world were invented rather than discovered. While Protestant theology insisted on the primary connections between the Scripture and the individual, the original assumption that there would be wide agreement on what the Bible said was not realized.⁹ The orderly government of Church and State demanded that the making of those connections be carefully regulated; not just anybody could make connections between "This," "that," and "a third" verse, nor could everyone make the claim that his life was a complete and authentic fulfillment of and commentary on the Bible.

What is conspicuously absent from "H. Scriptures II" is

the institutional and discursive apparatus that we saw in A Priest to the Temple, an apparatus that allows the country parson to place himself as the centralized interpretive authority in his parish. Richard Strier has argued that the "sense of the special, individually directed dynamism of Scripture" expressed in the poem confirms his argument for seeing Herbert as Protestant individualist (151). But, here and elsewhere, he overlooks the fact that in Herbert's poetry, and in the religious culture of 17th century England, individualism was not for everybody; not every claim to have had one's life "found out" by the Bible was accorded the same status. Both Strier and the poem he adduces as evidence suppress the crucial mediating discourses and institutions--those of the Church in particular--connecting Scripture to Scripture and an individual to the "destinie" produced by those connections.¹⁰ In short, the "dynamism" of Scripture in Herbert's poem is ideological in one of the most basic senses of the word: it attempts to represent a process that is institutionally and discursively constructed as natural and given. The text is said to read the individual and confer coherence on him; the individual is passive and made coherent by correspondence to the ultimate coherence of the Scripture. But these are the very processes that the various forms of Church practice and discourse were designed to control. Missing from the poem, and most critical accounts of its theology and ideology, is

an acknowledgement of the issue of the limited access to the modes of interpretation, the methods of reading the relationships between individual stars and "all the constellations of the storie," and the institutionally centralized authority to "make good" those interpretations. The passivity of the speaker is, in theological terms, a concession that his life is determined for him; seen ideologically, this same passivity can be read as an active assumption of the power of self-determination, the aspiration to mastery of the modes by which verses of the Bible "make up" the destinies of individuals.

A brief look back at The Priest to the Temple will clarify the ways in which Herbert's "individualism" may be seen as an institutional and discursive function rather than an essential and separable attribute that belongs, simply, to Herbert. The exegetical method of combining Scriptures is described in Chapter IV, which recommends "a diligent Collation of Scripture with Scripture" and "an industrious, and judicious comparing of place with place" (229). But here the very things that "H. Scriptures II" fails to mention are clearly spelled out. First, the method requires diligence, industry, and judiciousness; the biblical text is not seen as self-explicating in its interconnections. Secondly, and most crucial, the method is marked as "The Parsons Knowledge;" the diligence, industry, and judiciousness required to make the appropriate interconnections between biblical

verses are the result of specialized training and produced from the position of the authorized interpreter within the parish; the product of these interconnections are "the unchallengeable opinions of the accredited expounder of Christianity" (Hill Century 64). In short, this authority is monopolized by the parson, and managed by his application of the Church catechism.

A Priest to the Temple gives no indication that rural parishioners have their own individualities apart from the institutional and discursive means that the parson uses to integrate them into the social, political, and religious order; no sense, that is, of the possibility of their having the kind of unmediated encounter with the Bible such as is described in "H. Scriptures II." All individuality is thus mediated through the parson, whose role is "the reducing of Man to the obedience of God." The parson clearly holds the keys to the interpretation of the specific nature of that obedience, and for "uniformity sake," he relies on the "ordinary Church Catechisme" to help an individual "discover what he is." What the prose treatise makes clear, and what the poem obscures, is that while individuals are defined by Scripture it is only a specific individual endowed with specific privileges and power, and employing specific rules who is able and allowed to articulate and apply that definition.

Like "H. Scriptures II," "Providence" represents an

individual's praise of the coherence, consonance, and congruence of God's truth. Again, however, a close look at the poem and a look back at A Priest to the Temple indicate that it cannot be any individual speaking, but only one who speaks from a particular institutional and discursive position. As with "H. Scriptures II," "Providence" represents the conditions for its production as given and universal, and it too depends upon but cannot acknowledge the processes of selection and emphasis.

The poem's argument is that while providence fills and controls everything "from end to end," only "Man" has the ability to understand and articulate its patterns and meaning:

Of all the creatures both in sea and land
 Onely to Man hast thou made known thy wayes,
 And put the penne alone into his hand,
 And made him Secretarie of thy praise.

(5-8)

The natural aspiration of all creation to find expression is "brought to Man," who is to function as "the worlds high Priest": ". . .he doth present/ The sacrifice for all . . ." Refusal to perform this office is to refuse an essential function of "Man" and to upset the providential economy of universal praise:

He that to praise and laud thee doth refrain,
 Doth not refrain unto himself alone,
 But robs a thousand who would praise thee fain,

And doth commit a world of sinne in one.

(17-20)

In this context of capacity and obligation, the poem situates the speaker's choice to praise God by writing, a choice that occurs in the larger context of an all-determining providence: "shall I write, / and not of thee, through whom my fingers bend to hold my quill? shall they not do thee right?" (2-4). According to the poem, it is incumbent upon "Man" ("right") to record the expressions of providence ("write"); this is what separates "Man" from the rest of "mute" creation. But the poem's construction of the obligation, the capacity, and finally the authority to write "of God" also implicitly, but decisively, separates some men from others; "Man" is the "worlds high Priest"--commissioned to speak for "all" the world--but the speaker, the 'I' of the poem, stands in a priestly relationship to other men, a condition that is revealed in the poem's language and logic though not acknowledged by its argument.¹¹

Claiming that it is only right to write of God, the poem makes a claim also to the right to do so; speaking for the "lame and mute," the speaker of the poem, by his commitment to speaking for "all," implicitly cripples and silences other claims to authentic praise--those made by those who are unable to write, at one extreme, for instance, but also those whose view of providence might

differ. The tongue, the speaker says, "is mine to praise," and the hand "is mine to write," and in choosing what is both given and compulsory, the speaker becomes able to represent "all": "Wherefore, most sacred Spirit, I here present/ For me and all my fellows praise to thee" (25-26). The speaker thus grounds his writing "here" on the God-given capacity and obligation, laid in general on "Man," to both understand and express for "all" the workings of God's providence "from end to end."

Claiming as obligation and capacity the impulse to praise God in writing, however, the speaker makes a claim to an authority that was not available to everyone. The condition of the possibility for authentic praise extended beyond mere membership in the category "Man." The poem makes universal claims to give expression to "all," "Man," and the totality of the created order, but in moving from the "Man" into whose hands God has "put the penne" to the man who actually performs the secretarial role, the poem enacts a kind of literacy test for the expression of praise. Only "Man" is able to represent creation of God's providential ways, but writing represents "Man." And in assigning "Man" to speak for all, the poem attributes to a providential order the condition that some men will speak for "Man" while others either (explicitly) will not or (implicitly) cannot.¹²

As with "H. Scriptures II," what is at stake in the

representation of an apparently unmediated and natural transition from a general and universal condition of possibility for religious truth and a particular instance of its application is the suppression of the mode of production of that truth. But unless we are simply to accept the implication of the poem that it was produced by the providence of God, we must consider the possibility that the ability and authority to praise that the speaker of the poem claims as "mine" is his insofar as he assumes the appropriate position within an institution and its discourse. The movement from the seemingly spontaneous impulse to praise in "lame and mute" creation to "Man" and finally to the 'I' of the poem reveals the mediation that the poem cannot acknowledge, for to acknowledge that this man has taken up the pen to write of God rather than had the office thrust upon him would be to introduce human interpretation and invention--selection and emphasis--into a discourse in which it cannot be allowed if that discourse is to make a truth claim.

The Temple as a structure operates within this essential requirement to deny--and even to denounce--human "invention": we can follow it from the "The Dedication," which humbly gestures to "return" the poems to God, for "from thee they came;"¹³ to "Jordan II," which disavows "trim invention" and the figures of speech through which the "self" insidiously works itself into a text devoted to God in favor of the reproduction of a "sweetnesse readie

penn'd;" to Herbert's ars poetica, "A Posie," which bids "Invention rest" and bows out of the contest of wits in order to repeat "Lesse than the least/ Of all Gods mercies."¹⁴ To describe these assertions as evidence of Herbert's (humbled) experience is to beg a host of questions. Disavowals of human invention and interpretation were discursive and political necessities; as we have seen, the charge that various religious positions and practices were merely the products of human fancy and fabrication were frequently leveled by opposing theological and ecclesiastical factions at one another. Charles, for instance, accused puritan lecturers of being "furious promoters of the most dangerous innovations," and in his official pronouncements on the Church insisted on the dissemination of only those doctrines and interpretations that were settled by the traditions and councils of the established Church (Hill Century 138). Puritan critics in turn saw the direction of the Church in the 1620's and 1630's as a departure from the received traditions of revealed and reformed religion. Referring to the passivity of Herbert's speakers again raises as many interpretive questions as it resolves, even or perhaps especially if one maintains that this is what Herbert "believed."

A recognition of this disavowal of invention as a statement in a particular discourse rather than simply as the product of an individual's belief or experience makes it

possible to look at its function in Herbert's poems as ideological, as part of a general justification that enabled and allowed some men to speak for others, to represent religious truth both to and for others. The institutional and discursive position of the speaker of "Providence" can be further clarified by looking first at how the speaker of the poem constructs his praise of providence, and then back at the country parson and his unique and central capacity to "represent" providence in his parish.

In "Providence," the point at which the speaker begins to speak as "Man" in behalf of "all" is also the point at which we see, in his specialized vocabulary and precise distinctions, his position within a discourse and, in effect, his class position. After establishing his capacity and obligation as 'I' to write "of God," he shifts to the first person plural in line 29 and following. The movement from the generality of the third person "Man" to the specificity of the singular first person to the plural first person, again, represents not only a theological position but an ideological mediation, attaching the speaker of the poem to a general enabling ground which in turn authorizes him to speak for "all":

We all acknowledge both thy power and love
 To be exact, transcendant, and divine;
 Who dost so strongly and so sweetly move,
 While all things have their will, yet none but thine.

(29-32)

The speaker speaks for all of all, but the terms in which he praises the primary and all-permeating attributes of God reflect a scholar's language: the natural expression of praise is further subjected to the mediations of writing and discourse. "All" that occurs is said to be the result of either God's "command" or his "permission":

Nothing escapes them both; all must appeare,
 And be dispos'd, and dress'd, and tun'd by thee,
 Who sweetly temperest all. If we could heare
 Thy skill and art, what musick would it be!

(33-36)

The "exact" discursive distinctions which describe God's providential action are transposed into an inaudible music; the poem can only approximate the all-encompassing harmony to which the destinies of each and all contribute. And yet, as we shall see, the poem maintains its claim to be representative of truth.

The poem describes a universe governed by providence for the evenly distributed benefit of all: "Thy cupboard serves the world: the meat is set, where all may reach" (49-50). Speaking for all, the poem praises God for the uninterrupted interconnections of universal plenitude, a world in which "all" is filled with God and "nothing" lacks: "Thy creatures leap not, but express a feast,/ Where all the guests sit close, and nothing want" (133-134). The vagaries of human history are placed within the providential economy which governs it in ways not entirely, or in any significant

degree, intelligible to human "art": "Doubtlesse our plagues and plentie, peace and warres, / Are there much surer than our art is sure." More specifically, human technological development and economic valuation are particular expressions of this universal economy:

The sea, which seems to stop the traveller,
Is by a ship the speedier passage made.
The windes, who think they rule the mariner,
Are rul'd by him, and taught to serve his trade.

And as thy house is full, so I adore
Thy curious art in marshalling thy goods.
The hills with health abound, the vales with store;
The South with marble; North with fures and woods.

Hard things are glorious; easie things good cheap.
The common all men have; that which is rare,
Men therefore seek to have, and care to keep.
The healthy frost with summer fruits compare.

(89-100)

God's providential economy is likewise seen as the driving force behind an international mercantile economy, in which human desire for luxury is ultimately the expression of God's design to unite the world:

All countreys have enough to serve their need:
If they seek fine things, thou dost make them run
For their offense; and then dost turn their speed
To be a commerce and a trade from sunne to sunne.

(105-108)

This is an economic felix culpa: the apparently sinful desire for goods in excess of God's providential "marshalling" of them is "turned" by God into an apparently lawful

"commerce and trade," which seems to be of universal benefit "from sunne to sunne."

We need to look at "Providence," and other of Herbert's poems, not solely or simply as the development of a particular theological or ecclesiastical position, or as the expression of a particular kind of religious experience, but as ideologically constrained and constraining productions. Arguing for the presence of "rhetorical motives" in unsuspected places, Kenneth Burke writes: "If you would praise God, and in terms that happen also to sanction one system of material property rather than another, you have forced Rhetorical considerations upon us" (Rhetoric 26). For Burke, one of the key functions of rhetoric is the "identification" of one perspective or set of interests with ultimate terms (19); the purpose of this identification, of course, is to extend the domain of that perspective and that set of interests. The speaker of "Providence," speaking as and for "Man," introduces his presentation of praise "for me and all my fellows" with a revealing economic metaphor: "And it is just that I should pay the rent, / Because the benefit accrues to me." But what the poem does not and cannot openly acknowledge is that the the 'I' of the poem is positioned within a discourse so as to be in possession of the means of making that payment, and that his praise implicitly endorses an economic order and economy of truth in which the benefits do not accrue evenly. In short, the individual represented

in the poem is in a privileged position and tacitly supports the privileges of a given economic order and a given economy of truth by presenting it as an expression of a larger providential economy.

But as "H. Scriptues II," with its opening allusion to "all" the "configurations" and "constellations" within the Bible, raises but cannot acknowledge the problem of selection and emphasis, so too "Providence" both anchors and unmoors itself as a representation of God's truth by making reference to the unattainable knowledge of the totality of that truth. As with many of Herbert's poems, a gesture of humility and human limitation is a necessary condition of its power to assert the truth. In effect, this gesture enhances rather than diminishes the authority of the poem, because we are always left with the implication that it is God who completes and underwrites the limited expression. A disabling disclaimer of the individual enables the claim that that individual's utterance is God-given rather than humanly constructed.

So "Providence" concludes by seeming to contradict the spontaneity and plentitude of praise implied earlier in the poem as a prelude to an affirmation of its own status as authentic praise:

But who hath praise enough? nay who hath any?
 None can expresse thy works, but he that knows them;
 And none can know thy works, which are so many,
 And so complete, but onely he that owes them.

(141-144)

There are striking, and ideologically shaped, ambiguities here. The general sense of the lines would seem to be that only God can truly and fully know God's ways, but the "he that knows" is not given a clear referent. The lines can be construed so as to suggest that only those who have been carefully and thoroughly trained in reading God's ways from a particular perspective should be permitted to express praise, that only those who are knowledgeable in the great number and total system of God's ways are actually able to express praise. In this reading, lines 142-144 would answer the question of line 141 and severely limit the possibilities for praise that at the beginning of the poem were presented as the universal capacity and obligation of "Man." "He that knows" would then be a particular individual possessed of a particular kind and amount of knowledge.

But even if we follow the seemingly more ready way of reading line 141 as rhetorical questions which indicate that no one can even begin to understand God's ways well enough to praise them, we are left with contradictions that have implications for the ideological position of the speaker of the poem. For despite (in effect, again, because of) the acknowledgement that God's works can neither be known nor expressed, the poem goes on to express its knowledge of "All" of them and to assert its praise of all for all:

All things that are, though they have their severall
 wayes,
 Yet in their being joyn with one advise
 To honour thee: and so I give thee praise
 In all my other hymnes, but in this twice.

Each thing that is, although in use and name
 It go for one, hath many wayes in store
 To honour thee; and so each hymne thy fame
 Extolleth many wayes, yet this one more.

(144-152)

The implied gap between the manifold and total ways of God, which are unknowable and inexpressible, and the knowledge of them expressed by this poem, I suggest, must be filled with the human systems of knowledge and interpretation that the poem's logic and rhetoric would exclude. The conventional way of reading Herbert would be to close that gap by bringing God, "he that knows," into the next stanza, completing with his presence the speaker's necessarily partial and imperfect praise.¹⁵ But to read this way is, again, to beg the question of authority and the carefully limited access to it: how is it justified that some men claim the authority to represent God's truth to and for others? In its closing focus on unity in multiplicity and multiplicity in unity, the poem stakes a special and specialized claim to the representation of religious truth. The speaker of this poem claims to praise God "twice," both as "Man . . . the world's high Priest," and as a poet.¹⁶ The individuality of the poet and the function of the high

priest are joined and the authenticity of the praise is confirmed. The missing middle term, however, is an institutional rather than an ontological priesthood, or a "priesthood of all believers."

"He that knows" the ways of God must be, in order for the poem to be able to make its claim to truth, both an individual who has mastered and been mastered by a certain discursive knowledge, and God, who is present in the necessarily flawed and incomplete representation. The former is necessary to control access to the representation of religious truth, and the latter is necessary in order for the claim to be seen as God-given. Both the personal and the official work together to authorize and reproduce a system of truth, a form of government, and an economic system. This will become clearer by looking briefly at "The Parson's Consideration of Providence."

In A Priest to the Temple, the parson uses his specialized knowledge of Providence, and of country people, in order to induce certain effects in his parishioners. The particular discursive and institutional position implied in the praise of "Providence" is more clearly specified: "The Countrey Parson considering the great aptnesse Countrey people have to think all things come by a naturall course . . . labors to reduce them to see Gods hand in all things, and to beleieve that things are not set in such an inevitable order . . ." In order to replace their naive naturalism

with the belief that God often changes the course of things "according as he sees fit, either for reward or punishment," the country parson "represents to his flock that God hath and exerciseth a threefold power in every thing which concernes man" (270-271. The threefold powers are sustaining, governing, and spiritual).

The parson is placed in a position to shape the ways in which his parishioners see themselves and the world in which they labor. In particular, the parson strives to make his rural charges see the world governed by an uncertain providence in which they are not to count on anything coming as a matter of natural course. Their labor will not necessarily bring returns, the parson notes, as "it is observable, that God delights to have men feel, and acknowledg, and reverence his power, and therefore he often overturnes things, when they are thought past danger; that is his time of interposing" (271). The parson's role here is to represent what is "observable," making it apparent to the agricultural community in such a way as to cause them "to depend, and fear continually."

While the parson's aim is to cause his parishioners to fear and depend on God in order that they will devalue the things of this world and attain the next, this attitude can also be said to "concern the commonwealth." Fearful and dependent laborers are likely to be more compliant and governable, especially if they are made to feel that the

uncertainty of the fruits of their labors is caused by God rather than any system of production and distribution. Furthermore, in the process of causing his parishioners to depend on and fear God for the sake of their salvation, the parson also makes them dependent upon him and his representation of providence. God may bring scarcity and plenty "as he sees fit," but it is the parson who is in the position of seeing how God manages creation for the distribution of spiritual effects.

Again, it is a matter of seeing the priest, even a country parson, not so much as a powerful individual but as occupying a powerful place within a system of truth and power. Burke has suggested that, in analyzing the motivation of any "specialized activity," we ought to recognize that it may have a place in a "wider context, a place with which the agent may be unconcerned." Thus,

The shepherd, qua, shepherd, acts for the good of the sheep, to protect them from discomfiture and harm. But he may be 'identified' with a project that is raising sheep for the market.

(Rhetoric 27)

While Herbert may have intended that The Temple and A Priest to the Temple be read primarily for the spiritual comfort, instruction, and enlightenment of individuals, nonetheless these texts may be identified with the project of total governmental control of religious, social, economic, and

political activity in Stuart England. While William Kerrigan, and others, have noted that the author of The Temple "is unmistakably a priest," little emphasis has been placed on the ways in which the poetry is also priestly, in the context of a religious politics in which the word priest and priestly functions were highly charged with ideological implications (Kerrigan 69).¹⁷ Milton could think of nothing more damaging to say of his Presbyterian adversaries than "new presbyter is but old priest writ large," and in their battle over appropriate forms (or the abolishing of them) of devotion, Henry Burton accused Richard Cosin of altering the Service Book ("as if he would correct Magnificat") "with his owne hand" to read "priest" where it was printed "minister" (3v). This, Milton maintained, was "arrogation," the presumptuous claim of a few to special access to "that which God universally gives to all his Ministers" (682).

When I speak of a "priestly poetics" then, I do so in order to select and emphasize those poems and aspects of the poetry that function superstructurally, that serve to reinforce the state-church's monopoly on religious truth and that, through the application of that monopoly, shape behavior as it "concerns the commonwealth" by attempting to attach individuals to specific functions within a corporate framework.

In these poems, as in A Priest to the Temple, authority to speak and write "of God" is obtained by an

ideal union of person and office, of the genuinely inward, reverent, and regenerate individual and the place he occupies within an institutional and discursive order. The effective discursive representation of God depends, in Stanley Stewart's words, on an unbroken connection, an "aesthetic union between the priest's daily life and the decencies imposed on public worship" (45, emphasis added). The utterance that results from this union, however partial it is said to be in deference to God's majesty and mystery, will be fixed, exclusive, unquestionable, and total. The passivity and the effacement of the priest as speaker in this discursive production contributes to this effect, and enables his speech to be at once partial and total. Because it is supplemented--even implemented--by the presence of God, the priest's speech and writing does not invite, because it does not need, further discussion; thus, though "H. Scriptures II" and "Providence" acknowledge that they do not and cannot approach "all" the possible interconnections between God's writing in Scriptures and God's ways in the world, they do not therefore imply that anyone can make these interconnections, or a need for the inclusion of additions and suggestions, before speaking on behalf of all. The content of the poems is received passively, and therefore passes on its passivity after first localizing and confirming its truth in what Vendler calls "lived experience" and what Stewart refers to as the experience of

"gratitude" which makes the unknowable ways of providence known and communicable (Vendler 198, Stewart 66). But that experience and that gratitude are not in any simple sense prior to their expression or separable from the material "place" from which expression comes.

The poet's and the priest's representation of himself as a mere channel is, I have endeavored to demonstrate, as much ideological, a part of "the politics of truth," as it is theological or experiential, in that it is tied in crucial ways to an appropriately placed individual.¹⁸ The ideal union I speak of above is a strategy for pursuing the aspirations of a system of hierarchically distributed and tightly controlled access to authorized religious discourse; it is achieved in a place to which there is limited access, and once achieved, possesses unquestionable authority. Consider, for example, the matching of person and office that underlies Charles' Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion, November 1628:

Being by God's ordinance, according to our just title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge, in the unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace: and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction in both in Church and Commonwealth.

(Gee and Hardy 518-519).

The king, representing a union "by God's ordinance" of person and office, of place and "zeal," proclaims unity, and

his institution by God allows him to limit instantiations of God's word, disallowing certain kinds of discussion or of preaching as factious and factitious. In other words, as a channel of the presence of God in the world, the king is positioned to determine, as he holds it "most agreeable," what form religious discourse should take.

In "The Windows" we find a poem much concerned with the union of person and office, and with a "place" instituted and effected by God and so endowed with great power and spiritual authority. Like "H. Scriptures II" and "Providence," "The Windows," Herbert's poem on the "art" of preaching, grounds its representation of the capacity to speak of God in a clearly Protestant homiletic, though one which uses the material and institutional church as a metaphoric vehicle. Still, effective preaching is achieved solely by the grace of God. God's presence is said to shine through an individual--not of course any individual, but one of "The holy Preachers"--who is neither simply transparent nor opaque and so intensifies without distorting that presence. And, as do "H. Scriptures II" and "Providence," it settles this capacity on the figure of a generalized "Man," who in his natural condition is incapacitated to serve as the medium of God's truth. This condition is rectified by God's grace and presence, completing and making effective an otherwise broken and inauthoritative speech which will leave its auditors unaffected:

Lord, how can man preach thy eternall word?
 He is a brittle crazie glasse:
 Yet in thy temple thou dost him afford
 This glorious and transcendant place,
 To be a window, through thy grace.

But when thou dost anneal in glass thy storie,
 Making thy life to shine within
 The holy Preachers; then the light and glorie
 More rev'rend grows, & more doth win:
 Which else grows watrish, bleak, & thin.

Doctrine and life, colours and light, in one
 When they combine and mingle, bring
 A strong regard and aw: but speech alone
 Doth vanish like a flaring thing
 And in the eare, not conscience ring.

The genuine affect and effect of the sermon, then, both depend on the correspondence of the right (as in rectified) person with a generally accessible place. Lewalski has maintained that "Protestants generally agreed that worthy sermons and prayers must spring from inner illumination by the Spirit, and from the experience of grace and redemption: whatever the role of art, the artist and his matter must first be formed by God" (216). Her description seems particularly appropriate to "The Windows": even before the preacher mounts the pulpit, a place has been prepared for him, preveniently, forming out of the material of "brittle crazie glass" a window. Out of this in-and un-firm, flawed material--the O.E.D. lists "Full of flaws, damaged, impaired, liable to break or fall to pieces . . ." and "diseased, sickly; broken down, frail, infirm" as available meanings of "crazie"--God's institution has shaped a form and endowed it

with a function. What otherwise would break apart and distort, by refracting "crazily," the unity and wholeness of God's light of truth, is in a sense framed and held together, directed through the window and shone on the congregation. But the generality of Lewalski's account of the Protestant aesthetic and homiletic, and the generality of the poem's description of "man's" place in God's "temple" itself, raises as many questions as it resolves. While the general agreement about inward authenticity and homiletic efficacy in principle existed among Protestants--and most likely in Christian rhetoric as a whole¹⁹--any particular claim to occupy the place of the preacher in a "glorious and transcendent" way was liable to be disputed.

These claims were liable, however, but not open to dispute. Taste in preachers may have been a matter of personal preference, and certainly following one's own preacher depending on one's own estimation of his inward authenticity by "gadding to sermons" was a possibility; but it was not officially countenanced. In short, the "glorious and transcendent place" was the focus of intense debate and intensive institutional regulation.²⁰ The more immanent refractions of God's light in a particular person and place are left out of the poem (of course) and out of critical placements of it. For instance, to return to the canonical matters that I cited in analyzing A Priest to the Temple in the previous chapter, there are the stipulations for "the

qualities of such as are to be made minister," and the process of licensing "under their hands and seals" depending on subscription to the articles attesting to the person's acceptance of the royal supremacy, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Articles of 1562 as "agreeable to the Word of God" (Canons XXXI and XXXVI). Furthermore, the official Church set canonical and statutory limitations on the topic and the place of preaching, in such documents as the oath ministers were required to swear in the aftermath of the anti-propheying repression of the 1590's: "I shall not preach, or publically interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority, with out special license from the bishop under his seal" (cited by Hill, Society 34).²¹ We could also consider the canonical prohibition on "conventicles," informal and unauthorized preaching in private houses (Canon LXXIII), or James' Directions to Preachers with its imposed limitations, based on clerical rank, on preaching, restricting topics to those endorsed by the Articles and Homilies and confining the lower orders "wholly to those two heads of faith and good life, which are all the subject of the ancient sermons and homilies" (Gee and Hardy 517). These and other Church of England canons and regulations were designed to control the topoi of sermons, restricting them, in more senses than one, to common places.

On these aspects of place, Herbert's lyric is necessarily silent, and it is almost certainly not the case that

Herbert would have regarded the archbishop's seal or the licenser's imprimatur as more important than the presence of God in determining the legitimacy of religious discourse. But, given the context in which I have placed Herbert's writing and, in consideration of the deference to public authority and reference to public concerns in evidence in A Priest to the Temple, these questions more naturally arise: Is the occupying of the preacher's place merely and solely a transaction between God's grace and "man"? Does the poem's opposition of God's "storie" indelibly fixed within and radiantly shining without and "speech alone" likewise only concern "The holy Preachers" and their direct expression of their experience of God? How is the process by which God "dost anneal in glass thy storie" understood? Is it verified simply by the listener's response and the effect on his conscience? What governs the movement from the position of "man," disabled by nature to represent God, to "This glorious and transcendant place" and then into the more select places occupied by those in whom God is especially present? These questions, I suggest, are not amenable to simple answers based on a general Protestant consensus on the one hand, or a traditional institutional approach on the other, so that to answer that God's presence or institutional consensus and communal practice can resolve them seems to me incomplete. For the questions involve points of contention between Protestants and within institutions, and

concern struggles over not only the religious principles but the authority to "make good" the principles in actual instantiations of them. To invert the point of the beginning of this paragraph, it is unlikely that Herbert would have regarded as one of "the holy Preachers," in whose words and life God's "storie" was undeniably present, an unordained itinerant who lacked a degree.

Further, the clerical and governmental regulation, even monopolization, of preaching is not merely a matter of contention between Puritan Sabbatarians and high Church ritualists. As with other Protestant principles, the emphasis on the inward and the genuine in preaching runs up against organizational and institutional limits in all but the most radical separatist sects. It is only at those limits that we begin to find calls for a widely distributed and non-hierarchically verified access to the pulpit or the encouragement of response to the pulpit through discussion. Together with an emphasis on the "general agreement" on the inward illumination of the preacher as a necessary element of true preaching, we must take into account the "place" of the preacher himself, educated and elevated over the heads of the members of his congregation. A complementary part of the general consensus was the concentration of discursive authority in the singular figure of the Protestant preacher. That authority was often invoked against those who claimed to preach by virtue of certainty, illumination, conviction,

the presence of the Spirit, or other Protestant doctrines, interpreted as though they really extended the priesthood to all believers. Hill has described the Protestant problem created by a simultaneous need to spread the word and limit access to its interpretation, and his words represent another aspect of the "general agreement" among Protestants: "The protestant and later Puritan emphasis on preaching as necessary for salvation was a way of maintaining clerical supremacy whilst allowing the laity to think for themselves within limits laid down by the clergy" ("The Problem of Authority" 43).²²

To read "The Windows" as if it were a self-contained expression of Herbert's embrace of truly inward preaching would be to remain within, by refusing to acknowledge, the limits of access to the "glorious and transcendent place" of the preacher. It would be to overlook as well the kinds of mystification that some felt such glorifying of the place of the preacher was meant to serve. Again, this pertains not only to the "Anglican" preacher or the "dumb dog" ritualist, but to the figure of the specially-graced preacher in general. William Walwyn, for example, complains of the institutionalization of preaching itself, the creation of an institution given in large part to creating, extending, maintaining, and reproducing its own exclusive claims to be "the only public speakers." This is accomplished by a rhetorical maneuver in which the priesthood of all believers

vers is made to vanish before the congregations eyes, making the potentially dangerous implications of the reformation disappear. Finding, as had Milton, the "new presbyter" as imposing as the "old priest" ("less stately and pompous, but altogether as imperious and awful over men as the former"), Walwyn maintained,

The second interest of the divine is to preserve amongst the people the distinction of clergy and laity, though not now in those terms, because they have been unhappily discovered, the Scriptures so evidently making the people God's clergy by way of distinction from the ministers (1 Peter 5:3) but never the ministers by way of distinction from the people . . . Well, the distinction by words is not so material as a real distinction which their interest is to preserve. They would not have us to think, that a minister comes to be so, as another man comes to be a merchant, book-seller, tailor, etc., either by disposal of him by his friends in his education, or by his own making choice to be of such a trade. No, there must be something spiritual in the business, a iure divino, must be brought in, and a succession from the apostles . . . that therefore there is a like divine, though secret, ordination from God in making our ministers, and spiritual gifts and qualifications thereunto.

Walwyn includes here all those thing that Ferrar discounts. in his presentation of Herbert's being "enabled," "accounted meet," and "compelled" to serve at God's Altar--education, influence, choice--and he critiques the version of the priest as special, and specially close to God, mediator of the divine, as it is represented in "The Priesthood." Walwyn aims at giving "the people" some means of self-representation and determination in spiritual matters, to encourage them to "take boldness to themselves, and not

distrust their own understandings." The imposition of the iure divino rule of the preacher is meant to foster such distrust: "Because otherwise, if people did not believe so, they would examine all that was said, and not take things upon trust from the ministers, as whatever they spake, God spake in them" (254-255). In Walwyn, an official and institutional Protestant homiletic is challenged by the logical extension of a Protestant hermeneutic, so that the "people" can both respond to what is spoken, and speak for themselves.

In the particular instantiation of the Protestant homiletic represented in "The Windows," as Strier has argued, "God is presented as solving the problem of man's unfitness to minister the Word by conforming the minister to Christ;" I have argued that attributing all activity to God raises other, more political and immanent, problems concerning the governing principle of God's selection; not only the theological notion of election but also the minister's conforming to the canonical and other constraints on ministering the word, and the confirmation of this process in an institutional context. What results from the action of God on a passive "holy Preacher" is the overpowering image of persuasive discourse, and an undeniable but inaudible ringing in the conscience. The hearer of the sermon, or the reader of the poem, is invited to look upon this image with "regard and aw," but not to respond, review, or evaluate, as

in Walwyn's tract.

Implicit also in this discursive transaction is a negation of congregational election as a principle of church government, and discussion as a means of selecting the best preacher and arriving at the best truths to be had from his sermon. The determination of whether the "Doctrine and life" of the preacher coincide to produce genuine religious discourse with genuinely reforming qualities is solely a matter concerning the preacher and God. In "The Parson preaching" chapter from A Priest to the Temple, the parson occupies a pulpit that he is to regard as "his joy and his throne." Preaching from that elevated position, having achieved the union of person and office to the extent "that the auditors may plainly perceive that every word is hart-deep," the parson endeavors to impress on his hearers the sense that "God is so near them, and even over their heads." Calling on God to inhabit and inspire the parson's words, Herbert suggests, is a means to "make them appear exceeding revered, and holy": "Such discourses shew very Holy" (233-234). To emphasize here Herbert's emphasis on the appearance of holiness is not to question his sincerity. Instead, it is to underscore the hierarchic and unidirectional nature of his representation of preaching. In his directions to preachers, and in "The Windows," Herbert seems to reinvent the iconographic means of conveying religious truth to the unlettered in Medieval Catholicism. Though the

medium has been "re-formed" and the image makes its appeal to the "eare," the effects are the same: the congregation is offered a composed and final image of holiness in a discourse that is most effective insofar as it can be seen to unite person and office and so overwhelms verbal response or rhetorical analysis. In this, it becomes the the embodiment of what Mikhail Bakhtin called "monologism":

Monologue is finalized and deaf to the other's response, does not expect it and does acknowledge in it any decisive force. Monologue manages without the other, and therefore to some degree materializes all reality. Monologue pretends to be the ultimate word. It closes down the represented world and represented persons.

(Dostoevsky's 283)

In representing a kind of preaching opposed to "speech alone" that is composed and fixed by the presence of God, Herbert's poem aspires to the status of the ultimate word, an aspiration that a figure like Walwyn would have found to be an arrogation of authority rather than an expression of humility or holiness. However, we should notice that the poem indicates that this word is rare, that it is only a select group of "holy Preachers" in whom and in whose speech this "storie" is represented. The "place" that these preachers occupy as a condition of possibility for true preaching, however, is also instituted by God. I would argue that that "place" can be shown to correspond with those established by what I have been referring to as the state-

ecclesiastical. In the following chapter on "The Church Porch," I will discuss the ways in which "place" is to be regarded with awe as a position occupied by the divinely instituted representative of God, regardless of whether the person occupying it represents God in the living iconographic manner of "The Windows."

NOTES

1. This phrase is from Barnabas Oley's 1652 edition of Herbert's Remains. Oley is reporting the "censure" of "sober men," who felt that Herbert had not taken full advantage of his "brave parts" (A3).
2. The general shape of this account of Herbert's career is found in Walton. After the death of James, of influential friends, and the apparent death of his "court hopes," Herbert "betook himself to a retreat from London," where he debated whether "to return to the painted pleasures of a Court life. or betake himself to a study of divinity, and enter into Sacred Orders." Though there doesn't seem to be much of a choice here, the deliberation produced in Herbert "such conflicts as they only can know who endured them . . . but at last God inclined him to put on a resolution to serve at his Altar" (240-241). This same basic story--that of a well-born and accomplished individual overcoming, with the direct intervention of God, the temptation to a more grand but less genuine life--is retold often by Herbert critics, for example, by Leah Marcus in Childhood and Cultural Despair: "The Temple records Herbert's drastic reordering of the values and assumptions which had inspired his early manhood" (100). The assumption is that in abandoning the Court, Herbert was abandoning power; I argue that he assumed a different mode of exercising it.
3. In "What is an Author," Foucault describes the "author function" as a construction that "provides the basis for explaining not only the presence of certain events in work, but also their transformations, distortions, and diverse modifications (through his biography, the determination of his individual perspective, the analysis of his social position, and the revelation of his basic design)." The use of this construction, Foucault maintains, enables an interpreter to construct the work as a unity and to resolve all contradictions by arranging "incompatible elements" into a system governed by the development the putative author's consciousness, his influences, and his ultimate purpose (111). The critical debate in Herbert studies has been focused on attempts to define and defend an "essential" Herbert, a construction in reference to which all the elements of his writing can be explained, interpreted, and, in the cases of incompatibility, either dismissed or ignored. See, for example, Barbara Lewalski's argument that Herbert's "art is in large measure founded upon the elements of Protestant poetics," (283); or Strier's for "the centrality of a single doctrine to Herbert's poetry" (xii). By contrast, Heather Asals' work is an attempt "to restore

Herbert as a specifically Anglican poet," (5); John Wall, in trying to demonstrate "the kind of reader Herbert seeks," similarly appeals to Herbert's reliance on the rites and offices of the Church of England. Stanley Stewart sees the Protestant reading of Herbert as one of the "species of distortion" that has tempted criticism to abandon the way that Joseph Summers and Rosamond Tuve pointed to in the early 1950's ("Preface").

4. For instance, see Lewalski, 305: "'H. Scriptures II' provides a key to both Herbert's understanding of metaphorical patterns in scripture, and to his use of such patterns in his own poetry." See also Helen Vendler, The Poetry of George Herbert, 79-83. Chana Bloch, Spelling the Word, 9-10, and Stanley Stewart, George Herbert, 66-67.

5. C.A. Patrides notes that these lines are "A reiteration of the distinctly Protestant view that the best explicator of the Bible is the Bible" (77n). But here the Bible literally is said to read itself.

6. Patrides notes that line 8 is "elusive," but Hutchinson's suggestion that "watch" means something like "contrive" seems to fit the required sense.

7. For an analysis of the discursive relationships between text and commentary, see Foucault The Order of Things 40-42, and "The Discourse on Language," 220-221.

8. Here, as so often in Herbert criticism--and, I suppose, in the reading of lyrics in general--the assumption that experience precedes expression slips by almost unnoticed.

9. See Hill, "The Problem of Authority."

10. Stanley Stewart does introduce the Church's shaping role in these matters, but as with most scholarship that focuses on Herbert and the Church of England, he emphasizes the enabling rather than the constraining aspects of this influence.

11. Stewart observes that the poem "expresses the unique place of the poet in the divine scheme of things" (113). I would underscore the definite articles in this.

12. Raymond Williams notes that the capacity to write is "distinct from most other forms of communication in that its basic skills . . . do not come necessarily as parts of the basic process of growing up in society." Because of this, writing introduces "intrinsically new forms of social relationship." Even as access to the the basic skill of writing became more widespread, Williams argues, the

"socially differentiated" access to writing and "the possibility of effective contribution" remain important considerations (Writing in Society 3-4).

13. See Schoenfeldt, "Submission and Assertion," for an analysis of "The Dedication" in terms of client-patron relationships.

14. Italics are used in Herbert's poems, of course, to indicate that God's words are being used. Sometimes they are quotations from the Bible, and sometimes words, such as in "Jordan II" or "The Collar" which Herbert's speaker "might" hear or "Me thoughts" he heard. The status of these different attributions of the words of a poem to God could be discussed in terms of the problematic of invention.

15. Thus for instance Barbara Lewalski: "Herbert wrestles constantly with the paradox of his responsibility to create poems of praise, yet his inability to do so unless God will enable him and participate with him in those praises" (302). This way of reading Herbert's poems as written "with God's help" (the phrase is Illona Bell's) seems to me to be entirely uncritical.

16. See Hutchinson's note on line 148, page 519, and C.A. Patrides' on 133.

17. Kerrigan emphasizes Herbert's love of ritual as the expression of his priesthood. Heather Asals entire argument in Equivocal Predications rests on analogies between the functions of the priest and the poet, but it also asks us-- as, in one way or another, nearly all studies of Herbert do-- to simply accept Herbert's religious positions, to re-experience them; the reader is expected "to accept Herbert's brand of Christianity as his own" (xi). John Wall also emphasizes the ways in which the poems function within the context of corporate worship within the Church, but again where his operative verbs are "enable" and "facilitate," mine are "mystify," "enforce," and "coerce." Wall assumes that one who "reads Herbert as he would be read" will thereby discover the truth about him or herself.

18. It is, certainly, part of a long and more or less continuous theological and homiletical tradition, that of "Judeo-Christian Rhetoric": "The preacher is thus to be a vehicle through which an authoritative message will be expressed" (Kennedy, Classical Rhetoric, 122).

19. See Kennedy, Chapter 7.

20. As we shall see in Chapter IV, Herbert's Verser is keen to ensure that the youth he addresses be not over scrupulous in applying the criteria of "The Windowes" to any particular preacher; rather, established church services are to be attended, and the preacher, "whatso'er he be," attended to.

21. Hill comments, "The savage persecution of the fifteen-nineties aimed to prevent preaching by deprived ministers or by persons whose ordination lacked the approval of 'public authority'" (34).

22. Hill goes on to argue that organizational requirements forced even the more radical Protestants to define themselves and therefore delimit access to religious expression.

CHAPTER IV:

"THE CHURCH PORCH" AND THE CONFIRMATION OF HIERARCHY

The serviceability of Herbert's poetry to the ruling discourses of the Church and State of England is nowhere more evident than in "The Church Porch," the long didactic poem with which the collection opens. It begins by emphatically hailing a well-born individual "Thou," an individual who is apparently in active resistance to the official discourse in the form of sermons, and ends by instructing the recalcitrant in "how to behave thyself in church." Like the sermon, "The Church Porch" is an example of what Catherine Belsey has called an "imperative text," one which functions by "constituting the reader as a unified subject in conflict with what exists outside" (91). Over the course of its 462 lines, the poem attempts to attach an individual to his God-given identity, an identity which is shaped by and expected to contribute to an also God-given social, economic, political, and ecclesiastical order.

But whereas A Priest to the Temple was aimed at providing instruction in integrating uneducated laborers

into their place in the state-ecclesiastical, "The Church porch" is addressed to one who is to assume a role in the ruling class. This is a significant distinction in terms of the text's function as ideological reproduction. Althusser argues that ideology aims at reproducing submission in workers, but at developing the ability to reproduce and manipulate "in words" the ruling ideology in ruling class subjects ("Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" 133). Balibar and Machery extend this point into literary analysis, noting that "[f]ormally . . . literature makes no distinctions between readers," but in concrete terms, the subjection conveyed by means of a literary text means "one thing for the members of the educated dominant class: 'freedom' to think within an ideology, which is experienced and practiced as if it were a mastery, another for those who belong to the exploited classes" (96). Both "H. Scriptures II" and "Providence" offer ostensible choices within an ideology. But the choices are placed clearly within a normative framework, and the only choice is to choose what is given. In more openly political and social terms (which are yet tied to ruling religious ideology) "The Church Porch" appears to offer its reader a series of choices, the chance for mastery of self and the rules of social interaction and discourse.¹ But it is also, as I will show, a poem that as a poem, is a mode of subjection, an attempt to instill into its reader a government of the self that is in

accord with the government of the Church and State of England.

It is also a poem which most critics have found, perhaps because of its manipulations and open authoritarianism, to be either merely preliminary and peripheral to the essential spiritual aims of The Temple, atypical of its main literary achievement and interest, or the product of Herbert's ambitious youth, representing attitudes that he outgrew in his subsequent poetry.² Joseph Summers comments that it is "not at all typical . . . of the lyrics within the Church;" because it was merely "intended to prepare the reader for his entrance into 'The Church'," it lacks the spiritual vigour and intensity of the lyrics: ". . . as in the application of the catechism, 'inflaming' is hardly to the point" (103-104).³ Barbara Lewalski writes that the poem is about "the externals of the Christian life and the behavior fitting to a Christian profession which constantly echo classical and Hebraic moral principles," while the "lyrics of 'The Church' define the inner essence of the Christian experience . . ." (288)⁴

Summers and Lewalski are typical of the critical assessment of the poem in that they read it as a series of sound, though very tedious, pieces of moral and ethical sententiae, suitable in effect for all conditions and times. Richard Strier, on the other hand, has recently argued that the poem represents one of the "crudest and nastiest" ver-

ions of "devout humanism," a brand of piety designed for the none-too-taxing spiritual improvement of aristocrats. This watered-down version of Christian practice was, according to Strier, adapted in English noble circles as a "way of defusing the democratic and anti-elitist strains in Protestantism (and perhaps the gospels)" ("Sanctifying the Aristocracy" 37). Strier argues that the poem has an overly "prudential" emphasis, appealing to "self-interest" and "calculation" and that, unlike later poems in The Temple, it neither seeks to transform his audience nor seems to believe that they need transformation (49). But Strier also goes on to argue that "There can be no doubt . . . that Herbert came to transcend" the values of the Verser of the poem through "Reformation theology, fully apprehended"; indeed, he argues that the very "crudeness of the values of this early poem of Herbert's also perhaps helps explain some of his later revulsion against the attitudes he there expressed and against some of the aims of the 'devout humanism'" (57, 38).

While Strier is the first to look at "The Church Porch" in any kind of historically or socially specific terms, he concludes by excluding it from The Temple by invoking the standard pattern of Herbert's personal development from ambitious aspirant to prestige and place to humble supplicant of unmerited divine favor. Thus, the poem is not integral to the essential Herbert because it is early and because it is crude.⁵ But, nonetheless, the poem is part of

the text, and while Strier may be able to see the speaker of the poem as "fully identical with the young Herbert," the poem was not marked as such for contemporary readers. In fact, as Robert H. Ray has shown, judging by frequency of citations, the poem was far and away the most popular of The Temple in the seventeenth century, nearly rivaling Spenser and Shakespeare (Ray 12).

Furthermore, the poem is not presented in the volume as an optional juvenilia, but as the price of admission to "The Church."⁶ There is no dividing line between it and the poem that precedes it, "The Dedication," which claims for The Temple, self-effacingly of course, divine descent. But between it and 'The Church' comes "Superliminare," which, as the title suggests, is a liminal poem marking the boundary that only those who have mastered (and been mastered by) the pre-and pro-scriptive rules of "The Church Porch" are allowed to cross; all others are transgressors, "profane." "Superliminare" endorses all of the "former precepts" of "The Church Porch" as essential to adequate preparation for one desiring to "approach and taste, /The churches mystical repast;" social and political behavior, as well as manners and attitudes within the church building itself, are part of learning "to behave thysself in church." For Herbert, as for Hooker, good subjects of the state are also members of its church.⁷

To hurry too quickly through "The Church Porch" in

eagerness for the "mystical repast" of the essential Herbert, or to exclude it as an early and therefore ideologically and theologically neutralized poem, is to miss a fundamental point: that The Temple, like A Priest to the Temple, seeks to "transform" its readers into "Christians" and "commonwealths-men."⁸ And, as for the parson who has "no title to either except he do good to both," so for the priestly poet of The Temple. Rather than providing a set of preliminary externals that can be dispensed with as the reader progresses towards transcendence, "The Church Porch" serves as part of the delimiting and exclusionary frame of the "picture of the many spiritual conflicts" of Herbert's experience (Walton 276). As John Frow has written, "the frame is potentially what disrupts the 'interiority' of the work, betraying the interest by which it is delimited" (219).⁹ The potential for disruption in "The Church Porch" lies in its imposition of a set of external and exclusionary rules as preparation for entrance into the ostensibly interior experience of its heart, and the interests that it betrays are clearly those of the state-ecclesiastical.

As I have said, the poem begins by "hailing" an individual as "Thou." And, as in Althusser's account of the interpellation of concrete individuals into ideological subjects, from which I've taken the term "hailing," that individual is already "marked" as a subject:

Thou, whose sweet youth and early hopes inhance

Thy rate and price, and mark thee for a treasure,
 Hearken unto a Verser, who may chance
 Ryme thee to good, and make a bait of pleasure.
 A verse may find him, who a sermon flies,
 And turn delight into a sacrifice. (1-6)

The terms of valuation here suggest that the possibilities for a developed individuality in Herbert are tied to class position, education, and certain kinds of institutional and discursive entitlement.¹⁰ The Verser first reads the individual as a valuable asset, a "treasure," and proposes to use his poem for "good." What is less than clear, and what bears looking into, are the questions of whose treasury this individual will contribute to, and whose and what kind of good will be served. From what perspective is the "sweet youth" regarded as a "treasure?" What is he being asked to sacrifice, and whom will it benefit?

The answer to these questions has of course two parts, and it is the function of the discourse in which Herbert is working to see that they work as one. The Verser, like the country parson, is in possession of the codes by which individuals are created, assessed, and made to contribute to the wealth, strength, cohesion, and authority of the state-ecclesiastical. Lewalski is right to see in the poem a progression from self to neighbor to God, but rather than seeing this progression as a theological move toward greater closeness to transcendence, we need to see its ideological function as an intensifying and, to use Burke's term, identifying, rhetorical equation of the ways of the state-

ecclesiastical with the ways of God. Thus the sweet youth is a treasure to God, and the Verser aims for his ultimate good; at the same time, he is a treasure to the state and its power and wealth. Seeing these two perspectives as coincident is the strategy of the state-church, and of "The Church Porch."

At the heart of the Verser's often repetitive and mannered advice is the instruction to "Think the king sees thee still, for his King does" (122); his aim is to create and confirm individuals who, following this advice, "work by themselves" by imagining themselves to be under constant religious and political surveillance, and who therefore place themselves in voluntary and internalized subjection to the hierarchy.¹¹ Producing this kind of responsive subject was the aim of much official preaching; Donne wrote that the aim of one of his sermons preached at the King's request was "the imprinting of persuasibility and obedience in the subject" (Selected Prose 161). This, to use a phrase of John Wall's with a different emphasis, is the "kind of reader Herbert seeks."

Herbert's Verser is also clearly seeking a male reader. To conduct oneself as if one were being constantly monitored, according to line that precedes the one quoted above, is to "Do all things like a man, not sneakingly." This is a facet of Herbert's practice that has rarely been noticed, and even when it has, it has not been treated as noteworthy.

But in addition to being shaped by a class-specific poetics, "The Church Porch," and much of The Temple, is gender-specific. This should have a significant effect on claims for Herbert's poetry and its "representative" status. The poem aims to reinforce reverent respect for hierarchies, and prominent among them is the dominance of men over women. As he does elsewhere in the poem, the Verser ties self-government and mastery of one's desires to forms of political and social government and mastery. As Michael Schoenfeldt has recently observed, several of Herbert's poems equate women with the alluring yet deceiving, frivolous, and trivial nature of the world, a world to be scorned and desire for which is to be controlled ("Sexuality and Spirituality in The Temple" 283). "Constancie" is a poem that, like "The Church Porch," links duties to God, neighbor, and self, includes among its definitions of the steadfastly constant individual one "Who, when he is to treat/ With sick folks, women, those whom passions sway,/ Allows for that, and keeps his constant way." Such condescending allowances take a more intensely contemptus mundi form in "Dotage," which casually makes apposite "Foolish night-fires, womens and childrens wishes" and all the delusory pleasures of earthly existence.¹²

The connections between the subject's sex and sexuality and his governability are stressed by the poem's rhetorical equations. The performance of one's duty in the presence of

the king, as with Donne's versions of it "imprinted" in the hearts of all English subjects, is taken to be the proper interpretation and response to a discourse inscribed within the most intimate regions of the subject. The ideological strategy of "The Church Porch" is to make the reader aware of that he is "written" by God, but to locate the interpretive authority for reading the divinely inscribed self in the also God-given hierarchy. It seeks to make individuals self-governing by gaining their submission to the government of the state-ecclesiastical and its discourse.

Seen in this regard the poem's address to the youth concerning his sexual behavior in lines 7-24 becomes not only pastoral or moral counsel, but a stage in the construction of the well-governed subject. Focusing the individual on his own disordered passions is then a way of asserting the necessity of an external order. This is the basic strategy of the Homilies' defense of order and hierarchy: man's rebellious nature necessitates structured restraint; by this strategy, order is maintained and the possibility of man's real nature being restored is protected. The poem as a "bait of pleasure" therefore begins by insisting that sexual pleasure be bated:

Beware of lust: it doth pollute and foul
 Whom God in Baptisme washt with his own blood.
 It blots thy lesson written in thy soul;
 The holy lines cannot be understood.
 How dare those eyes upon a Bible look,
 Much lesse towards God, whose lust is all their book?

(7-12)

There is of course nothing surprising about a religious poem advising sexual restraint; what is important here is more the mode by which the individual is read by the Verser, and by which he in turn is to experience himself. As with the first stanza, the individual is already "marked" as a subject by the rite of baptism. This rite seems to have inscribed within the individual his very particular truth: "thy lesson written in thy soul." The danger of lust is that it makes the self created, or at least consecrated, through the Church's rite unintelligible; the self is presented in terms of "holy lines" that can be deciphered with greater or lesser ease. What the poem does not directly confront is, as with "H. Scriptures II," the issue of interpretation. The apparent implication of the lines is that lust will make the subject unable to read himself; but in a important sense, the subject is already read into the field of interpretive possibilities provided by the Verser's discourse.¹³

In short, what is of significance here is that while the poem represents truth as an inscription within the individual, at the same time it can be read to reveal the ways in which the individual is inscribed within a system for the production and management of truth which works in an hegemonic fashion. Focusing on the inevitability and woeful consequences of the sins of individuals was, in the seven-

teenth century for nearly all but the most radical of protestants, an essential part of the assertion of order, a means for the justification of social and economic inequalities, and for the concentration of interpretive authority into the hands of a few--whether priest or presbyter.

The possibility of reading the Verser's sexual counsel for the youth against its apparent aims is prominently displayed in the fourth stanza. Here, the proper regulation of male sexual conduct is, in curious and even contradictory ways, metaphorically linked to a controversial and class-based system of land management and ordered agricultural and economic increase: enclosure. Promiscuity is likened to an unchecked use of common lands, monogamy to remaining within the fence which God has constructed around the individual's desire:

If God had laid all common, certainly
 Man would have been th' incloser, but since now
 God hath impal'd us, on the contrarie
 Man breaks the fence, and every ground will plough.
 O what were man, might he himself misplace!
 Sure to be cross he would shift feet and face.

(19-24)

Taken out of context, there is no reason to read this as pertaining to sexual conduct; it conforms completely to the dominant order's defense of its own necessity.¹⁴ In context, it ties the truth of the individual male's sexuality to modes of economic and political subjection, organization and production. Again, the necessity of order--God's order--is

affirmed by "Man's" recalcitrant, "contrairie," and "cross" nature. If God had not made specific arrangements for man's appropriation of woman--figured throughout the stanza as passive ground to be subjected to man's "husbandry," as in Shakespeare's Sonnet 3--then "certainly" man would have made his own, presumably anarchic and excessive ones. But since in fact God has "impal'd" man, man in turn refuses to recognize the God-given boundaries and wantonly disrupts sexual order. This refusal is a product of "Man's" inveterate instability, his stubborn willingness to "shift feet and face."

The strategy of Herbert's Verser here is to make the reader aware of his own instability as a sexual subject, even while insisting that the subject's real nature is given, fixed, and decipherable, but his choice of metaphor suggests that he is also concerned with larger economic and political stability. Alerting the youth to the danger of inverting feet and face in sexual conduct, the Verser confirms a larger hierarchy of order and degree; God has not in fact "laid all common"--not all women, all property, or all authority to determine the lines of the "fences" God has constructed.¹⁵ Instability and contrariness demand a stable authority for the preservation of order.

The creation and maintenance of that authority, however, in turn demands subjects who "work by themselves" in accordance with its imperatives; hierarchy must be confirmed

both in the immediate and intimate conduct of the individual and in his insertion into larger structures. Thus, for instance, the Church's rite of confirmation reads out of the intimate command to "Love thy neighbor as thyself" a whole set of social obligations, moving from duty to mother and father to obedience to "the king and his ministers," to the commands "To submit myself to all governors, teachers, spiritual pastors, and masters" and "To submit myself lowly and reverently to all my betters" (The Book of Common Prayer 286). Love of the self is one with love of neighbor; love of neighbor in turn embraces and is embraced by the hierarchy.¹⁶

While the concern of Herbert's Verser for the youth's sexual ethic in the avoidance of lust implicitly endorses a specific insertion of the individual and his desire into larger political and economic patterns, his counsel to the youth to "Flie idlenesse" (79) makes this insertion quite explicitly. The rite of confirmation's recital of the duty towards neighbor concludes with the youth's vow to "learn and labor truly to get mine own living, and to do my duty in that state of life, unto which it shall please God to call me." Affirmation of the religious virtue of industry confirms and conforms to the needs of a hierarchical society, presupposing that the subject's "state of life" will feed into the life of the state, and that God himself makes the assignment of one to the other. The "state of

life" of the youth adressed by Herbert's Verser is, as the opening stanza describes it, quite hopeful; lines 85-96 reveal that the youth's treasure is meant to be contributed to the wealth, strength, and prestige of the state.

As in "The Parson Surveys" in A Priest to the Temple, the Verser's vocational advice to the youth is to seek to integrate himself into the ruling class and the ruling ideology without resistance or question. A place is prepared for the youth, a place that brings with it determinate duties, which are coupled with an a ideological function that marks their performance off from the sin of idleness:

Art thou a Magistrate? then be severe;
 If studious; copie fair, what time hath blurr'd;
 Redeem truth from his jawes: if souldier
 Chase brave employments with a naked sword
 Throughout the world. Fool not: for all may have
 If they dare try, a glorious life, or grave.

(85-90)

Much has been written on the Protestant, and particularly Calvinist, emphasis on calling; this is certainly that, something more, and something more specific. The wording of the confirmation rite's affirmation of calling was broad enough to include any "state of life." Here, however, the Verser equates the avoidance of idleness with the implementation of the law, the search for knowledge and the pursuit of empire--a definition of industry aimed at producing a legal, scholarly, and military elite to manage and extend the knowledge and power of the state.

It would be helpful at this point to look into "The Church" for a treatment of calling that is both ideologically complementary and theologically contradictory to the one presented in the "The Church Porch." With this imperial notion of calling in mind, it becomes possible to read "The Elixer," a poem from "The Church" that exemplifies the Protestant doctrine of callings, as defined in Luther's "Treatise on Good Works," sanctifying all manner of occupations as authentically religious, athwart its ostensibly humble and pious intentions:

Teach me, my God and King,
In all things thee to see,
And what I do in any thing,
To do it as for thee:

Not rudely, as a beast,
To run into an action
But still to make thee prepossest
And give it his perfection.

(1-8)

Coming just prior to the great eschatological conclusion to The Temple, this poem would seem to represent the point at which the speaker has left far behind thoughts of "brave employments" or a "glorious life" and would perhaps even be willing to remove the "Perhaps" from his estimation of the indisposition of "great place" to "God's praise." And indeed Herbert's speaker seems deliberately to identify with those of lower degree, in contrast to the Verser's concern with making the well-born well-placed:

All may of thee partake,
 Nothing can be so mean,
 Which with his tincture (for thy sake)
 Will not grow bright and clean.

A servant with this clause
 Makes drudgerie divine:
 Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws,
 Makes that and th' action fine.

(13-20)

It does not seem possible to reconcile the two postures towards calling contained respectively in "The Church Porch" and "The Elixer," but rather than seeing the latter, and perhaps later, poem as a progression beyond the former, we need to see ways in which it stands both in complement and in tension to it. For they make identical, if somewhat obliquely so, claims to justify certain positions and functions within a social, political, and economic system: God's presence in the individual, his "tincture" and "touch," transforms those positions into expressions of God's order.

But if such a posture affirms the value of even the meanest action by alchemically transforming it from base to divine, it also confirms the social order by the hierarchically structured syntax of its argument. A lesson in the proper conduct of one's vocational duties is derived from "my God and King,"¹⁷ applied to "all things" in the speaker's life and made accessible to "All" individuals, and given a local habitation and name in the servant's "drud-

gerie." The pattern of the poem combines theological imputation of worth by faith and ideological mystification of value by function; these are brought together in its extended alchemical metaphor. Choosing which to emphasize depends partly on whether one is concerned with delimiting and defining Herbert's experience and beliefs, or with the cultural and political systems which enabled and made use of that experience and those beliefs.¹⁸

Despite the main thrust of its argument uniting all callings in the alchemical economy, there is a subtly implied distance between the speaker of the poem and the servant whom he supplies with "this clause," the "famous stone," for transforming "drudgerie" into divinity. This distance, as before, can be located in the gap between "all things" and the particular instance. In the poem's argument, this distance is closed by passing through a sort of mirror stage in which a representative "man" is instructed how to recognize his place in the divine, and simultaneously social, order:

A man that looks on glasse,
On it may stay his eye;
Or if he pleaseth, through it passe,
And then the heav'n espie.

(9-12)

It could be argued that the ideological function of this stanza is to persuade the reader that the glass is not merely a reflector of the self's social, political, or

economic situation--not a mirror--but a transparent means of discovering one's self and one's place in God. The reader is offered the choice, "if he pleaseth," to focus attention on the glass as an intervening medium reflecting the particulars of one's situation, or to see the glass as the direct means of access to a more primary reality, and therefore "through it passe." All perspectives open on an expansive "heav'n," rather than reflect the immediate circumstances, and the poem seeks to divert attention from the human construction--"the glass"--that focuses those perspectives.

The poem thus represents, as Strier has argued, the "transforming power of fiction" (207), but that fiction is as much ideological and social as theological and personal--or ideological and social because theological and personal. Further, its power to transform is grounded in its position of power, in that it represents the possibility of the servant's "drudgerie" being tinctured with divinity from above. To perform one's duties "as for [God's] laws" is therefore both a theological means of affirming oneself and an ideological means of confirming the individual's place within the hierarchy. "The Elixer" implicitly presents this process, this powerful fiction, not as the internalization of the reflection of immediate social circumstances, but as a transparent means of discovering self and God in those circumstances.

Having read "The Elixer" as ideologically complementary

rather than as a theologically or experientially transcendent of the view of calling presented to the elite in "The Church Porch," it is difficult to accept Strier's claim that it provides confirmation that "Herbert fully endorsed the anti-elitism of the doctrine of imputation" (206). While it may be true that in theological terms, "A peasant may believe as much/ As a great Clerk, and reach the highest stature" ("Faith" 29-30)¹⁹, in terms both of religious politics and social, political, and economic relationships, the Clerk retains a hierarchically superior status. Maintaining this distinction, along with and through various kinds and degrees of imputation, is a vital concern of The Temple.

The specifically ruling class orientation of "The Church Porch," moreover, would seem to ensure that a poem like "The Elixer" not be construed as addressed to a servant. It can only be said that Herbert "fully endorsed" an anti-elitist theological view by separating theology from ideology, by looking at the expression of a theological position apart from the hierarchical position from which it is expressed; in short, by separating the inside of "The Church" from the outside of "The Church Porch."²⁰ The powerful fiction that one performed lowly duties "as for" God is the very view that the elite wished to propagate to all classes for the maintenance of order and the expansion of the state's wealth, power, and prestige. "The Church

"Porch" may or may not be an early poem, but both it and A Priest to the Temple, dated 1632, would have their readers believe that the most serious religious failing to be faced in England is the sin of sloth, which brought with it occasion for various other sins and which diminished the resources of the state. Thus the country parson's survey finds "The great and nationall sin of this Land . . .to be Idlennesse; great in itselife, and great in Consequence . . ." (274). Likewise "The Church Porch"--rising it seems to me above the rhymed sententiousness of many of the Verser's stanzas to an imaginative and poetic level worthy of Herbert's talent--excoriates with hissing contempt the "Gentry" for failing to meet the obligation that God has laid upon them to shun "dressing, mistressing, and complement" for the greater "glorie" of God and England:

O England! full of sinne, but most of sloth;
 Spit out thy flegme, fill thy breast with glorie:
 Thy Gentry bleats, as if thy native cloth
 Transfus'd a sheepishnesse into thy storie;
 Not that they are all so; but that the most
 Are gone to grasse, and in the pasture lost.

(91-96)

Both the decadent life of ease to be eschewed and the brave pursuit of glory to be sought by the implied reader of "The Church Porch" reveal how the conception of theological sin has been shaped by class, social, and national concerns. The "glorie" of line 92 is, given the increasingly intense imaginative focus on the glorious life of the colonial

adventurer in the previous stanza,²¹ clearly not the glory of the world to come, but rather the strength and status of England as a world power.

While the idleness of the gentry was a common complaint of critics of the hierarchy, the social criticism of "The Church Porch," on this issue and others ultimately confirms the elite function of the hierarchy to govern the social, political, and finally ecclesiastical order. The youth addressed in the poem is given instruction in ruling class ethics and the mastery of the social signs of status conveyed through speech and rhetorical carriage: the judicious use of wit, the proper management of polite conversation, and the translation of "forraine wisdom" into the idiom of the English ruling class: "Keep all thy native good, and naturalize / All forrain of that name." The youth is urged to adopt a self-contained and assured demeanor which both observes, without obsequiousness, the social hierarchy and meets challenges to it with a calm arrogance that is born of the self-mastery enabled by social status. Aiming ultimately to prepare the reader for entrance into the religious heart of "The Church," "The Church Porch" also integrates him into a ruling class ethic in which self-government and government of the state are one, an ethic with a long tradition.²² The reader is lessoned in rules, and the Verser presents himself as one who has mastered and been mastered by those rules, which govern selves, stars, and states: "Man is a shop of

rules, a well-truss'd pack, / Whose every parcel underwrites
 a law." The individual is, by the effect of these rules and
 the implied authority of the Verser to recognize and apply
 them, integrated into a state governed by universal rules:

Houses are built by rule, and commonwealths.
 Entice the trusty sunne, if that you can
 From his Ecliptick line; becken the skie.
 Who lives by rule then, keeps good companie.

(135-138)²³

Subjected to and by these rules, the position of the
 youth within the social structure is presented as a given
 but limited observation of its hierarchy, stopping short of
 idolatrous "adulation":

Towards great persons use respective boldness:
 That temper gives them theirs, and yet doth take
 Nothing from thine; in service, care or coldnesse
 Doth ratably thy fortunes mar or make.
 Feed no man in his sinnes: for adulation
 Doth make thee parcell devil in damnation.

(253-258)

But if the well-placed individual within the hierarchy is
 not to be regarded worshipfully, the hierarchy of place
 itself is, even if stripped of its outward adornments:

When basenesse is exalted, do not bate
 The place its honour, for the persons sake.
 The shrine is that which thou dost venerate;
 And not the beast that bears it on his back.
 I care not though the cloth of state should be
 Not of rich arras, but mean tapestrie.

(265-270, emphasis added)

The equation of social "place" and religious "shrine," and the respect due to the position created through their coincidence regardless of the moral status of the individual who occupies it, form the basis of the defense of the social hierarchy from the Homilies to Hobbes--even if the latter used the connection without accepting its metaphysical truth. It is written into the fundamental doctrines and practices of Church and State. For instance, according to Lancelot Andrewes' A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine, the social order of England is a given structure which reflects God's distribution of his presence, his "tincture" and "touch," to use the terms of "The Elixer." In devising human society, God made

some partakers of His excellency, and set them in a higher place; others, of a meaner degree, and set them in a lower place: that mutual society might be maintained. For this he provided in the commandment [the fifth]; here he established the cloth and chair of estate, having given such excellency to some that he styled them gods, Ps. lxxxii. 6; to these, others of inferior rank must submit and shew their observance.

(174)

"The Church Porch" seeks to obtain the submission to and observance of the divinely sanctioned hierarchy, though without bringing much pressure on the reader's inferior rank; this it does partly by focusing on submission to a superior place rather than a "great person" who is a moral superior. In this, it is an example of what Balibar and

Machery have characterized as literature's function as a mode of subjection for the "dominant educated class": because it provides "'freedom' to think within ideology," it obtains "a submission which is experienced as if it were a mastery" (96). While the individual's legitimacy depends on his moral self-mastery--the early stanzas focusing on individual morality consistently link moral failure with loss of a legitimate self, through lust which "blots" the divinely inscribed lesson, or drunkenness, which "above all things doth Gods stamp deface"--the legitimacy of the hierarchy is maintained regardless of the moral status of the individuals who fill its orders.²⁴ The individual reader is both self-mastered in his adherence to the rules of moral conduct, and mastered by his submission to the equally rule-governed moral, spiritual, social, and cosmological hierarchy.

But in this submission the individual also discovers rhetorical self-composure and a certain security by occupying a position of truth; in adopting and internalizing these rules, the "sweet youth" is able to become a "treasure" simultaneously to himself and for the dominant order. The individual who submits to the moral, ethical, and social position of Verser's rhyming will find himself of unshakable self-confidence in disputation, looking benignly on the "mistakes" of others:

Be calm in arguing, for fierceness makes

Errour a fault, and truth discourtesie.
 Why should I feel another mans mistakes
 More, then his sicknesses, or povertie?
 In love I should; but anger is not love,
 Nor wisdom neither: therefore, gently move.

(307-312)

In following this advice, the individual attains a kind of mastery, and the dominant order a firm and persuasive defender.

Mastery is also the goal of the Verser's vocational counsel. In respect to the individual's vocational pursuits, the Verser's discourse functions so that the ethical and moral choices that are made contribute to the welfare of the state. In an apparent contradiction, the Verser counsels both mistrust of wealth and high ambition; compassionate charity and self-regarding calculation. Attempting to prescribe a remedy to the sad state of the "Gentrie," the Verser advises a greater educational emphasis on the disposition to rule: "Some great estates provide, but do not breed/ A mast'ring mind; so both are lost thereby. . ." (103-104). He preaches against "wealth without contentment," but primarily as a means of correcting spendthrifts. (Polonious-like, the Verser repeats himself on this issue: "Never exceed thy income" (157); "By no meanes runne in debt" (175)). Insofar as the ethical individual is concerned, the principles are self-effacement, self-restraint, and self-mastery. "As it concerns the common-wealth," however,

the individual is to be ambitious--though in an almost Machiavellian way, he is to go about it in a humble fashion:

Pitch thy behaviour low, thy projects high;
 So shalt thou humble and magnanimous be:
 Sink not in spirit, who aimeth at the sky,
 Shoots higher much then he that means a tree.
 A graine of glorie mixt with humbleness
 Cures both a fever and lethargicknesse.

(331-336)

As for Shakespeare's Henry IV, who "stole all courtesy from heaven,/ And dressed myself in such humility" in the pursuit of very highly pitched projects, in order to "pluck allegiance from men's hearts" (Part One, III i. 50-52), humility is seen as a political strategy for the attainment of a greater glory. If the Verser's emphasis falls more heavily on being than seeming, on "spirit" and ethical health, this is because the youth at whose good he aims is to be both masterful and mastered by submitting to this advice; his humbly ambitious pursuit of "glorie" will be both the attainment of his own health and wealth and a contribution to the well-being of the political economy of the commonwealth.

The good at which the Verser aims is a function both of a fixed and given identity written within the individual, and a given position within a stable political economy and social structure. But he begins by making the reader aware of his instability; focusing first on the threats to the intelligibility of "thy truth written in thy soul," the

Verser is able to attach the individual to a system of "rules" by which that intelligibility can be maintained. Mastery of and by these rules is the means by which the individual is both ruled and by which he is to assume a position of rule. Though this is not specifically acknowledged, the knowledge and interpretation of these rules reside not with the individual whose truth they make manifest, but in the hierarchy. The verser's composed and regular six-line stanzas tacitly present him as the spokesman of this political economy and economy of truth, and the choices that he offers the reader are very carefully circumscribed to preclude the possibility of critiquing this economy.²⁵ This is most evident when the Verser ushers the sermon-flier into the Church, though not yet into "The Church."

The first order of business, literally, in teaching the recalcitrant "how to behave/ Thyself in Church," is the payment of tithes. Here the "treasure" which the Verser had marked in the "sweet youth" is claimed as the Church's, or rather God's, due: "Restore to God his due in tithe and time:/ A tithe purloin'd cankers the whole estate." Matter for a world of theological, ecclesiastical, and economic dispute is packed into these ostensibly commonsensical lines. The youth's treasure, again regarded quite literally, is his due within a providential economy; he has merely to "Restore" the portion God expects as his due. To fail to do

so would be to rob God of his share and so deprive oneself of a legitimate claim to one's "estate." Moreover, the intermediate receiver of the payment due is left unmentioned. The "legal right to collect tithes," as Christopher Hill has shown, was essential to the maintenance of the state church and its clergy, and was therefore intensely questioned by its critics. ("Authority" 44). This legal right in turn depended upon the argument that the rights of state church derived from its status, historical and metaphysical, as God's institution.

The state-church's intense devotion to the protection of the Church's divine right to tithes can be seen in the official reaction to John Selden's The Historie of Tithes, published in 1618. Selden's historical inquiry into the various laws and practices surrounding tithing led him to conclude that while the right to tithes may be a product of "ecclesiastical or positive law," it cannot be demonstrated that they are due "by the divine moral law or the divine natural law that should bind all men and ever" (Chapter 7). In this undertaking, he described himself as "a mere Narrator," and his purpose as "not at all against the maintenance of the clergy" (iii-iv). Using the historical record of canon law to argue that tithes have been a practice of the Church from time immemorial, and so of divine origin, Selden argues, is like using Plato's Laws or Aristophanes' or Lucian's fictions as evidence of historical

practice (xii). One who argues against the human origin of tithing based on the historical record is one who "makes the object of his discourse rather what he would have should be, than anything that indeed is at all" (xiv). Pursuing this line of investigation, Selden recognized, was to threaten the limitations placed on questioning and knowledge by the hierarchy:

For the world hath never wanted store of such blockes laid in the way of learning, as willing endure not any part of curious dilligence that seekes or teaches whatsoever is beyond their commonly received nihil ultra.

(xvi)

Selden proved correct in his prediction, as the official response to his work was fierce and indignant, and representatives of the Church saw the Historie as a threat to the legitimacy of the entire institution. Selden was questioned by members of the privy council and the High Commission, where he expressed regret at publishing the work. Richard Tillesley's Animadversions upon M. Seldens History of Tithes and his review thereof expressed the fear that "secular man by custom would abrogate the Churches authority," a possibility which he felt was already "too true now." Selden's work was a threat not only to the Church but also to the Royal Supremacy of James, to whom Tillesley's pamphlet is dedicated. Selden's scholarly inquiries had pried into holy matters wholly beyond his reach and beyond the nihil ultra: "Surely this number Tenth, or Tithe

is sacred and very mystical, and communicated only to sacred and mystical persons that are Gods Vicars upon Earth, that is Kings and Priests . . ." (A1). Though published after Selden's expression of regret to the High Commission, Tillesley's pamphlet expresses his concern that despite the "Author's hearty submission" the Historie will provide occasion and "premises" for those indisposed to the Church's authority and impressed by Selden's specious erudition, who will find in its "many uncouth and unsound marginal notes" material "whereby they hope, nay resolve, their own desires are unanswerably defended" (A2). Therefore, in "To the Reader," the unwary are warned to reject Selden's "curious dilligence" and unquestioningly accept the authority of the Church and its entitlement to tithes as, in the Verser's phrase, "God's due": Selden's book should be avoided

lest thou be led by names and many strange quotations (which thou hast not leasure or care to examine) in the danger of thine own soule, to undoe the Mother of the faith, the Church. . . Thou wilt not hazard thy conscience, upon the opinion of private, though learned men, but, submitting thy understanding to the judgement of Gods Church, relying upon Gods word, in obedient devotion wilt thou both do and think as it teacheth.

(B2)

Thus is the divine right of tithes, and of the established Church "unanswerably defended."²⁶

In Herbert's poem, as in the tract, the individual's welfare is tied to the welfare of the church, and both are

guaranteed by God's own provision for the distribution of material "treasures," of estates and of sacred tenths of those estates. For the distribution of more spiritual "blessings," the Church has been given a monopoly, one which is likened to the monarch's dealing out of favors. The individual is counseled to "observe" the obligatory "Sundaies," a requirement of ecclesiastical law, and the churchgoer is placed in a position of observation, of viewing the spectacle that, like the king's majesty, is imaginatively accompanied by an otherworldly aura that sets its performance apart from the spectators:

Sundaies observe: think when the bells do chime,
 'Tis angels music; therefore come not late.
 God deals then blessings: If a king did so,
 Who would not haste, nay give, to see the show?

(385-390)

By the end of the stanza, the tithes solicited as God's due has become the price of admission for a performance of his presence. Failure both to attend, observe, and pay the price constitutes a kind of lese majesty, an affront to God's representative.

But to view the Verser's aims merely as the enriching of the Church's coffers would be simply to concur in the complaints of critics of the state church: that its practices were exploited by the clergy for gain. But to ignore the importance of tithes in the poem as the financial and ideological underwriting of an institution claiming to

possess a monopoly on God's blessings would be simply to accept the Verser's version of good as God's and the individual's. The financial claim to extract tithes is necessary in order for the Church to exact obedience, in order for its spiritual discipline to have feasibility and credibility of a certain kind. Thus, having obtained submission to the collection of tithes, the minimum due from an estate-holder, the Verser can go on to identify the Church's collects with God's ordinance: "Twice on the day his due is understood" (391). The Verser thus makes the performance of Morning and Evening Prayer an essential part of God's order of worship, but he also wants it understood that the payment of this due is not to be unsupervised; the forms of the hierarchy are confirmed in the hierarchy of private and public prayer: "Though private prayer be a brave design,/ Yet public hath more promises, more love." The individual's private relationship with God, conducted in private without clerical guidance, is figured as a wager with long odds, and the legitimacy of the Church is confirmed with a Hookerian (or, recalling the scandalous conclusion of "Show me dear Christ," Donnean) emphasis on the assent of the most numerous faction: "Leave thy six and seven;/ Pray with the most: for where most pray, is heaven."

The Verser's objective appears to be to gain the reluctant church-goer's assent and conformity to the offices and officials of the state-church. Aiming to use his verse "to

reach him, who a sermon flies," the Verser means to see that the youth hears the approved sermons, preached in the approved places at the approved time, leading to the approved conclusions; in short, it is not difficult imagining the Verser remaining well within the "boundary and pattern" of James' Directions to Preachers. The youth is advised to "Resort to sermons, but to prayers most;/ Praying's the end of preaching," suggesting that the Verser shares his Church's unease with what was frequently called "gadding to sermons," which tended to undermine the control of the Church and the primacy of its order of worship.

Ultimately, the Verser confirms the ecclesiastical hierarchy with the same appeal he had used to gain submission to the social order: it is the place, the office, and not the person or his performance, that decides the degree of deference and attention that is called for. To question the fitness of a preacher is to question the fitness of God's rule. It is to fail to understand that spiritual meanings are hierarchically determined and transmitted, not from God to the individual but, in ways that may appear to be "folly," through the rule of the established order of things. Dissent, criticism, or even discussion are thereby ruled out:

Judge not the preacher; for he is thy Judge:
 If thou mislike him thou conceiv'st him not
 God calleth preaching folly; Do not grudge
 To pick out treasures from an earthen pot.
 The worst speak something good: if all want sense,

God takes a text, and preacheth patience.

(427-432)

All avenues of speaking back to the church are closed, foreclosing on the possibility of dissent. Even if "all" were to speak poorly or worse, the hierarchy must be endured as God's lesson in patience. Taking up the argument that was used to justify unqualified obedience to sovereign princes in even tyrannical actions, this stanza endorses the existing order with only the barest promise of reward: "He that by being at church escapes the ditch,/ Which he might fall in by companions, gains" (435-436). Such a response was not likely to satisfy those puritans and separatists who were hungry for the nourishment of preaching.

Attempts to criticize the hierarchy in a particular instance of its expression are met by two strategies: accusing the accuser, and affirming the God-given status of the hierarchy without making it accessible to human evaluation. The stability of the hierarchy is maintained through an assertion of the instability of the individual, and God's ways are placed beyond the ken of human understanding:

Jest not at preachers language, or expression:
 How know'st thou, but thy sinnes made him miscarrie?
 Then turn thy faults and his into confession:
 God sent him, whatsoe're he be: O tarry
 And love him for his Master: his condition,
 Though it be ill, makes him no ill Physician.

(439-444, emphasis added)

This argument jure divino for the established church sees

the preachers as ontologically separate in their "condition," having access to a relationship with the "Master" that is not available to everyone, and thus a certain status as a Judge. This "condition" is a condition of possibility for religious expression in Herbert's Church. "The Priesthood," for example, locates in that "Bless'd order" the power both to raise individuals to heaven or to condemn them to hell. Concentrating on Herbert's own humble approach to taking that power on himself, Herbert's readers have failed to see or failed to see as interesting the unhesitating way his poetry attributes that power to the "just censures" of an institutional role. "The Church Porch" uses that power to damn dissenters by equating a refusal to accept the justice of an order "whatsoe're" it may be with a rejection of God, a refusal to accept the constraints of an institution as the action of God to "hedge us in" (450), within the limits of a "pattern and a boundary." In the most chilling lines of this deceptively commonsensical poem, the Verser sees the ways of God as the ways of the established church, and banishes to hell those who unable or unwilling see it thus: "None in hell such bitter pangs endure,/ As those, who mock at Gods way of salvation."

NOTES

1. John Wall has written of the "dialectics of choice" in the poem, but as with the whole of his study of Herbert and the Church he overlooks or deemphasizes the subtle but emphatic forms of coercion that exist in the very act of presenting a choice. The reader is allowed to do things either his--not her--way, or God's. See especially 197: "One must become that sort of reader if one is to be the kind of reader Herbert seeks."

2. It is, for example, omitted from Anthony Hecht's selection of The Essential Herbert, as is "Lent."

3. In The Heirs of Donne and Jonson, Summers maintains the necessity of "The Church Porch" to The Temple while yet maintaining the great gap between it and 'The Church.' Reading the poem, Summers argues, the youth "has learned the rudiments of external behaviour, and has established at least his desire to be holy, pure and clear" (96). These religious virtues, however, are in my reading inseparable from the youth's adherence to and passive acceptance of the dictates of an institutional and political order.

4. Lewalski notes similarities between the rules for conduct offered to the "sweet youth" of "The Church Porch" and those prescribed for the parson in A Priest to the Temple. She misses, however, the implications of this for understanding Herbert's view of "a Christian profession": both texts are addressed to members of the ruling class, and these are rules appropriate to this class and not simply to any Christian (285).

5. Though he rightly complains of the "shadow of Saint George" that hangs over Herbert criticism, it seems to me Schoenfeldt does the same thing: Herbert brought the vocabulary and strategies of social climbing to his religious verse, only to expose and transcend them.

6. Schoenfeldt has argued that "The Church Porch" is "contiguous rather than divorced from the sacred lyrics it introduces." But he places this contiguity in the context of what seems to me a relatively minor rewriting of the typical narrative of Herbert's career: "In The Temple, Herbert not only turns away from the social and political world but also turns the language of this world into the medium for his

lyric worship of God" (252). Schoenfeldt argues that we need to place Herbert's poetry in the context of the social and political world, but he attributes to Herbert the kind of canny transcendence that has typically been seen as Herbert's poetic strategy.

7. Whether all are members of the true, invisible church is another matter, one which does not much concern me here, though in the theological readings of Herbert's poetry, this is the issue.

8. The forms of "hurrying" I have in mind are reductions of the structure of the poem to one schemata or another. Lewalski sees the poem as making progressive provision for the general Protestant's "duties to self, neighbor, and God," assuming, as most Herbert scholars do, that Herbert's ways which, especially at the end of "The Church Porch," are the Church's ways, are God's ways. Wall sees the poem in connection with the catechism and rite of confirmation in the English church. I concur, but Wall is not specific enough in his analysis to detail the ways in which the poem confirms not only the community of worship but also the power of the state and the economic order.

9. In the Introduction, I argue that Ferrar's preface also significantly frames The Temple.

10. Christopher Hill has argued that, despite its theological positions, the degree and kind of self-scrutiny and literacy demanded by Protestantism ensured that, in practice, it nonetheless was maintained by an elite.

11. The phrase "work by themselves" is Althusser's.

12. Herbert's parson is ideally "rather unmarried than married," but social arrangements and bodily desires being what they are, marriage is recommended. The wife is to be chosen "not by the eye" which may cheat the judgment but "by the eare," and having been chosen, is installed in the household government "yet never so giving over the reins, but that he sometimes looks how things go, demanding an account, but not by the way of an account." This demanding but benevolent despotism is of course not unusual, but still the control of women is a vital part of the parson's self-government and the government of his house and parish.

13. Foucault has argued that power works "to structure the field of possible actions of others;" this he calls "government" ("The Subject and Power" 224).

14. In "The Social and Political Backgrounds of Herbert's Poetry," Sidney Gottlieb sees this stanza as an instance of the "informed topicality" of many of Herbert's poems. As I do, Gottlieb sees the lines as "ostensibly but not exclusively about marriage," and sees implied in them concern with wider threats to social order.

15. Peter Brown has suggested that the Christian preoccupation with the dangers of lust derives from the apostle Paul's obsession with the issue, an obsession which was tied to his concern for stable communities and his own authority. In Paul's letter to the Corinthians, Brown writes, "we can glimpse a church where issues of sexual control and sexual renunciation condensed anxieties about the entire structure of communities Paul wished to found" (The Body and Society, 32).

16. John Wall argues that this passage gives us insight into the "occasion" of "The Church Porch," and that we should see in this connection Herbert's commitment to "Christ's community-oriented summary of the law." What Wall neglects is the specific and ideological ways in which Herbert's "catechetical model" affirms a hierarchical community.

17. Taken together with "The Church Porch's" aim to make individual's aware of the continual gaze of the king and the King, it seems possible to see this phrase as pertaining to both the heavenly and the earthly ruler.

18. For the theological alternative, see Strier, 206-8.

19. Cited by Strier along with "The Elixer" as evidence of Herbert's anti-elitism, 207-208.

20. Deborah Shuger maintains that "The Church Porch" is representative of the "public self," which is "autonomous, ethical, and social," while the lyrics of 'The Church' figure the self as "dependent, passive, and private." Though in a more sophisticated and historical way, Shuger maintains the distinction between outside and inside in The Temple and in the religious culture of 17th-century England that I want to question--though not to remove (93).

21. See "The Parson's Surveys" for a recommendation of "those new Plantations, and discoveries, which are not only a noble, but also as they may be handled, a religious employment" (278). The syntax seems to recommend colonialism first as it might add to the wealth and prestige of the Commonwealth, and its religious purposes only secondarily. See also Donne's sermon to the Virginia Company, 1622, in which he pleads, "O, if you could once bring a Catechisme to be as good ware amongst them ["Indians"] as a bugle, as a

knife, as a hatchet" (Sermons IV 269). Donne lays much more emphasis on the advancement of the Gospel as a motive--the motive, in fact--than does Herbert.

22. See for instance Norbert Elias, Power and Civility, 292-300; and Michel Foucault, The Care of the Self, 89: "The rationality of the government of others is the same as the rationality of the government of oneself."

23. Foucault argues that this rule-governed rationality is typical of the operations of power in the "modern state." See "The Subject and Power."

24. Huizinga maintained that this attitude was definitive of the Catholic Middle Ages: "To the catholic soul the unworthiness of the persons never compromises the sacred character of the institution" (48).

25. In a somewhat "monologic" fashion, Bakhtin argued that the uniformity and regularity of poetic discourse distinguishes it from prose, so that heteroglossia is "organically denied to poetic style." Thus, "The language of the poetic genre is a unitary and singular Ptolemaic world outside of which nothing else exists and nothing else is needed" (The Dialogic Imagination 286). While I question whether this definition is applicable to all poetic genres or discourses, it does seem to suit "The Church Porch" and for the most part those aspects of Herbert's practice I am isolating. Herbert's poems are finished and final in this sense.

26. Selden wrote but did not publish, for obvious reasons, replies to Tillesley, archdeacon of Rochester, and James Sempil, another of the three clergy officially appointed to refute Selden's historical argument (the third was Richard Montagu). Selden's mocks Tillesley's criticisms of his "false quotations" and "ill-beseeming language," and continues to insist on the primacy of empirical historical data over figurative or biblical expressions like "first fruits" in ascertaining the reality of tithing practices. Further, he responds indignantly to Tillesley's implication that he had appeared before the Court of High Commission; he had only spoken privately to members of the Court to express his regret at the offense caused by his work, as he would have had he published a "most orthodox catechism that offended" (1371). He concludes by brushing off Tillesley's ad hominem attack as impertinent: "I wonder he should keep such a stir here, and elsewhere, that I should acknowledge the ius divinium of tythes. Why, what is that to my subject?" These responses are found in David Wilkin's 1726 edition of The Works of John Selden.

CHAPTER V:

'ALL DISPUTES CONTROL': HERBERT'S HEART, SET FORMS, AND THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

The goal of the Verser of "The Church Porch" is to bring the individual whom the Church is unable to reach within the confines of the Church. Responding to the poem as a "bait of pleasure," the sermon-flier is lured into becoming one who, as Ferrar said of Herbert, will be "singularly remarkable" in "obedience and conformitie to the Church and the discipline thereof;" in so doing, he will occupy that position where "God do hedge us in" (l.450) as his own subjective reality, in correspondence with the official forms of Church discourse and practice.¹ The combination of singularity and conformability is a mark of the exercise of a powerful discourse which both particularizes and totalizes, which locates and fixes individuals within a corporate structure, not by ruling out and prohibiting, but by structuring a field of choices through which an individual can rule himself. The only legitimate choice, however, is ultimately to choose what is given, and the means for discovering that given is ultimately the sole

possession of the state-ecclesiastical and its appointed officers. The Verser speaks on behalf of that order, and the youth, though called upon to be active in ruling himself and others in accordance with the rules the Verser prescribes, is translated from a condition of active resistance--albeit in the decadent form of "dressing, mistressing, and complement"--to the official discourse of the state-ecclesiastical, to an explicitly specified posture of passive acceptance. "The Church Porch," then, can be said to serve the purposes of the incorporation of the individual into the official ruling culture and the exclusion of unruly or ungovernable passions, feelings, or ideas from the individual. Government and self-government are described as coextensive, mutually reinforcing, and part of a single process.

The focus of this chapter will be on the ways in which poems of "The Church" continue to assign a reader to this position of passive acceptance, not, certainly, of her or himself but of the established "Church and the discipline thereof," as mediated by the forms of the poems. The subject position created for the reader of "The Church Porch" is one of unquestioning obedience to the existing forms and practices of the Church--the established Church and its set forms--and aesthetic pleasure is proposed as the means of obtaining this posture in the individual. Seeing Herbert's strategy in The Temple in these terms is nothing new; what

is is most often assumed, however, is that the poet's promise to "Ryme thee to good" coincides with a universal and transcendent, and so timelessly benevolent, desire to achieve the good of any individual who reads the poems.

Despite Herbert's legendary--real or apocryphal--deathbed dismissal of his poems as "Lesse than the least of all God's mercies," the poems make some remarkable claims concerning their own status as forms of truth, forms which both appeal to God for completion and mending of their inadequacies, and implicitly assert God's cooperation in their composition from the beginning.² Somewhat paradoxically, Herbert displays in this self-effacing gesture, as Thomas Docherty has argued, a kind of ambition that "should make that of Donne pale into insignificance" (149). (Donne, it could be said, weaves himself more openly into his lines: if there is a genesis outside his own invention--and unlike Herbert, Donne acknowledges a relationship with a Muse--it is assigned to an earthly patron, as in the dedication of "La Corona" to Magdalen Herbert or the poem addressed "To E. of D. with Six Holy Sonnets.")³ Docherty sees evidence of this ambition in the fact that Herbert continues to write poems despite the acknowledgment, common to devotional poets, that "the project to write has been negated, or prevented, by the theological premises from which the writer operates" (147). For Docherty, all elaborations of the authority to write of religious matters are also a dis-

placement of that authority; therefore, there is no valid reason for anyone to write further or otherwise than what has been revealed in the Scriptures and established in the Church.⁴ All attempts to write are as a result attempts to weave oneself illicitly into a primary text and therefore produce a struggle between the individual poet and the "rival authorities" of the church and state.

It seems a bit too simple, however, and of little help in approaching the problem of authority and religious writing in the period, to discover conflict because, despite the apparently forbidden nature of individual writing on religious matters, some men continued to write. It would be overingeniously rash therefore to assert "critical heresy as the founding principle of Herbert's authority" (94). While the state and the state-ecclesiastical did indeed stand as "rival authorities" to the authority of the poet to create, they also served as authorizing bodies which, through education, licensing, and various other means of overseeing the production of religious writing, encouraged, enabled, and even depended upon the discourse of some men to elaborate and extend its authority. We have already seen how this operates in the form of Directions to Preachers, Church Canons, and the elaboration of authority in the parish by the priest. In short, seen solely as a poet--and Docherty seems to endow the figure of a poet with some romantic, Bloomian characteristics--Herbert can be said to have

challenged the authority of the precursor state and its church, and even God (or the King) and his Bible in his writing. But as a poet who is also a priest, Herbert remains well within and even reinforces the boundaries and limits set by the established church and its discourse. (This is not to say, as we shall see, that Herbert merely reiterates and reproduces a prior authority; rather, Herbert's position within the boundaries and limits of the Church enables him, if not to transgress, then to approach them critically; his unshakeable adherence to the established Church allows him to question its stability.⁵) Rather than looking at the agon of the autonomy of the poet and the auctoritas and potestas of the state church, then, I will look at Herbert's attempt to create--recreate, perhaps, or "re-reveal" in "forms of joy and art" to use Donne's phrase from his poem on the "Sidneian" Psalms--spiritually authentic and efficacious⁶ poetic forms that do not compete with but instead complement official and entirely orthodox forms⁷.

"Singular Sincerity"

One of the prominent aims of Barnabas Oley's preface to his collection of Herbert's Remains is to hold up Herbert as a model priest of the Church. He uses Herbert's exemplarity as a means to measure how far the clergy in general had fallen from God's favor, and in so doing to account for the calamities that had befallen the established Church by 1652, the date of the first edition of the collection. God was using the abolition of the liturgy, the sequestration of the priests, and the despoiling of church buildings as a visitation of his displeasure on the Church for not consistently maintaining the pattern of primitive piety represented in Herbert's writings. To be an adherant of the Church in 1652 and to read The Priest to the Temple is to be confronted with "Indictments," to look into "a strange Speculum Sacerdotale. . . As if this good Bazaleel had invented a living, pure looking-Glasse, in most exact proportions of beauty, that should both present it self as a body of unblemished perfections, and all the beholders deformities at once. . ." (A2). Oley sees in the text an ideal version of the Church and its order, a

reflecting on common Conversation in the day of our prosperity, and the paralelling of the Book of mine own conscience with the Authors Book (in both which I find my self (not to say thee) written highly defective in every duty the good man commends, and not a little peccant in every particular taxed by him.)

(A2-A2v)

Oley analyzes and applauds the rhetorical skill, the "singular Dexterity" of Herbert's morally and spiritually "taxing" Book, a skill evident in the construction of the "figure" of the parson as an exemplar: "Like a wise Master-builder, he has set about a forme of Speech, transferred it in a figure, as if he were all the while learning from another man's mouth or pen, and not teaching any." Herbert is said to have produced a form which represents for Oley and other priests of the Church now deprived of their livings "a living, pure looking-Glass" which represents to them their ideal form, both "exact" and complete in all particulars. This text, however, in addition to being a mirror reflecting the ideal parson's external duties, is at the same time a "figure" which, in its metaphorical guile, draws out Oley's conscience, "paraelling" it and revealing the places wherein he finds himself "written highly defective." But what makes the text most effective and, I would emphasize as Oley does not, legitimate, is that its authority is achieved by a kind of ventriloquism: its ethos is a rhetorical figure in which Herbert is both intensely himself and the mere channel of the authorities he pretends to rely on.

Not surprisingly, Oley presents Herbert as a defender of the Church, its forms and offices. Together with Thomas Jackson and Nicholas Ferrar, Herbert is lauded for "singular

sincerity in embracing, and transcendant Dexterity in Defending the Protestant Religion established in the Church of England." Oley here employs a formula familiar in the writings of supporters of the established Church. It is crucial that Herbert be presented sincerely embracing Protestant religion, but equally crucial that it be the Protestant religion "established in the Church of England." (Needless to say, of course, it must be emphatically sincere.) Thus, one that reads "Mr. Herbert's Poems attentively shall finde not only the excellencies of Scripture Divinitie, and choice passages of the Fathers bound up in Meetre; but the Doctrine of Rome also finely and strongly confuted" (Bv-B2). The anti-Roman Catholic component of Herbert's and his fellow's lives and works, however, is less crucial to what Oley is attempting to do than what follows: their maintenance and proper use of the forms of the Church, into which they "thrust their hearts," to paraphrase Herbert's "Obedience," a poem to which I shall shortly turn. The intensity of their commitment to and investment in the official forms of the church make them exemplary figures for the revival of the priesthood that Oley's preface and edition of Herbert's prose and proverb collections was meant to promote.⁸ Over and above their other attainments and attributes, Herbert and Ferrar are worthy of imitation because

the chief aime of Master F and this Authour was to win those that dislike our Liturgy, Catechisme, &c: by the

constant, reverent, and holy use of them: Which, surely had we all imitated, having first imprinted the virtue of these prayers in our own hearts, and then studied with passionate and affectionate celebration, (for voyce, gesture, &c.) as in Gods presence, to imprint them in the mindes of the people (as this Book teaches,) our prayers had been generally beloved as they were scorned.

(B2v-B3)

Those who objected to the forms of the Church were not, the passage implies, really reacting to the forms themselves or the problem of external forms mediating the relationship between the individual's experience of faith and its expression, but to the insincere or imperfect performance of them. The problem was not, the passage suggests, the mediation of forms but the insufficiently lively presence of the mediator in the practice of reading them. (Oley goes on to suggest that the prayers were therefore also ineffectual in reaching God.) A more honest and earnest reading of them, one that originates in the heart, would have resulted in the transcription of the prayers as forms of consciousness from the mind and heart of the priest; they would thereby be "imprinted" in the minds of those who otherwise "disliked" them.

Herbert's "singular sincerity" in performing and defending the rites and offices of the Church is developed further, as Oley infers from the poems "The Priesthood" and "Aaron" his full knowledge of "what he did" in taking orders as a priest. (These poems are cited also by Walton to serve similar ends.) Oley takes A Priest to the Temple as evidence

of the "unparallell'd vigilancy which he used over his Parish," praises his "artful" exercise of "Reproof," his "careful (not scrupulous) observation of appointed Fasts, Lents, and Embers," and finally the "conscientious devotion" of his use of the "Church Liturgie" (C2). Responding to the most prevalent criticism of the use of set forms, Oley reports that Herbert's employment of the Liturgy was performed "not of Custome, but serious Judgement," and, according to Oley, it included and refuted the "Sophism" of arguments against it. The reasons Oley presents, which "men of understanding" recognized as sufficient, are those that had been advanced since the inception of the Book of Common Prayer in the English Reformation as a check against those who felt the Church should be reformed further: that while the set forms of the Church did indeed derive from the Catholic Mass Book, they had been purged of superstition: "the wise reformers knew that Rome would cry, Schism, Schism, and therefore they kept all that they could lawfully keep, being loth to give offense"; that they were necessary for those of lesser spiritual maturity and acuity: "The Lambes poor of the flock are forty for one grounded Christian: proportionable must be the care of the Church to provide milk"; and finally, that it was a means of presenting a uniform and united front to those not yet within the Church's purview: "He also thought that a set Liturgy was of great use in respect of those without, whether erring

Christians or unbelieving men" (C2v-C3, emphasis added).⁹

What is important to emphasize here is not simply that Oley advocates Herbert's advocacy of set forms.¹⁰ Rather, I am eager to establish the discursive positions created by the use of set forms, and ultimately the ways in which those positions can also be said to govern the forms of some of the poems in The Temple. A sincere performance of a given and sufficient form (i.e. a reading of it with appropriate "voyce, gesture, &c,") serves as the basis for a communication between priest and people: this essentially one-way transaction I have discussed in relation to A Priest to the Temple. The same connection between sincerity and spiritual presence and legitimate forms of language, obtains in the poems of The Temple. A familiar example would be "A True Hymne," which Asals sees as a type of set form: the effectiveness of a form of language depends on its being "truly said." Again, these are familiar themes in Herbert criticism: Herbert's sincerity is said to govern and lie beneath the slyly complex forms of his lyrics, and Herbert is said to value sincerity over and above all other values.¹¹ In looking at a number of poems from The Temple, I show that the "singularity" of Herbert's sincerity is not simply an individual trait or possession, but that it serves a centralizing function: its singularity resides not simply or singly within the heart of Herbert, but is also produced by his correspondence with the legitimate forms and the

enabling institutions of the state-ecclesiastical. And again, it is a matter of seeing the speaker of Herbert's poems as an individual but not any individual: his "singular sincerity" becomes a model for other individuals by virtue of its capacity for incorporation by the forms of the Church; in his poems, we find the exclusion of threats to the peace, stability, and necessity of those forms mediated and even mandated by the forms of the poems. The forms of the poems and the shape of the individual experience that they represent can be shown to correspond to officially formulated ideology. Herbert's sincerity is singular in the sense that it takes on the form provided for sincere religious expression. I focus first on a poem, "Obedience," in which this correspondence is apparently absent but nonetheless effective in the discursive and emotional transaction offered in the poem, and then on "The Familie," in which the government and organization of the individual and his conscience is almost exactly "paralleled" by the government and social structure of the state, the established church, and its set forms.

"Obedience" as a Set Form

The crucial formal aspect of the set forms of the established Church is their fixed nature, which is grounded in the historical continuity of the Church as an institution. Oley's preface goes on to suggest that Herbert's devotion to and defense of the set forms of the Church--he is said to have called for them on his death bed "saying None to them, None to them"--were of such strength and quality that they also enabled him to create in The Temple forms that endured when those of the established church lay in disuse and its buildings in ruins. Praising Herbert's dedication to the rebuilding of "the ruined Church at Leighton," Oley concludes:

So that the Church of England owes him (besides what good may come by this Book towards the repair of us Church-men in point of morals) the reparation of a Church-materiall, and erection of that costly piece (of Mosaick or Solomonick work) The Temple; which flourishes and stands inviolate, when our other Magnificences are desolate, and despoiled.¹²

Like A Priest to the Temple, which Herbert is said to have constructed like "a Master-builder," Herbert's writing is here said to be "living" (it "flourishes") within the Church, and part of and in keeping with its most durable identity (it "stands inviolate" in a time of the destruction of its pride and prized "Magnificences"). The poems are both animated, capable of moving a reader to response, and solid

and fixed insofar as that response will be in keeping with the forms of the Church.

"Obedience" is a poem constructed to achieve such durability, a form devised to enable others to renew its life by discovering in its contractual arrangement a "parallel" of their own most ardent and intimate spiritual desires. The question to which I will now turn centers on the means by which the drafting of the "speciall Deed" (l. 10) of the speaker--inscribed upon a "poore paper" with the hearts-blood of sincerity and sacrifice (recall Oley's reference to The Temple as a "costly piece"), affirmed with riders and waivers and exclusions of any "reservation"--is transformed to the point where it may be offered to one who "may set his hand/And heart unto this deed" (ll. 37-38, emphasis added). How is it that the "singularity" of the achieved form of "Obedience," a private transaction between the speaker and his God specified in writing, creates a position to be assumed by one not party to the original agreement? How can we interpret this process as Protestant? Does it not attempt to insert a prior and external form between an individual and his relationship with God? Barbara Lewalski has written of the "individual-typical" speaker of The Temple, but it is my contention that the connections between individuality and typicality are more complex and social than her account of Herbert's Protestant poetics allows.¹³ I would like to suggest, therefore, that

the relationships implied in the transcriptive process by means of which the priest enlivens and "imprints" the set forms of the Church, first in his own and then in the hearts of his hearers, also governs the relationship between Herbert and the readers of this poem. This is still a Protestant process--a Catholic version of the efficacy of instituted forms would not place so much emphasis on the state of the priest--but it is also a highly mediated one. Authenticity and individuality are the objectives, but they are not easily or simply to be opposed to the formal and the social.

Before looking closely at the poem, it will be helpful to understand a little of what was at issue and at stake in the debate over set forms. At the broadest level, as Horton Davies has written, "The two notions of prayer, liturgical and spontaneous, reflect two different concepts of the church and its relation to the state" (198). In the former, unity and uniformity under the spiritual and political headship of the king and his appointed officers are stressed; state citizenship and church membership are co-extensive and automatic, as in Hooker's famous formula. In the latter view, "gathered" churches regarded the church as the voluntary congregation of believers, come together under elected ministers, which had no need for the "stinted forms" of the Book of Common Prayer.¹⁴ For supporters of the liturgical and ceremonial order of the Church, the danger of

spontaneous prayer was that it could not be determined whether the prayer was reasonable and legitimate; prayer would be left to the "singular" fancies of private persons, not based on the solid foundations of custom, learning, and public determinations. On the opposite side it was said that "The Prayer Book condoned a bare reading ministry . . . By its length alone the liturgy left neither time nor inclination for preaching . . ." (Collinson Elizabethan Puritan Movement 251). The imposition of set forms, Milton was to write, "upon Ministers lawfully call'd, and sufficiently tri'd¹⁵ . . . is a supercilious tyranny improprating the Spirit of God"; set forms are a "presumption" that certain men have used to "arrogate to themselves that which God universally gives to all his Ministers" (Complete Prose I, 682).

A more particular sense of the debate surrounding set forms can be had by looking at an exchange between three (somewhat extreme) parties to it in the late 1620's. In 1627, John Cosin, future Bishop of Durham, published A Collection of Private Devotions, or the Hours of Prayer. This was a substantial anthology of forms of devotion drawn from a variety of sources, arranged according to the Church calender, and "Applicable not only to public prayer, but also to private." The collection brought angry and alarmed responses from Henry Burton and William Prynne, who saw in it the encroaching popery that was to become the theme of

the growing opposition to the hierarchy of the Church in the following decade.¹⁶ As was typical of the Church debates of the early seventeenth-century, Cosin, Burton, and Prynne traded accusations of "innovation" and "novelty," each side claiming that the other was committing usurpations of authority and violations of the true nature of the English Church and its devotional practices. The issue, in short, centered on where and how to locate sincere, efficacious, and authentic religious devotion: in forms that have been tested by time and, as Cosin emphasizes, established by "high and Sacred Authority," or in the (ostensibly) unmediated effusions of a sincere heart?¹⁷

At the heart of the matter was disagreement over what was necessary, sufficient, and acceptable in the forms of private and public prayer and devotion. This disagreement centered on different emphases placed on the biblical text preceding the prototypical--and for some, the only allowable--set form: the Lord's prayer in Matthew 6:9ff. Cosin's preface cites Matthew 6:6,9, "Christ's set form for private prayer." Eliding verses 7 and 8, he jumps from Christ's injunction to avoid hypocritical public prayers and to pray in secret to Christ's provision of particular words to use: "Pray then like this." Cosin uses this selective reading of the Scripture to authorize and legitimize set forms:

By which passages those prayers which are chiefly allowed and recommended unto us (for all sudden and godly ejaculations are not to be condemned) which with

good advice and meditation are framed beforehand by them that best know what belongs thereunto.

Cosin derives the authority of the Church's set forms from Christ's institution of an order of words for private prayer; Cosin and other official representatives of the Church are equated with Christ as "them that best know" what is appropriate for the verbal form of a prayer. This is an implicit argument for the Apostolic Succession of the bishops of the Church of England. Milton, in his response to the Remonstrant's (i.e. Joseph Hall's) attempt to employ this same connection between the Lord's prayer and set forms, curtly cancels this equation and the implication that bishops are the direct spiritual heirs of Christ's government:

Remon. And if the Lords Praier be an ordinary, and stinted form, why not others?

Ans. Because there be no other Lords that can stint with like authority.

(683)

Milton denies that Christ's authority is transmitted historically through the hierarchy, but for Cosin, the form of Christ's prayer informs and underwrites subsequent forms modeled on it, having served in "all ages of the Church

as the chief and fundamental part of them [prayers], the Ground whereupon she builds, the pattern whereby she frames, and the Complement wherewith she perfects all the rest of her heavenly Devotions, framing them all as this is framed, though not with any superfluity of words.¹⁸

In publishing his volume, Cosin maintains, he is only re-issuing forms that have "heretofore been publish'd amongst us by high and Sacred Authority," which he has "renewed, and more fully set forth again . . ." His primary reason for doing so is to ensure that individuals both know what to say and have the means to avoid "a superfluity of words" by maintaining commitment to the Spirit-guided continuity of legitimate forms of prayer governed by the Church. Foremost among the four purposes he gives for issuing the volume is

to continue and preserve the authority of the ancient Laws and old godly Canons of the Church, which were made and set forth for this purpose, that men, before they set themselves to pray, might know what to say, and avoid, as neare as might be, all extemporal effusions of irksome and indigested Prayers, that they use to make, that herein are subject to no good order or form of words, but pray both what, and how, and when they list.

This requirement that individual expression be guided and checked by tradition and order extends even to ordained priests, and has not only the weight of history but the force of law behind it. Thus of priests, Cosin says "it is not lawful for them to pray of their own heads, or suddenly say what they please themselves." This is a fortiori true for those liable to utter prayers "formed by Private Spirits and Christs of our own."

Extreme and eventually even more moderate Puritans had a ready answer for this sort of reasoning involving the appeal to history, and the necessity of uniform and public

set prayers. The anonymous author of The Anatomie of the Service Book maintained that "Antiquity without truth is no better than a custome of errour." This pamphlet also ties the use of the liturgy to the domination of the church hierarchy: "The Hierarchie and the Service Book are resembled already to mother and child, so they may be two twins, begotten and born of Pride and Superstition, nursed and brought up in the ways of covetousness."

Henry Burton's A tryall of private devotions, or a diall for the Hours of prayer charges that Cosin's book is an attempt to restore papistical domination over the life of the individual in the Church, an attempt to reinstitute seven canonical hours of prayer when the Church recognized only Morning and Evening Song. For Burton, these are the only necessary and allowable forms; the rest of the time is to be occupied with "breathing out some Ejaculations out of a sense and feeling of our manifold infirmities and necessities" (D2). Each individual is thus said to be best able to frame his own prayers; religious expression is intensely immediate and individual, a matter of one's own breath, "sense and feeling." The repeating of others' words would only make one's religion less "lively." Burton places one of the verses elided by Cosin on his title page: "Matthew 6:7: When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen or hypocrites do; for they think they shall be heard for their much Battologie."¹⁹ In this pamphlet, Burton makes it clear

that by "vain repetitions" he means the over-embellished and ineffectual, because merely and so inauthentically reproduced, forms of devotion that he associates with courtly religion of tradition and custom, crypto-Catholicism. He conveys this through the use of a dialogue between Charis, representing the country, and Curia, representing the court, and their respective chaplains, Johannes and Diotrephus. Charis and Johannes attempt to demonstrate for the credulous Curia the papistical and superstitious danger that Cosin's volume, by which Curia is much taken, represents. In the dialogue, we are taught to "see such an infinite odds of Court-wit to country simplicitie" (B2), and are led to consider the differences between "Devotion blind and superstitious . . . and a Devotion illuminate, and truly Religious . . . inspired and inflamed by Fire from Heaven" (C).

The chief objection to Cosin's volume--and in the next decades, to the legal imposition of set forms in general--was that it overrode the maturity and liberty of the individual believer. (Recall that one of Oley's reasons for Herbert's devotion to a set liturgy was that "The Lambes poor of the Flock are forty, for one grounded Christian.") Charis's appeal to Curia is "suffer not either your Court nor your Christian libertie to be imposed upon": "We are not so childish, after so long a bringing up under the Word, to accept such Baby-devotion worthy of our least emulation, much less of Apish imitation" (B3v).

William Prynne's response to Cosin's collection, A Brief survey and Censure of Mr Cosins His Couzening Devotions, was much the same as Burton's. He found it "scanadalous and prejudicial to our Church," and asked "who can think that he either prayes, or preacheth, from the very abundance of his heart, and the fervencies and strength of his affections; who prayes, or speakes, but onlie from his coppie, and that perchance from some others, not his owne." A similar argument was to be used by Milton in The Reason of Church Government in 1642:

. . .The Gospell, as stands with her dignity most, lectures to us from her own authentic handwriting, not copies out from the borrow'd manuscript of a subservient scrawl, by way of imitating.

(764)

Like the author of An Anatomie of the Service Book, Milton sees in the repetition of set forms--and for Milton, this includes the whole of the "prelatical" church government--"the cause of setting up a superior degree in the Church;" it limits access to legitimate forms to a few Priests, access intended for all Ministers (767). The whole of the episcopal structure is for Milton based on "vain repetitions": "This very word of patterning or imitating excludes Episcopacy from the solid and grave ethical law, and betraies it to be a meere child of ceremony . . ." (765).

These arguments against set forms and the hierarchical government which they require are labeled by Oley as a

"Sophism used to make people hate them;" these same arguments, however, in Herbert's "Knowing" refutation of them, became "a solid reason to make men of understanding love them" (C2-C2v). The insubstantiality of the objections to a set form of liturgy becomes the best argument for maintaining them. The basic assumptions underlying the two positions seem to be such that they are mutually exclusive. Following the debate, this is in fact what emerges: each side excludes the other: "patterning and imitating" are necessary for validity and authenticity; "patterning and imitating" invalidate and inauthenticate a form of worship, devotion, or church government. Forms therefore become forms of exclusion, and forms which make exclusive claims to represent the truth.²⁰

"Obedience" can be seen as an attempt to resolve this dilemma by creating a form which is authentically immediate and formally governed so as to provide a model for mediating its authentic experience for another.²¹ It tries to produce a form which is sincere, necessary, and exclusive, ready-made for reproducing its spiritual experience in the heart of another by a kind of transcription. The poem presents a very peculiar image of writing, one that is modeled on a type of form--the contract--but enacted in a way that would seem to preclude correspondence with any prior form: the poem claims to be produced by the heart's bleeding on a "poore paper." The specific form of the contract is said to

be determined by the will of the parties involved:

My God, if writings may
 Convey a Lordship anyway
 Whither the buyer and the seller please;
 Let it not thee displease
 If this poore paper do as much as they.

(1-5)

The poem implicitly raises the problem of its own efficaciousness: worldly writings can represent the wishes of the parties to them "anyway;" can a humble individual desiring to produce a document that both earns God's approval and represents the "Whither" of the speaker's wishes "do as much as they"?

Conditions for divine ratification appear to be that the "writing" be sincere and sacrificial, and that it be both sincerely willed and simultaneously sacrifice the will. In the second stanza, the speaker specifies the transformation of the "poore paper" into an effectual and valid form:

On it my heart does bleed
 As many lines as there doth need
 To passe itself and all it hath to thee.
 To which I do agree,
 And here present it as my speciall Deed.

(6-10)

The resulting poem establishes an intimate and, it would seem, unique relationship between the speaker and this "speciall Deed." The poem's form originates in the heart, emanates from the heart in painful sacrifice, and establishes itself in the self-effacing "lines" of the poem as a

permanent form.

We might suggest that the cause of the heart's bleeding in the first place is God's writing upon it. The early poems of The Temple repeatedly invite this divine inscription.²² "The Altar" erects the heart as a form fit for God's writing on it, free of any scriptive will of the speaker: "Whose parts are as thy hand did frame,/ No workman's tool did touch the same" (3-4). The poem disavows not only the self, but also any technological mediations shaping the self, in order to present itself as "A heart alone/ . . .As nothing but / Thy pow'r doth cut" (5, 7-8).²³ In "The Sinner," the speaker finds within himself only incoherence, dissipation, and lassitude, "shreds of holiness" that "dare not venture / To shew their face" (6-7). The poem concludes with an appeal to God to write on him internally so as to enable him to express legitimately holy feelings externally: "And though my hard heart scarce to thee can grone,/ Remember that thou once didst write in stone" (13-14). The speaker of "Good Friday" encounters the problem of how to "measure out" and "Number" the sufferings of Christ in verse ("lines"), and decides that the appropriate medium is the heart, "Since blood is fittest": "My heart hath store, write there, where in, /One box doth lie both ink and sinne" (23-24). "Nature" similarly asks that God "smooth my rugged heart, and there / Engrave thy reverend Law and fear" (13-14).

But it is not sufficient that the heart be engraved; it

must be a heart of flesh and not a heart of stone; the former signifies a heart truly receptive to God's imprint, and thus able to reproduce it in the "ink" of blood; the latter a heart in which the knowledge of God is merely present but not effectually so in a "lively" faith.²⁴

Implicit in Herbert's poem is the notion that the "lines" produced by the bleeding heart correspond to those written by God in the heart. In this movement of "externalizing the internal," the poem produces itself not only as authentic but also as necessary: "As many lines as there doth need."

Richard Strier has written that the poem is "clearly meant to be performative here" as the speaker agrees to the terms he has stipulated in line 9 and 10 (92); but there is also something of a performative contradiction. Claiming to represent the authentic writing of the heart on the "poore paper," the poem can only "present" the formalization of that process in "lines." In order to be a form that can be offered to another, the sum and substance of the "self and all it hath" must be excluded, and cannot be detailed. It is a form for a total individual commitment to God, but not an account or representation of that commitment.²⁵ To produce a form for inward commitment, a space in the discourse of the poem must in a sense be emptied out in order for it to be fulfilled.

The poem proceeds to stipulate clauses of exclusion, to remove the possibility of any formal claim to amend or

challenge its total abandonment of rights and property to
God:

If that hereafter Pleasure
Cavill, and claim her part and measure,
As if this passed with a reservation,
Or some such words in fashion;
I here exclude the wrangler from thy treasure.

(11-15)

Aspects of the self, abstracted and labeled "Pleasure," are thus denied legitimacy; they are "wranglers," who threaten to disrupt an established formal contract with "cavilling" counterclaims. (This exclusion is not to be mistaken for the dismissal of all pleasures; the next poem, "Conscience," chides as also disruptive a "pratler" who "lowres" at any "fair look," "sweet dish," or "Musick."²⁶) The movement of the poem is toward the establishment of a single center of control in the self, a single will and sincerity, in which the making of contracts "anyway" the desires of the parties wish is replaced with the sole and all-engrossing will of God. The written and willing sacrifice of the self and its initiatives, which I suggested above is underwritten by the writing of God in the heart, is itself disowned and abandoned as an action of the self to be replaced totally by the will of God:

O let thy sacred will
All thy delight in me fulfill!
Let me not think an action mine own way
But as thy love shall sway,
Resigning up the rudder to thy skill.

(16-20)

At the heart of the poem is an individual's rewrite of the Lord's prayer and its resignation to the will of God: "Thy will be done." The poem's thought generates the disavowal of self-originating thought; Herbert's skill in "writings," evident especially in his dismissal of it, is devoted to the production of a form "Resigning" skill. In theological terms, this is explicable as a paradox resolved by referring to the presence of God in all things and in all wills.²⁷ The speaker of the poem himself, after all this struggle to forge a document out of his most precious, sincere, and intimate emotions, finds it all for nought: Christ's sacrifice--his "death and blood"--are "no faint proffer, / Or superficial offer / Of what we might not take, or be withstood." The speaker's attempt to fetch his dedication to God from the deepest part of himself, and to make this dedication legible in his own blood are shown to be but "faint" and "superficial" in relation to Christ's sacrifice, which prefigures, outdoes, and determines everything the speaker can do or write. In the face of this ineluctable logic, the speaker can only retire: "Wherefore I all forgo." The poem is transformed from a deed of "gift or donation," guaranteed by the speaker's signature in blood, into a Bill of Sale, the documentation of an offer too good and too powerful to refuse. From its halting beginning with its questioning of its own status as a legitimate form, the poem

becomes a testimony to its own necessity because it recognizes its superfluity.

But this very gesture also authorizes, deepens, and makes permanent what otherwise could be refused or withstood as merely the speaker's "speciall Deed" and not a necessary form. As elsewhere in Herbert's writing, the disclaimer is an essential part of the poem's claim to legitimate form. But the problem still remains: why produce a form for a process in which the only necessary and legitimate forms already exist? Or, rather, that exist in a form that cannot be imitated or duplicated, Christ's sacrifice?²⁸ The poem is willed into existence in struggle, sincerity, and sacrifice; the form of the poem produces a logic by which that will is canceled and supplanted by a superior and anterior will; the form itself remains, despite its apparent superfluity.

"Obedience" both makes use of and in effect neutralizes the "singular sincerity" of an--not 'the'--individual. In the process, the "speciall Deed" is transformed into "this Deed," and its 'I' made available for another to occupy. The poem in a sense becomes something separate from its origin in the speaker's heart, cleared of the disruptively singular forces of "Pleasure," and is both an expression of and an invitation to submission to God's "sacred will" filling and ruling all. It can now be offered to another, insofar as it is no longer the speaker, his singularity, or least of all, his thought or skill (ll. 18-20), that are

responsible for its efficaciousness as a form:²⁹

He that will passe his land,
 As I have mine, may set his hand
 And heart unto this Deed, when he hath read;
 And make the purchase spread
 To both our goods, if he to it will stand.

How happie were my part,
 If some kinde man would thrust his heart
 Into these lines; till in heav'ns Court of Rolls
 They were by winged souls
 Entered for both, farre above desert!

(36-45)

The final stanza revives the will of the speaker to be a text, to be a set form that in its specific shape, in "these lines," will allow someone else--someone who owns "land," someone who reads poems, we might notice of Herbert's projected reader and his class position--to experience the resignation of himself to God. The reader's role is active, but it is active only in re-enacting a prior text, and so passive in the production of meaning or substance, which he merely reads and wholeheartedly accepts. In this, the reader plays the part of the people responding to the performance of the priest.

"The Familie" and the Imposition of
Peace and Order

"The itch of disputing is the scab of
the Church." Jaculaa Prudentum 1137

"Obedience," insofar as it ostensibly mediates only the relationship between the speaker, God, and "some kind man," would seem to be a rather "faint offer" and not an instance of the deprivation of Christian liberty feared by dissenters from the use of set forms. Milton, for instance, in response to the Joseph Hall's remonstrance "What a poore exception is this, that Liturgies were composed by some particular men?", allows, "Well may men of eminent guifts set forth as many forms, and helps to praier as they please," and objected merely to their being imposed on ministers of the Gospel. But in its subtle way, the poem does represent its lines as only those and those only that "there doth need" to perform a legitimate act of self-sacrificial devotion; and while the reader may not be one who, in Milton's villifying phrase, "cannot be trusted to pray in his own words without being chew'd to and fescu'd to a formal injunction of his rote lesson," he is presented with a complete and sufficient form which he has but to read and affirm.

I want to use Oley's account of Herbert's "conscientious Devotion" to and "Knowing" defense of set liturgy to frame another aspect of the function of poetic form in The

Temple: the position allotted to "those without" the bounds of the Church and the status accorded to their reasons for remaining outside them.³⁰ The issue is complicated by the fact that, due to the coextensive nature of the English church and state, those without are still within; their condition is therefore a matter of double concern, insofar as it represents a threat to the uniformity of the state-ecclesiastical.³¹ In Oley's preface, Herbert is said to have held that set forms are most useful in those instances when "our best arguments" fail to win "erring Christians or unbelieving men" from their errors and unbelief. The sincere use of set forms enables proponents of the established Church to "to shew them a Form wherein we did, and desired they would serve Almighty God with us: That we might be able to say, This is our Church, Here we would land you" (C3v).

"Those without," then, are by implication formless and groundless in their resistance to the "best arguments" of the established church; the sincere performance of a set form would be sufficient to "Shew" them the truth of what argument could not persuade them to accept. The substance of their reasons for remaining "without" is not taken into consideration, and so dissent or conflict is denied any substantial basis in reality.

The sincere performance of a set form in its small way functions similarly to larger unity-affirming cultural rituals, for example to spectacles, as defined here by Guy

Debord: "Spectacle is the existing order's uninterrupted discourse about itself. It is the diplomatic representation of hierarchic society to itself, where all other expression is banned" (cited by Mullaney 38). I want to examine "The Familie" in relation to this "uninterrupted discourse" as it appears in two forms. First, though they would appear to unspectacular, royal proclamations for the peace and order of the Church, such as those issued concerning the Hampton Court Conference. The conference itself was regarded by some as something of a performance; it was described by Henry Jacob, one not pleased with its outcome, as follows: "the whole managing of it was underhand plotted and procured by the prelates themselves;" and by another as a "show of dispute," the participants merely players in a performance enacted to enable the more effective enforcement of conformity. I will also compare the form of "The Familie" to that of the court masque, like the royal proclamations and Herbert's lyric, the masque typically asserts the primary reality of unity in peace and order, frequently in greater elaboration and extravagance as dissent intensified and the distance between the ruler and the ruled grew. All of these forms of expression work in similar ways, at different levels certainly, but to the same effect or end: to organize potentially conflicting elements, of the culture and of the self simultaneously, under the rule of a single, divinely sanctioned and hierarchically communicated and enforced

order; and to rule out agents of dissent or "disquiet" as disorderly, illegitimate, insubstantial, and ultimately non-existent disturbers of the peace.

The royal proclamations and the court masque are explicit formulations of the official ideology of the state and the state-ecclesiastical. They are forms which represent the king's command of the realm into order and obedience, and they anticipate that the fulfillment of the monarch's proclamation will be accomplished by the "meere Motion" and pure presence of the king. Though this is true of the masque in a particular way, both forms represent an intense idealization of governance, an imagination of rule accomplished at once and by fiat: all commotion is expected to cease, all resistance to give way to compliance, all contrary elements either to conform or depart. The amount of idealization conveyed by these forms seems to have increased in proportion to the levels of real and potential conflict perceived by the rulers. Christopher Hill has written of the thematic consistency of the masques:

The theme of court masques was basically the same: social harmony, idealization of a united nation under a strong monarch. All problems were solved at the end by the King descending from the clouds like a God. Such a heavy insistence on harmony betrays fear of the discord, anarchy lurking to seize the moment when the central power loses control.

("The Pre-Revolutionary Decades," 8)

The masques represented the rarefied extension of the king's

presence, power, magnificence, and abundance; they were "festal embodiments" of a conception of monarchical rule in which the monarch himself was the representative and exemplar of a whole nation (Orgel 42-43). In this context acknowledgement of divergence from unity or even diversity within the realm was impossible, for it would also imply a self-divided ruler. In the masques, government is an effortless extension of self-government; peace and order are imposed on the wild and the unruly places in the realm by imaginative extension from the self-discipline of the king, accomplished by the loving service of the king's allegorized servants, the players representing Harmony or Order or some other platonized abstraction.

Stuart proclamations for the peace and order of the Church also idealized political rule and discipline, by representing peace and order as the expressions of the effective will of the Supreme Head of the Church in concert with his intimate advisors. James' "Proclamation concerning such as seditiously seek reformation in church matters" advertises the monarch's resolve to undertake at Hampton Court a "serious examination of the state of this church, to redeem it from such scandals, as both by the one side and the other were laid upon it." James' proclamation warns and reminds the authors and supporters of the Millenary Petition (who had assured James that they were neither "factious men affecting a popular parity in the Church," nor "schismatics

aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical," but merely loyal subjects whose consciences stuck at some of the ceremonies and practices of the Church) to respect the lawful force of his sincere religious rule:

But this our godly purpose we find hath been misconstrued by some men's spirits, whose heat tendeth rather to combustion than to reformation, as appeareth by the course they have taken: some using public invectives against the state ecclesiastical here established, some contemning their authority and the processes of their courts, some gathering subscriptions of multitudes of vulgar persons to supplications to be exhibited to us [i.e. Millenary Petition, so called because of its "multitude" of signatures], to crave that reformation, which if there be cause to make, is more in our heart than in theirs (emphasis added).

The monarch represents the nation by God's institution; therefore, the sincere resolutions of his heart embodying that institution are held to be decisive. Contrary inclinations, it becomes "apparent to all men," "are unlawful, and do savor of tumult, sedition, and violence . . . and cannot but be the occasions of dissentious partialities, and perhaps of greater inconveniences among our people." The cause thus becomes matter for the "princely care," and the king and his appointed bishops and clergy are given exclusive claim to deliberate on what is and what is not "agreeable to the word of God and the form of the primitive church" in the established church. Individual subjects are not to trouble themselves or the public peace: ". . . our pleasure is, that all our subjects do repose themselves, and

leave to our conscience that which to us only appertaineth, avoiding all unlawful and factious manner of proceeding." Failure to comply in this complete conferral of the right to deliberate on matters of religion to the king's conscience becomes prima facie evidence of "a more unquiet spirit than becometh any private person to have toward public authority," and will draw "chastisement" and "peril" on any who "will answer to the contrary" (Cardwell 148-150).

Though its nature and its effects are disputed among historians, the ensuing conference at Hampton Court seems to have been a discussion staged for the purpose of removing the need for further discussion; pressure for further discussion could thereafter be called "dispute" and condemned as unnecessary and disruptive of unity and peace. The representatives for the Puritan party were royal appointees and, according to Henry Jacob, the concerns expressed in the Millenary Petition were "but nakedly propounded, and some not at all touched." Jacob complained,

Most of the persons appointed to speak for the ministers were not of their choosing, nor nomination, nor of their judgment in the matters then and now in question, but of a clean contrary.

Humphrey Fen claimed that the speakers were "purposely chosen" because they "never took the question of ceremonies to heart." David Calderwood concluded that the conference was as a result a sham of sincerity, a production of the king's which gave the opposition no real hearing: "What

sincerity was there meant when for the sincere party were nominated two that were very corrupt. Apparently, they were nominated only to be spies, and to prevaricate" (Collinson, Elizabethan, 462-463).

Though he was not averse in principle to some of the main objections of the Puritan party, James was later to boast of his handling of the Puritans at the conference--though it seems that they were chosen specifically because of their adaptability and the likelihood of their being awed by the royal countenance and theological agility--and revealed in private correspondence that he went in to the conference resolved to make no major changes, but to maintain the Church in the conservative course established by Elizabeth: "For I would be sorry not to be as constant indeed as she was, who called herself Semper eadem" (Cardwell 160). In the course of discussing one of the points on the Puritan agenda, "That the church government might be sincerely ministered, according to God's word," which Joshua Reynolds assured the king meant no more than minor modifications of the existing institution, the use of the word "presbytery" provoked James' ire and his well-known dismissal of the Puritan appeal: "If this be all . . . that they have to say, I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of this land, or else do worse."³²

This threat was followed up by "A proclamation enjoining conformity to form of the service of God established" on

16 July 1604. The proclamation bases itself in the "care" and "pains" taken by James "to settle the affairs of this Church of England in a uniformity," announces the "issue" of the conferences, warns all subjects against "further trouble or speech of matters whereof so solemn and advised determination had been made," and makes "general" conformity the law of the land.

At Hampton Court, the proclamation says, "no well-grounded matter appeared. . . why the state of the church here by law established should in any material point be altered." Having thus determined, no "reasonable" individual has cause for dissatisfaction or dissent; there exists "no apparent or grounded reason" for remaining "without" the Church: "all in general" should therefore

conform themselves thereunto without listening to the troublesome spirits of some persons who never receive contentment . . .but in their own fantasies, especially of certain ministers who, under pretended zeal of reformation, are the chief authors of divisions and sects among our people . . . such things . . .so weakly grounded as [to] deserve not admittance. (Emphasis added)

James expresses confidence that his subjects will abandon the "shadows and semblances of zeal" to "join in one end . . . a uniformity of our endeavors," but if "intractable men" remain so after a grace period,

. . .we shall not fail to do that which princely providence requireth at our hands, that is, to put into execution all ways and means that make take from among our people all grounds and occasions of sects, divisions, and unquietness . . . (Emphasis added)

In order that "this our admonition may have equal force in all men's hearts to work a universal conformity," the proclamation enjoins all "ecclesiastical persons" to use "conferences, arguments, persuasions, and . . . all other ways of love and gentleness, to reclaim all that be in the ministry to the obedience of our church laws . . . to the end if it be possible that uniformity . . . may be wrought by clemency, and by weight of reason, and not by force of law" (Kenyon 135-137). This was in turn followed by the issuing of the Canons of 1604, and the imposition of subscription to the Articles of the Church and its ceremonies on all clergy.

Charles' "Proclamation for the establishing of the peace and quiet of the Church of England," issued 16 June 1626, follows the form and tone his father's edicts in coming out against "troublesome" and "unquiet" subjects and in support of the church "established" in England. But unlike his father, who is reported to have enjoyed theological disputation even as sincerely as he forbade it, Charles and his eventual archbishop Laud believed strongly that "popular and public controversy over articles of faith was positively unseemly" and "intellectually fruitless" (Reeve 64). His documents therefore descend to the smallest particulars, seeing the king's role as the "Supreme Governor" of the church by God's investiture as the prevention of

small disputes before they become large ones: "in all ages disturbances both in the Church and State have ensued out of small beginnings when the seeds of contention were not timely prevented." Like James, Charles uses the "integrity" and sincerity of his own heart as a basis for mandating peace and order in the state-ecclesiastical, to which his subjects are absolutely enjoined to conform:

His Majesty, therefore, in the integrity of his own heart and singular providence of the peaceable government of that people which God hath committed to his charge, hath thought fit, by the advice of his reverend bishops, to declare and publish . . . his utter dislike to all those who . . . do or shall adventure to stir or move any new opinions not only contrary [to] but differing from the sound and orthodox grounds of the true religion sincerely professed and happily established in the Church of England . . .

The proclamation forbids the "least innovation," and threatens any who "shall dare either in Church or State to disturb or disquiet the peace thereof." It prohibits "writing, preaching, printing, conferences," if they "raise any doubts, or publish or maintain any new inventions or opinions concerning religion other than what has been established in the Church of England. Like James' proclamations, Charles' also calls on all officers of the church and state to "observe and execute his Majesty's royal and pious will herein expressed," and declares that refusal to heed this will be regarded as evidence of "unquiet and restless spirits" such as threaten to "willfully break that circle of order, which without apparent danger to the Church and state

may not be broken;" for these he promises "exemplary punishment" (Kenyon 154-155). A declaration accompanying a subsequent edition of the Articles maintains Charles' commitment to "the unity of true religion" and "the bond of peace" with a resolve not "to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth." The declaration reinforces the laws requiring clergy to subscribe to the Articles, and commands "all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof . . . prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles." Charles reserves the right to limit deliberation on the meaning of the Articles to the clergy under his "broad seal" of approval, and will not allow departure in "the least degree" from the "true, usual literal meaning of the said Articles" as acknowledged by "all clergymen within our realm" (Gee and Hardy 519-520 emphasis added). Institutional continuity and consensus are the principles by which religious discourse is governed.

The masques and the royal proclamations I have been discussing represent government of the realm by the monarch as the expression of a single, self-contained, and self-validating center, around which all the elements under its rule are to take their appointed and ordained places. In the Stuart kings' proclamations on the church, conflict and dispute are resolved within the heart of the king, from

which issues orders for the ordering of the church and the kings' subjects. These conflicts, it could be said, however, were similarly staged. In the masques, opposition to the king is represented in the subhuman antimasquers who dance to cacaphonous music, or as rebellious passions which need to be tamed and governed. At Hampton Court, the representatives of the Puritan party were regarded by some as not representatives at all, but stage players whose role was carefully scripted, so that the Puritan complaints got no "sincere" hearing; subsequently, their views are treated as the outward racket of an unquiet spirit. After the performance, of the masque at Court or the conference in the Privy Chamber, dissent and dispute are no more. In a masque they vanish: ". . . the whole face of the Scene altered; scarce suffring the memory of any such thing" (Jonson 301). In proclamations, they are reduced to mere "shadows and semblances" of genuine religious feeling, pretenses to "zeal." The proclamations aim first at persuasion, but they also command the king's ecclesiastical and civil officers to see that the royal will is performed and that "all in general" conform to it.

Herbert's poems too strive to establish a single center around which the rebellious or dissenting aspects of the individual represented by a poem's speaker will organize themselves in silent obedience and responsiveness to command. Throughout The Temple, in fact, Herbert's speakers

battle the proliferation of impulses and forms of discourse. "Content" is a poem devoted to the stilling of "mutt'ring thoughts," which are instructed to "Gad not abroad" but to remain "Within the walls of your own breast" : "Then cease discoursing soul, till thine own ground . . ." (1-5, 33). "Jordan II" also represents proliferation, this time of figurative "wit" as "wide pretence" rather than the one, central thing needful.

In several poems, though, the establishment of a single center of control of self-government seems more clearly related to the representation of government, divinely ordained and ordered, in the realm. In "The Temper II," the representation of a self ruled by the constant presence of God includes a place from which God may govern that looks very much like the space created for the king to observe a masque:

O fix thy chair of grace, that all my powers
 May also fix their reverence:
 For when thou dost depart from hence
 They grow unruly, and sit in thy bowers.

(9-12)

The place allotted to God in the heart organizes the otherwise unruly and even rebellious aspects of the speaker which would usurp and indecorously occupy the scenery of the well-tended self; the presence and perspective of God fixes and makes coherent the self by governing it from a stable center. For comparison, here is Steven Orgel's description

of the place fixed for a king at a Court masque employing the techniques of perspective, developed after 1605:³³

In the theater employing perspective, there is only one focal point, one perfect place in the hall from which the illusion achieves its fullest effect. At court performances, this is where the king sat, and the audience around him at once became a living emblem of the structure of the court.

The placement of the king's chair thus becomes a means for organizing the representation of hierarchy, so that "The central experience of drama at court involved not simply the action of the play, but the interaction between the play and the monarch, and the structured organization of the other spectators around him" (12-14). It thus accomplishes a social organization of "powers" in a structured--i.e., fixed and predetermined--representation; so too in Herbert's lyric the presence of God in a central place of reverence would arrange the individual's "powers" in an analogously hierarchical way. This arrangement is established in the theater before the first line is spoken, and often in the masque itself the establishment of this same arrangement is dramatized, as the king and his family descend to occupy a subdued and ordered realm cleared of unruly elements and so fit for a king. So in the final stanza of Herbert's poem, the "unruly" powers are either dispersed or deployed as God's servants as a condition and effect of God's presence:

Scatter, or bind them all to bend to thee:
 Though elements change, and heaven move,

Let not thy higher Court remove,
But keep a standing Majestie in me.

(13-16)

The correspondence between this formulated ideology and the form of the religious lyrics of Herbert is a matter neither of chance nor of direct influence, but of reference to a "shared code," as Stephen Greenblatt has called it in defining his "cultural poetics," a "set of interlocking tropes or similitudes that function not only as the objects but as the conditions of representation" (Shakespearean Negotiations, 86). Here, it is the representation of monarchical government and self-government that intersect: one is not the model for the other, but instead they are mutually constitutive. The king's self-government (itself, certainly, based upon models of government in general) is the means by which he governs the realm; this government in turn is presented as the rule by which subjects are able to arrange their lives. Unruly and disquiet subjects are governed by unruly passions and a disquiet spirit; unruly passions or "powers" can be governed within by expulsion from the self or by conforming them to the rule of legitimate government.

A more immediately pertinent means of approaching this process can be found in Bakhtin's suggestion that "there is no fundamental dividing line between the content of the individual psyche and formulated ideology."³⁴ Thoughts and

feelings that are repressed by the individual have, by this account, an integral connection to those "censored" by "official ideology." In his description of "behavioral ideology," Bakhtin maintains that an unbroken but vari-directional continuum exists between the "content of the individual psyche and the content of culture," and that thoughts and feelings of "inner speech" that official ideology can easily accommodate and incorporate are therefore more easily expressed: "On these levels of behavioral ideology, inner speech comes easily to order and freely turns to outward speech, or at least has no fear of becoming outward speech." Other thoughts and feelings, however, "bespeak the disintegration of the unity and integrity of the system, the vulnerability of the usual ideological motives," and so cannot be given outward verbal shape but with great difficulty (Freudianism, 87-89). Behavioral ideology is "that atmosphere of unsystematized and unfixed inner and outer speech which endows our every instance of behavior and action and our every 'conscious' state with meaning." Forms of official ideology are "crystalizations" of behavioral ideology which fix and structure expression, and these crystallizations "in turn, exert a powerful influence back upon behavioral ideology, normally setting its tone" (Marxism 91). Again, it is not a matter of one providing the source or the model for the other, but a more or less ceaseless interchange between forms of expression

and kinds of experience. But in order to be formulated, experience must be organized in forms that are inevitably social: "Expression is what gives experience its form and specificity of direction" (85). As a result, "The stronger, the more organized, the more differentiated the collective in which an individual orients himself, the more vivid and complex his inner world will be" (88). Self-consciousness and class consciousness therefore constantly involve one another; self-awareness and awareness of the norms and values of official ideology are part of the same process.

"The Familie" endeavors to make the form of the official ideology of the Stuart state-ecclesiastical the governing principle of the individual heart, or perhaps all individual hearts. Like "Obedience," "The Familie" attempts to create a form that is effectual, exclusive, and in essential ways representative of legitimate form as instituted and informed by God. And, as in "Obedience," "The Familie" uses the heart of the speaker as the locus for the taking shape of that form. But as Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth have noted, the poem has a much more evident "public dimension;" its "studied diction" reveals that its use of the metaphor of "God's house" is meant to apply to "both the individual heart and the visible Church" (6).³⁵ I would like to take this congruence between the heart and the Church in "The Familie" further than do Summers and Pebworth to suggest that it can be made to show not only Herbert's

in the absence or ignorance of government ("As if there were no rule or ears"). They are, as in the masques, unmusical, inharmonious. Rather than being compelling or persuasive, they are merely "loud", "noise" rather than rational speech.

As "complaints," they are such thoughts, perhaps, as prompted James' choleric interruption of Joshua Reynolds in the Privy Chamber at Hampton Court when the latter used the word "presbytery." In William Barlow's account, The sum and substance of the conference, James is presented as a model of passion restrained and legitimacy of monarchial rule asserted against the potential anarchy of competing claims:

At which speech his majesty was somewhat stirred; yet, which is admirable in him, without passion or shew thereof; thinking they aimed at a Scottish presbytery, which, saith he, as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil. Then Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my council, and all my proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus; and then Dick shall reply and say, Nay marry, we will have it thus.

(Cardwell 202)

Allowing the governed to have a say in government would only produce discord, and the names James assigns to those who, if allowed, would interrupt his government and his discourse suggest that he associates this sort of free discussion as the intrusion of the "rude" lower classes into places where they do not belong. James therefore affirms the establishment of himself as the center of deliberation and control: "And therefore, here I must once reiterate my former

speech, Le roy, s'avisera." It is the king's place solely to settle these matters, and Reynolds is enjoined to seven years silence on this point, after which time James says that if he has allowed his self-government to lapse, then he will give the thoughts of presbytery a hearing:

if then you find me pury and fat, and my windpipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you: for let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath, then shall we all of us have work enough, both our hands full. But, doctor Reynolds, till you find that I grow lazy, let that alone.

(202)

The alternative to monarchy, James implies, is the anarchy of an endless contradiction of alternatives presented by those who, unlike "le roy," are in no position--no social position--to consider such weighty matters. The efficient exercise of monarchy depends upon a king who maintains his own bodily fitness, in order to rule intellectually and spiritually, and to ward off the intrusion of rude persons and their disruptive thoughts. According to Barlow, members of the king's noble audience were awed by James' demonstration of intellectual prowess and spiritual acumen; his "singular readiness and exact knowledge" were such that one observer commented that he was "fully perswaded that his majesty spake with the very instinct of the Spirit of God." James thus becomes the very embodiment of the perfect union of the king's two bodies, an unprecedented and absolute

joining of person and office:

My lord chancellor [Cecil] passing out of the privy chamber, said unto the dean of Chester . . . I have often heard and read that "Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote," but I never saw the truth thereof till this day.

(204)

The king in Cecil's (flattering?) characterization becomes the living presence of an institutional ideal, familiar in the discourse of the Church, "often heard and read about" but not witnessed in truth and essence until James rouses himself to still both the passions threatening to disturb his composure and the unity of the church.³⁶ In "The Familie" we can also see an attempt to represent a perfect union of person--persona or "speaker" and individual--and priest. Self-government and priestly government coincide in the knowledge of the "rules" of harmony and the possession of "eares" attuned to their proper performance. As at Hampton Court, the thoughts that so violate the rules and so offend the ears, are not really heard nor allowed to take shape; they are not represented in the poem except as intrusions into and "noise" within the otherwise settled heart. Ultimately they are ruled out by silence and obedience, as Reynolds had been at the conference, or as the Satyres in Jonson's Oberon are told that "Before his presence, you must fall or flie" (353) Summers and Pebworth do an admirable job of historical annotation to suggest what

these thoughts might be, but here I am chiefly interested in their function in the form of the poem as alien intrusions and disturbing noise.

The impulse and direction of the poem are towards the quiet organization of the self--accomplished by the superimposition of the forms of the church and realm-- governed by a single principle. The form of the poem creates boundaries, governs the lines between without and within, banishes any elements that do not belong, and imposes order on what remains. "Those without" are here found within boundaries that would exclude them, and so they are without legitimacy. A sermon preached by Donne on the topic emphasizes the illegitimacy of "sects" to the point of reducing them to nothingness because they are not within the boundaries of the true Church, but are, like Jack and Tom and Will and Dick, not of a single mind but divided and in disagreement with one another:

Sects are not bodies, they are but rotten boughs, gangrened limbs, fragmentary chips, blown off by their own spirit of turbulency, fallen off by the weight of their own pride, or hewn off by the excommunications and censures of the Church. Sects are no bodies, for there is Nihil nostrum, nothing in common amongst them, nothing that goes through them all; all is singular, all is meum and tuum, my spirit and thy spirit, my opinion and thy opinion, my God and thy God, no such apprehension, no such worship of God, as the whole Church hath evermore been acquainted withal, and contented with.³⁷

(Sermons, III 87-88)

Sects lack the bodily wholeness of the Church, and so they

lack integrity and legitimacy, and are merely the excluded and diseased members of the true body. They are, in this condition, "singular" and separate from one another and the true and healthy, because single, body.

They are yet a threat to the health of that body by their continued proximity; they are within but not of the body, and so present the danger of infection. Mary Douglas has described this as one of the basic metaphors for representing threats to the cohesion of "social experience":

Since the social experience emphasizes external boundaries but not internal structure, the inside of the body under threat of attack is thought of as vulnerable but undifferentiated: at the level of social philosophy, this image corresponds to an optimism about the possibility of society remaining undifferentiated: injustice can be rectified merely by purging the system of internal traitors allied with outside enemies.

(Natural Symbols, ix)

In such thinking, the emphasis is always on "valuing the boundaries." Inside is whole and one, outside is the threat of disintegration. The validity or legitimacy of the "internal structure" is not in question: its integrity is said to equal health, and it can only be threatened by the assault or infiltration of alien elements.

In a different but related symbology, this logic of equating "within" with purity and health and "without" with impurity and disease underlies Herbert's "Church-rents and schismes." Here, the beauty and integrity of the dynastic "Brave rose" of the Church of England are violated by a

parasitic "worm, " which has usurped the place of authority (the "chair" of line 1). Whereas the rose is single and of a certain imperial splendour (it "didst lately . . .triumph and shine"), the usurper is multiple, base, and parasitic in a hideously insidious way: it is "A worm . . .whose many feet and hair/ Are the more foul, The more thou wert divine." Herbert is emphatic in assigning the blame for the breakdown of the Church to the intruder, which, having undermined authority and integrity from within, made the rose vulnerable to external attack, exposing the Church to the sacrilege of "rude unhallow'd steps." Herbert's lines are tense with revulsion and indignation:

This, this hath done it, this did bite the root
 And bottom of the leaves: which when the winde
 Did once perceive, it blew them underfoot,
 Where rude unhallow'd steps do crush and grinde
 Their beauteous glories. Only shreds of thee,
 And those all bitten, in thy chair I see.

(5-10)

The center, represented by the "chair" of a centralized authority, cannot hold against this multiple "This": the speaker cannot even name the intruder, but only hiss at it in fear and disgust. The dispersal and disintegration of the Church is accomplished by "debates and fretting jealousies" which "worm and work within" to the detriment of "health and beautie." The usurping worm has been transformed from a noun to a verb; from a thing with multiple parts that can be identified and so perhaps expelled to a diffused condition

of incoherence and decay working "within." This in turn leads to an incendiary situation and the breakdown of order, a condition leaving the order open to invasion from without:

Then did your sev'rall parts unloose and start:
Which when your neighbors saw, like a north-winde,
They rushed in and cast them in the dirt
Where Pagans tread.

(21-24)

George Herbert Palmer suggested that the "north-winde" is an allusion to Scottish Presbyterians, but even without that specific connection the breakdown described by Herbert seems to fulfill the vision of a breakdown of order presaged by James at Hampton Court: the raising of many voices in "debate" leading to the intrusion of the base into the holy places of government, which in turn gives way to a nearly apocalyptic chaos.

"The Familie," which appears a few poems prior to "Church-rents and schismes," looks like an attempt to stave off such a sacriligious breakdown, preventing the rushing in of the unruly and the wild by excluding--familiially disowning--those rebellious elements that would weaken and make vulnerable the structure by refusing to maintain their ordained places within it:

But, Lord, the house and familie are thine,
 Though some of them repine.
Turn out these wranglers, which defile thy seat:
For where thou dwellest, all is neat.

(5-8)

God, like the monarch in a masque, can only descend into a realm that has been cleared, civilized, and made "neat": this is, again, a condition and effect of the Lord's presence. God is not the God of confusion, but of order, Hooker had maintained repeatedly, and it was the task of Stuart preachers and propagandists to make it clear that that meant this order. So Henry King proclaimed the "God of Order" by linking proper order to one maintained through the single will of a monarch: no other form of government is "so near his own, which is the archetype, the first and best pattern of all others, as the monarchial; when a state is governed by a king as sole commander over all. For in this singularity of power, that person who is . . .the lively image of God, will some way represent the unity of his Maker too" (Cited by Sanderson 55). Resistance to this order, of course, is resistance to God.

With the exclusion of the disrupters of the peace--those elements "within" that are intruders or imposters, rather than real family members--peace and order can be imposed. This is accomplished by the action of "Peace," "Silence," and "Order," which function like similar abstractions in the masques to produce harmony and "Obedience." In place of the formless "noise of thoughts" produced by the "wranglers," "all things" are given expression by taking their places within set forms, the imposition of which

renders the self both orderly and passively obedient:

First Peace and Silence all disputes controll,
 Then Order plaies the soul,
 And giving all things their set forms and houres,
 Makes of wilde woods sweet walks and bowres.

Humble Obedience neare the doore doth stand,
 Expecting a command:
 Then whom in waiting nothing seems more slow,
 Nothing more quick than when she doth go.

(9-16)

The self is merely to receive a form of expression here; it is to be the passive object of the application of art and knowledge, or to use Foucauldian terms, discipline and technology. It is to be brought into harmony by an "Order" of knowledge and power which "plaies" it, brings it into tune with the "rules," and so makes its expression acceptable to those who have "eares" to hear. The score in this extended metaphor is of course, the "set forms and hours" of the Church.

The "wilde woods" could be said to represent those areas, in the self and in the state, most resistant to government. In early Stuart England, forest-dwellers, "the people bred amongst woods," were thought to be "naturally more uncivil and stubborn" than subjects raised in arable parts of the land (cited by Lockyer 277).³⁸ As noise is transformed into harmony by application of the rules, so the wilderness is tamed by cultivation and gardening, the latter of which, in his essay "On Gardens," Bacon saw as the ultimate expression of rule, power, and "civility." And in

both cases, it is a matter of subjecting disparate elements to a centralizing form that would render all the parts harmonious components of a single rule and economy. What is not clearly visible--though it is logically implied by the prior exclusion of the noisy "wranglers"--in "The Familie's" representation of the transformation of "wilde woods" to "sweet walkes and bowers" is the process of the removal of under- and overgrowth, the processes of "disafforestation" that was a necessary preparation to the cultivation of the "wilderness." The forests provided a sort of concealment and a "relative freedom" from governmental control for the poor, as well as subsistence in freedom from wage labor in fields that have been formed for husbandry and tillage.³⁹ Disafforestation also rendered "wilde" areas more amenable to social control and the imposition of religious uniformity. Christopher Hill has noted that woodland regions were rife with masterless men, vagabonds, and--and for Hill, the connection is significant--heretics ("From Lollards to Levellers" 91-94).

Conformity to these set forms, imposed from without but penetrating into the heart of the individual, is in "The Familie" presented as a necessary condition for the production of genuine religious expression. The paradoxical part of this expression is that, apart from the set forms and hours, the individual is silenced. Bacon also wrote that the stilling of dispute was necessary to the production of

fruitful religious writing:

The outward peace of the church distilleth into peace of conscience. And it turneth labors of writing and reading controversies into treatises of mortification and devotion.

(52)

But in "The Familie," these more fruitful devotions are governed by Peace and Silence; "all things" else are governed by the set forms of the Church. All dissatisfactions are driven inward where, unlike the "loud complaints and puling fears" which the following stanza describes as "distemper'd," they annoy no one and, because they are more genuine, are more effectual in reaching God.

Joyes oft are there, and griefs as oft as joyes;
 But griefs without a noise:
 Yet speak they louder then distemper'd fears.
 What is so shrill as silent tears?

(17-20)

Allowing one's expression to be entirely governed from without by public forms produces the paradoxical effect of a purely private and immediate expression which is both silent and pierces the ear of God. Thus assured, of course, one has no cause to trouble the peace, to infect the social body with "distemperd fears." This relationship between the public and the private governs both the Church and the self; the final stanza makes the abundance of these ordered individuals who produce outward harmony and inwardly intense

NOTES

1. Herbert's Verser here announces the strategy that Richard Levin's recent lambasting of political readings of Shakespeare ridicules critics for invoking, in an article in which he mocks accounts of a text's supposed strategy for offering "pleasure . . . as a kind of bait. . .to make us complicit in its ideological project" (496). Levin points to the common assumption "from the Greeks down to the present, that "pleasure is one of the things we go to literature for." Certainly, this is true, but nearly all of those accounts insist on utilite along with the poem's dulce; the threat of unregulated or uncontrollable pleasure is what made poetry--and in the Renaissance, drama--so fearful and so in need of frequent defense.

2. This last point was suggested by Barbara Johnson's reading of the implications of the writing self in Edward Taylor's "Meditation 6." ("Writing")

3. The E. of D. is credited with the "fatherly yet lusty rhyme" that provided the "engendering force" to the poems to which Donne has given birth. Magdalen Herbert is requested to give "Harbour" to Donne's "La Corona " sonnets. The Second Anniversarie modestly demurs assigning "The name of Mother" to Elizabeth Drury, preferring her to "Be unto my Muse, / A Father, since her chaste ambition is / Yearly to bring forth such a child as this." See also Sidney, "great with child to speak."

4. Something of this dilemma is revealed in Donne's poem in praise of the Sidney-Pembroke translation of the Psalms, in the opening invocation of

Eternal God, (for whom who ever dare
Seek new expression, do the circle square
And thrust into strait corners of poor wit
Thee, who art corner less and infinite)

The Sidneys, Donne maintains, do not invent, but in translating merely re-fashion the original and unsurpassable ("highest matter in the noblest form") poems into a more suitable and musical idiom for a changing culture. The translations

In forms of art and joy do re-reveal
To us so sweetly and sincerely too,
That I would not rejoice as I would do
When I behold that these Psalms are become

So well attired abroad, so ill at home,
 So well in chambers, in thy church so ill . . .

5. A notable exception: Herbert's prophecy that "Religion stands tiptoe in our land, / Ready to pass to the American strand" held up publication of The Temple. The suggestion that the religion "settled and established" in the realm needed further reform, or that bearers of true religion could possibly emigrate and take it with them was anathema. Though amenable to resolution by reference to a theological paradox, there seems to be something of a political contradiction in Herbert's different figurations of the Church. In "Affliction V," the Church is figured as a "floating ark," and in "The Church Militant" we see the True Church on the move through history. In "The British Church," however, the Church, whether or not it is the True one, is described as having been graced by God's special protection to a unique degree: "Blessed be God, whose love it was / To double-moat thee with his grace, / And none but thee." It seems to me that, despite The Temple's closing focus in "The Church Militant" on the Church on the move, there is an unresolved tension in Herbert's poetry between traditions which represent the Church as a pilgrim, and exile, and one which represents the Church as a settled, historical institution. Deborah Shuger identifies Foxe and Jewel as sources for the former and Hooker as source of the latter position (57).

6. As we shall see, it is at those points when Herbert asserts the efficaciousness of his poems as agents of conversion that their redundancy in relation to the forms of the Church and the text of the Bible become apparent and problematic. Herbert himself, the story goes, in addition to dismissing his poems as trifles, on his deathbed called for the "prayers of the Church--there's none to them." See Walton and Oley.

7. In a typically suggestive aside, Kenneth Burke writes that an "'orthodox' statement . . . would require us to consider complementary movements: both an internalizing of the external and an externalizing of the internal" (Puילותosophy 108). Burke's methodological definition informs much of what follows.

8. David Novarr contends that it was this combination that made Herbert attractive to and effective ideological material for Walton's biography: "Herbert's emphasis on ritual and ceremony . . . and his nonquestioning of fundamentals" appealed to Walton, as did "The intensity of

feeling in the poems coupled with the resignation and obedience and quiet of their endings" (308).

9. See the chapter "On Ceremonies" in the 1559 version of the Book of Common Prayer for an early use of these arguments in defense of the retention of ceremonial forms; the Hampton Court conference reaffirmed them with some minor adjustments; and the antiquarian Sir Henry Spelman brings them out again in his pamphlet published posthumously in 1642.

10. See Heather Asals, 66: She labels the "anti-ceremonialist" view "humorously irrational," and extols "the judiciousness of the Anglican attitude toward ceremony."

11. See Strier, Love Known, especially chapters 6 and 7. In a review of Strier's book, Barbara Lewalksi writes that "Strier is quite right to emphasize that for Herbert the heart's sincerity, the truth of its devotion, is the one thing needful" (Review of Strier, George Herbert Journal 8 (1985) 48).

12. The pagination in Oley's preface is irregular and many pages are without numbers.

13. As I suggested in Chapter III, in Lewalski's scheme the connection between the individual and his form of expression and its typicality are achieved by the presence of God. I am arguing of course, that it is mediated by Herbert's priesthood. See also, Chana Bloch, 203-204.

14. I would like to note the need to be dialectical here; while the anti-ceremonialist position allowed more freedom of expression, their forms were still highly mediated by a number of social factors. The freedom of expression was still reserved for ministers, the educated, and the elect, the latter a category that as Hill emphasizes most often excluded the lower classes.

15. "As all should be," Milton adds in the part I have elided, indicating that the process of forming public prayers should still be regulated.

16. See Lake's "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice" for a recent review of this movement.

17. Here is Milton's response, from "An Apology Against a Pamphlet": "Certainly Readers, the worship of God singly in itselfe, the very act of prayer and thanksgiving with those

free and unimpos'd expressions which from a sincere heart unbidden come into the outward gesture, is the greatest decency that can be imagin'd" (941-942).

18. Quotations are taken from Cosin's unpaginated "Preface."

19. Milton uses this word "Battologie" and alludes to this verse in his exchange with the Remonstrant in Anamadversion: If prayers of a man are mere repetitions, Milton wrote, "I cannot see how he will escape that heathenish Battologie of multiplying words that Christ himself, that has the putting up of our prayers told us would not be acceptable in heaven." (CPW I, 682). For both defenders and critics of set forms, the problem was "multiplying words."

20. It should be remembered that I am using writers like Milton and Prynne dialectically in relation to Herbert; Milton's Reason of Church Government maintains that it is "plain" and "evident" from the Scriptures that presbytery is the only divinely ordained form of government; Prynne, too, has some fairly strong feelings on what constitutes illegitimate forms that should be repressed: witness Historiomatrix. Burton's response to Cosin begins by appealing to the king for stringent laws for the suppression of "papistical" books. See William Lamont's "Pamphleteering, the Protestant consensus, and the English Revolution," for a critique of attempts to draft 17th-century religious radicals as proponents of a "liberty" with any kind of broadly based franchise. Thomas Corns, in "The freedom of reader-response," labels Milton's Of Reformation a "closed text" due to its exclusion of readers who would question the validity of its arguments.

21. Fish cites this poem as evidence in support of Herbert's catechistical objectives in The Temple (48). I of course concur, but I wish to question further the problems of authority involved in this mediation.

22.a See Rosalie Colie, Resources of Kind, for a description of what she calls the "School of the Heart" in Herbert's poems. 52ff. "in several poems, the heart asks to be written on . . ." (62)

23. The injunction to erect an altar without the prophaning tools of the workman is found in Exodus 20:25.

24. See 2 Corinthians 3:3.

25. These comments, as well as those concerning the necessary blank in "Holy Scriptures II" in Chapter III, were suggested by D.A. Miller's chapter on "Secret Subjects,

Open Secrets" in The Novel and the Police.

26. See Sidney Gottlieb, "Herbert's Case of Conscience."
27. See Strier, 93: "There is only one relevant will . . . The speaker does not want to steer himself to God but to be steered by God, to become an object on which and through which God's will--that is his love--works."
28. I should credit Docherty's analysis of "Herbert as Heretic" for generating this section of the argument.
29. In Strier's theological reading, the last two stanzas seem an "afterthought," a lapse he seems to regret: "What seems to happen . . . is that Herbert's intense desire for his poems to do some religious good overwhelms his care for his theology." A strict theology of a Lutheran sort will not allow for a poem that both represents an individual's relationship with God and serves as a model for another. This is a priestly transaction.
30. The argument that follows is an extension of the one focusing on "Lent" in the introduction.
31. There seems to be something of a "You can't quit, you're fired!" logic in the official response to dissent. On the one hand, voluntary separatism was not regarded as a legitimate option. On the other, dissenters were threatened with expulsion from the land, as in James' promise to "harry" non-conforming ministers out of the realm.
32. See Collinson, "The Jacobean Religious Settlement," for a detailed account of the complex and confusing politics surrounding the conference and reports of it.
33. Orgel points out that this technique was reserved for the royal audience only.
34. I use Bakhtin's name to refer to the following "disputed texts" because, while I am unable to venture anything like an educated guess as to their true authorship, the ideas I am most relying on seem to be not inconsistent with those developed in works that are assuredly by Bakhtin.
35. Though Summers and Pebworth correctly perceive that the poem's language "invites a political reading," their argument concludes by raising Herbert above politics: "The progress of 'The Familie' is from the jarring cacaphony of loud complaints to the soothing harmony of silent submission to God's order" (7, emphasis added.) "Political reading" thus means that the poem has political content. Like Illona Bell's "'Setting Foot in Divinity'," Summers and Pebworth

acknowledge Herbert's presence in the "world of strife" of 17th century church politics, only to identify--and identify with--Herbert's position as God's.

36. Barlow suggests that, however impressive the king's performance was, he was mistaken: "thinking they aimed at a Scottish prebytery . . ."

37. Holstun argues that recent "revisionist" historians gave employed a similar principle to argue the radical Ranters out of existence. Because they lacked a strong leader and a shared doctrinal outlook, they are not taken seriously as a "collective identity" (211).

38. See also Hill, The World turned Upside down, 50-56.

39. See Joan Thirsk, The Agrarian History of England and Wales, IV: 1500-1640, 36-38 and 96-98, and Hill.

CHAPTER VI:

CONCLUSION

They who echo the King's words and take the bishop's course, I will not say have the King's ends, but, so far, do the King's work.

Walwyn, The Compassionate Samaritane

I have argued that in "Obedience" and in "The Familie," and in all of the writings I discuss, Herbert both echoes the king's words and follows the bishop's course, attempting to subdue rebellious spirits and still voices of disquiet, and to subordinate them to the set forms of the established church. In conclusion, I would emphasize that the argument only goes "so far." First, I would emphasize the partiality and provisionality of my analysis of Herbert's writing as an elaboration of the state-ecclesiastical. There are important differences between a religious lyric and a religious edict, between the public and the private, between a sincere profession of faith and a merely erastian use of the divine to legitimize rule, and if I have slighted these differences it is because I do not believe that they are easy to locate or define. I have tried to make it more difficult to make the distinction with an appeal to the solution which Frederic

Jameson attributes to "liberalism, in which the political and the ideological are merely the 'public' adjuncts to the content of a real 'private' life, which alone is authentic and genuine" (The Political Unconscious 289). Herbert may have withdrawn into the private world of religious meditation to seek God and "relish versing," but this withdrawal coincides, both biographically and (often) ideologically, with his very public career as an authoritative and authoritarian representative of the state and its church. So while I concede the partiality of my approach, I do not mean to suggest that the issues I emphasize can be disposed of as merely preliminary obstacles to something more essential.

Perhaps more importantly, my argument only goes "so far" in a different direction. I have argued that Herbert's writing can be seen as an extension of the principles of government of the state-ecclesiastical, bringing them to life in a rural parish, in other individuals, and in his own (exemplary) heart. It would be difficult to say how much further or how successfully they extended those principles into something like actual governmental procedures and practices--or, indeed, how far the government of the state-ecclesiastical itself managed to fulfill its hegemonic aspirations. I suggested that Herbert's poems rely on what Greenblatt calls a "shared code" of representation in the way in which they present self-government. I would also insist that that code was not shared by everybody, and that it

certainly did not represent everybody. But even to the extent that it was shared, it was not commonly held in the sense that it could preempt or preclude resistance; it was not shared as a conflict-free consensus. As Jameson notes, "the shared master code of religion becomes in the 1640's in England the place in which the dominant formulations of a hegemonic theology are reappropriated and polemically modified" (Political 84). Aiming to "rewrite" a text in terms of its implicit dialogism, Jameson means to revive the class antagonisms that occasioned and animated "cultural monuments and masterworks," but because they

tend necessarily to perpetuate only a single voice in this class dialogue, the voice of a hegemonic class, they cannot properly be assigned their relational place in a dialogical system without the restoration or artificial reconstruction of the voice to which they were initially opposed, a voice for the most part stifled and reduced to silence . . .

(85)

The breakdown of censorship in the 1640s provides ample resources for the retrospective reconstruction of the implicit dialogism of Herbert's poems. This reconstruction would not be anachronistic because, as Christopher Hill has frequently maintained, the radical ideas that appear in print and the pulpit in this decade had been circulating underground for decades and even centuries: "Before 1640 the censorship prevented unorthodox ideas from getting into print: we hear of them only through the distorting medium of their enemies' attacks" ("Gerrard Winstanley").¹ The peace

and silence that reign at the end of a poem such as "The Familie" should be read not only as the presence of God but the exclusion of contestatory voices, a quiet imposed by censors and licensers and what Walwyn calls "spiritual engrossers."

Walwyn's The Compassionate Samaritane "reappropriated and polemically modified" elements of the shared code of Protestant religion, especially as it concerns the function of peace and authority. In the pamphlet, published in 1644, the Leveller Walwyn contended that the Presbyterians were threatening to erect a new state-ecclesiastical on more or less the same basis as the recently dissolved episcopal one. The new rulers were in danger of following after the bishops, who "had proposed to themselves such ends as could endure no discourse upon them, and framed such constitutions, ceremonies and doctrines as must be received without scanning, or else must appear empty and groundless" (265). Such, I suggest, is also the end of much of Herbert's writing, insofar as it invites no other response than acceptance and affirmation.

The Compassionate Samaritane argued for the toleration of all religious opinions, including those of "separatists" and "Anabaptists," long held by the religious hierarchy to be threats to the order and stability of the Church and State. The pamphlet responds to the "apologetical narration" of several Independents who, making a case for their own

toleration by the newly ascendant Presbyterians, sharply distinguished themselves from separatists, and showed how they had "cautiously avoided those rocks and shelves against which the separatists had split themselves." The apologist's metaphor has the effect, Walwyn writes, of silencing the opposition,

confirming . . . the people's disesteem of separatists, suggesting by that phrase of theirs, as if there were amongst the separatists some dangerous paths or opinions, which they warily shunned, though no mention be made what they are, which is the worst sort of calumny.

Walwyn's familiarity with both the lives and the characters of those thus calumniated, however, convinced him that they are "harmless and well meaning sort of people," who aim at nothing more than that their case "should be publicly and impartially reasoned" (247-248). Like Milton, who saw the publication of the variety of religious experience and expression that followed the breakdown of the episcopal Church in the early 1640's as a sign, not of impending chaos, but of the continuance of the long delayed reformation, Walwyn saw religious diversity as a necessary consequence of human freedom and the dignity of the individual's powers of reason. Walwyn argues that there can be religious dispute and disagreement without anarchic disorder and, again like Milton, maintains that one can be a heretic in the truth by holding an opinion because it is the compulsory but not internally compelling word of authority and hierarchy. Walwyn

confronts the official religious culture--and he maintains that Presbyterians are in danger of becoming distinct but not different from Episcopacy so far as the "engrossing" of religious authority is concerned--with what Bakhtin calls the "naive absence of conflict" implicit in any unitary ideological and verbal system ("Discourse" 368), and suggests that diversity is a constant, unavoidable, and even healthy part of temporal existence:

All times have produced men of several ways, and I believe no man thinks there will be an agreement of judgement as long as this world lasts. If ever there be, in all probability it must proceed from the power and efficacy of the truth, not from constraint.

(263)

Walwyn's pamphlet attempts to bring the diversity and density of religious opinion, as it already does and always will exist, within the protection of authority, and so change the task of those in authority from being forcers of conscience to facilitators of toleration: "'tis the principle interest of the commonwealth that authority should have equal respect, to all peaceable good men alike, notwithstanding their difference of opinion, that all men may be encouraged to be alike serviceable thereunto" (249). Tolerated diversity and dialogue, rather than enforced conformity and imposed quiet, are what unite a nation, Walwyn suggests.

I have argued that much of Herbert's writing can be identified with the efforts at religious constraint in the state-ecclesiastical of pre-revolutionary England. It "echos

the King's words and follows the bishop's course," in the words of my epigraph, in its representation of the government of the self and the government of selves in accordance with a single center of authority, and the imposition of unitary and unquestionable order of religious discourse. This comes through clearly in the country parson's projected place in the rural parish: he and his discourse occupy the central position of authority in the village. Moving out from this center, in "Circuit" or by a "busy cast of his eye on his auditors," he observes, governs, watches over, reproveth, censures, censures, and manages an apparently exhaustive amount of individual and parochial detail with a God-like comprehensiveness: "Wherefore there is nothing done either wel or ill, whereof he is not the rewarder, or punisher" (Works 254).

In its aspiration to comprehend the exclusive and the ultimate word, Herbert's voice is monological: in its official, clerical accent it assumes the priestly position accorded "the only public speakers," as Walwyn characterizes the monopolistic authority of official (Presbyterian) preachers. But the example of Walwyn's pamphlet serves here to remind us of the the provisional, "posited" nature of monologism and the existence of individuals in active resistance, mute indifference, or otherwise beyond the reach of the official and the authoritative.

Herbert's writing attempts to elaborate official

discourse, bringing it to life first within himself and then within his parishioners or his readers, producing some effects and excluding others. Parishioners and readers are held at one remove from the priestly speaker whose discourse is, in the sense given the word by Bakhtin, authoritative:

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher.

My argument has been that Herbert's writing is authoritative in that "strives . . . to determine the very bases of our ideological relations with the world, the very bases of our behavior": it tries to make the "authoritative" "internally persuasive" ("Discourse" 342). But in Bakhtin's account, the authoritative is in constant dialogical interaction with the internally persuasive, both within an individual and in the culture at large. Walwyn's pamphlet insists that, monopolizers and "spiritual engrossers" notwithstanding, difference and diversity exist, and that they exist in a form not in keeping with official characterizations of them as disorderly and dangerous.

The internally persuasive is, according to Bakhtin, in its extreme form "denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged in society . . ." (342). In its relationship with the authorita-

tive, however, what is officially unacknowledged makes its presence felt as that toward which the authoritative is directed and oriented. Bakhtin's point is that the authoritative rarely becomes internally persuasive on its own terms; the two kinds of "alien discourse" speak to and confront another in struggle and negotiation. There is much that can be done in the religious writing of the seventeenth century by acknowledging this struggle; too often religious writers have been either dealt with in isolation from other voices and perspectives, or placed in a "tradition" which highlights only those features of a writer's work that identify them with other, very disparate and disputative voices. It has been my aim to bring Herbert's texts into dispute and into dialogue, to see him not in withdrawal to meditative solitude with unitary religious traditions or in solitary colloquies with a God whose "word is all, if we could spell," but engaged in the world as the representative of a state-church claiming to represent God's word, and claiming the sole authority to determine its spelling.

NOTE

1. See "From Lollards to Levellers" and The World Turned Upside Down. See also Holstun's "Ranting at the New Historicism."

WORKS CITED

- Andrewes, Lancelot. The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine. London: Robert Parker, 1610.
- Asals, Heather. "The Voice of George Herbert's 'The Church.'" ELH 36 (1969) 511-528.
- . Equivocal Predication: George Herbert's Way to God. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1981.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In Lenin and Philosophy. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- . Rabelais and His World. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968.
- . "Discourse and the Novel." In The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 259-422.
- See also Volosinov, V.N.
- Balibar, Etienne, and Pierre Macherey. "On Literature as an Ideological Form." In Untying the Text. Ed Robert Young. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Bell, Illona. "'Setting Foot into Divinity': George Herbert and the English Reformation." MLQ 38 (1977)
- . "Herbert's Valdesian Vision." ELR 17 (1987) 303-328.
- Bernard, G.W. "The Church of England c. 1529-c. 1642." History 75 (1990) 182-206.
- Belsey, Catherine. Critical Practice. London: Methuen, 1980.
- Bloch, Chana. Spelling the Word: George Herbert and the

Bible. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.

The Book of Common Prayer, 1559: The Elizabethan Prayer Book. Ed. John E. Booty. Charlottesville: The UP of Virginia for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1976.

Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.

---. The Philosophy of Literary Form. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.

B[urton], H[enry]. A tryall of private devotion, or, a diall for the Houres of prayer. London: M. Sparke, 1628.

Canons and Constitutions of the Church of England. London: Robert Barker, 1612.

Cardwell, Edward. A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer; From the Year 1558 to the Year 1690. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1849.

Casuabon, Isaac. Anglican Catholoicty Vindicated Against Roman Innovations in the Answer of Isaac Casaubon to Carinal Peron. London: Published by Authority, 1612. Reptd. Baltimore: Trumball Bros., 1875.

Charles, Amy. A Life of George Herbert. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.

Collinson, Patrick. The Elizabethan Puritan Movement. Berkeley: U of California P, 1967.

---. "The Church: Religion and its Manifestations." In William Shakespeare: His World, His Work, His Influence. Volume 1: His World. Ed. John F. Andrewes. New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1986.

---. "The Jacobean Religious Settlement." In Before the English Civil War. Ed. Howard Tomlinson. New York: St. Martin's, 1983.

Corns, Thomas. "The freedom of reader response: Milton's Of Reformation and Lilburne's The Christian Man's Trial." In Freedom and the English Revolution: Essays in Literature and Histroy. Eds. R.C. Richardson and G.M. Ridden. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1986.

Cosin. Richard. A Collection of Private Devotions in the practise of the Ancient Church, called, The Hours of Prayers. London, 1627.

- Davies, Horton. Worship and Theology in England, 1603-1690. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- Docherty, Thomas. On Modern Authority: The Theory and Condition of Writing 1500 to the Present Day. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Donne, John. The Sermons of John Donne 10 Volumes. Eds. George Potter and Evelyn Simpson. Berkeley: U of California P, 1953-1962.
- . Selected Prose. Ed. Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.
- Douglas, Mary. Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology. New York: Pantheon, 1972.
- Dreyfus, Hubert, and Paul Rabinow. Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Second Edition. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Dwalphinatramis [pseudonym]. The Anatomie of the Service Book. London, 1641.
- Easthope, Anthony. Poetry as Discourse. New York: Methuen, 1983.
- Eagleton, Terry. "Two Approaches in the Sociology of Literature." In Literature and Social Practice. Eds. Philipe Desan, Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, and Wendy Griswold. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1989.
- Elias, Norbert. Power & Civility. The Civilizing Process, Volume 2. Trans. Edward Jephcott. New York: Pantheon, 1982.
- Elton, G.R. "The State: Government and Politics Under Elizabeth and James." In Shakespeare: His World, His Works, His Influence. Volume I: His World. See Collinson, above.
- Ferguson, Arthur. Clio Unbound: perception of the social and cultural past in Renaissance England. Durham, N.C.: U of North Carolina P, 1979.
- Fish, Stanley. The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. New York: Vintage, 1973.

- . "The Order of Discourse." In The Archaeology of Knowledge. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972. 215-237.
- . The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction. Trans, Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1980.
- . "Politics and Reason." In Politics Philosophy Culture: Interviews and Selected Writings, 1977-1984. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritman. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- . Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon, 1979.
- . "The Subject and Power." In Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Paul Rabinow, Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982. 208-226.
- Frow, John. Marxism and Literary History. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986.
- Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain, Vol. 3. London: Thomas Tegg, 1842.
- . The Holy State and the Profane State. London: Thomas Tegg, 1842.
- Gottlieb, Sidney: "Herbert's Case of 'Conscience': Public or Private Poem?" SEL 25 (1985) 110-126.
- . "The Social and Political Backgrounds of George Herbert's Poetry." In The Muse's Commonweale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century. Eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1988. 107-118.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Hall, Joseph. A Common Apology for the Church of England. London, 1610.
- Halley, Janet E. "Heresy, Orthodoxy, and the Politics of Religious Discourse: The Example of the Family of Love." In Representing the English Renaissance. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. U of California P, 1987. 303-325.
- Herbert, George. The Works of George Herbert. Ed. F.E. Hutchinson. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1941.
- . The Complete English Poems of George Herbert. Ed. C.A.

Patrides. London: J.M. Dent, 1974.

- . The Essential Herbert. Ed. Anthony Hecht. The Essential Poets Series. New York: The Ecco Press, 1987.
- Hill, Christopher. Society and Puritanism in Pre-revolutionary England. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.
- . The Century of Revolution. New York: Norton, 1961.
- . "The Pre-revolutionary Decades." In The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Volume One: Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth Century England. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1986. 3-31.
- . "The Problem of Authority." The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Volume 2: Religion and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts P, 1986, 37-50.
- . "The State-Ecclesiastical." In Above, 51-62.
- . "From Grindal to Laud." In Above, 63-86.
- . "From Lollards to Levellers." In Above, 89-116.
- . "Sin and Society." In Above, 117-140.
- . "The Religion of Gerrard Winstanley." In Above, 185-262.
- . "A Bourgeois Revolution?" In The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Volume Three: People and Ideas in Seventeenth-Century England. 94-124.
- Hobbes, Thomas, Leviathan. Ed. C.B. Macpherson. Hammonds-worth: Penguin, 1968.
- Hodgkins, Christopher. "'Betwixt This World and That of Grace': George Herbert and the Church in Society." Studies in Philology 87 (1990) 456-475.
- Holstun, James. "Ranting at the New Historicism." ELR 19 (1989) 189-225.
- Hooker, Richard. The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Volumes 1-3. Ed. Georges Edelen. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977.
- Huizinga, Johann. The Waning of the Middle Ages. New York: St. Martin's P, 1924.
- James I. The Trew Law of Free Monarchies. In Wootton, Ed.,

Divine Right and Democracy. 99-106.

- Jameson, Frederic. "Religion and ideology: a political reading of Paradise Lost." In Literature, Politics, and Theory: Papers from the Essex Conference, 1976-1984. Eds. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iverson, and Diana Loxley. New York: Methuen, 1986.
- . The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.
- Johnson, Barbara. "Writing." In Critical Terms for Literary Study. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 39-49.
- Jonson, Ben. Ben Jonson Volume VII: The Sad Shepherd, The Fall of Mortimer, Masques and Entertainments. Ed. C.H. Hereford Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.
- Kennedy, George A. Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Traditions. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1983.
- Kenyon, J.P., Ed. The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688: Document and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.
- Kerrigan, William. "Ritual Man: On the Outside of Herbert's Poetry." Psychiatry 48 (1985).
- Lake, P.G. "Calvinism and the English Church." Past and Present 114 (1987) 32-76.
- Lamont, William. "Pamphleteering, the Protestant consensus, and the English Revolution." In Freedom and the English Revolution. See Corns, Thomas, above.
- Lentricchia, Frank. "Foucault's Legacy: A New Historicism?" In The New Historicism. Ed. H. Aram Veesser. New York: Routledge, 1989. 231-242.
- Lewalski, Barbara. Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.
- . Review of Strier, Love Known. George Herbert Journal 8 (1985).
- Lockyer, Roger. The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England 1603-1642. New York: Longmans, 1989.
- Luther, Martin. A Selection of His Works. Ed. John

- Dillenberger. New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Malcomson, Christina. "George Herbert's Country Parson and the Character of Social Identity." Studies in Philology 85 (1988) 245-266.
- Marcus, Leah. Childhood and Cultural Despair. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1978.
- . The Politics of Mirth.. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.
- Marcuse, Herbert. From Luther to Popper. Trans. Joris Debres. London: Verso, 1983.
- Miller, D.A. The Novel and the Police. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Milton, John. Complete Prose Works of John Milton, Volume I: 1624-1642. Ed. Don M. Wolfe. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953.
- Mullaney, Steven. The Place of the Stage: License, Play and Power in Renaissance England. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.
- Nicholls, David. "The Political Theology of John Donne." Theological Studies 49 (1989) 45-66.
- Novarr, David. The Making of Walton's Lives. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1958.
- Oley, Barnabas. Herbert's Remains, or, Sundry Pieces of that Sweet Singer of The Temple Mr George Herbert. London: Timothy Garthwaite, 1652.
- Orgel, Stephen. The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance. Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.
- Prynne, William. A Brief Survay and Censure of Mr Cosins his Couzening Devotions. London, 1628.
- Ray, Robert H. "Herbert's Seventeenth Century Reputation: A Summary and a New Consensus." George Herbert Journal 9 (1986) 1-15.
- Reeve, L.J. Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Said, Edward W. The World, The Text and the Critic. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Sanderson, John. 'But the people's creatures': The philoso-

phical basis of the English Civil War. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.

- Schoenfeldt, Michael C. "'Subject to Every Mounters Bended Knee': Herbert and Authority." In The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture. Eds. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.
- . "Submission and Assertion: the 'Double Motion' of Herbert's 'Dedication'." John Donne Journal 2 (1983) 39-49.
- . "'That Ancient Heat': Sexuality and Spirituality in The Temple." In Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry. Eds. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katherine Eisaman Maus. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.
- Selden, John. The Historie of Tithes. That is the practice of payment of them. The positive laws made for them. The opinions touching the right of them. A review is also annexed which both confirms it and directs the use of it. London, 1619.
- . The Works of John Selden, esq. Ed. David Wilkins. London, 1726.
- Shuger, Deborah. Habits of Thought: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.
- Skinner, Quentin. The foundations of modern political thought. Volume 2: The Age of the Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Stewart, Stanley. George Herbert. Twayne's English Authors Series. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.
- Strier, Richard. Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- . "Sanctifying the Aristocracy: 'Devout Humanism' in Francois de Sales, John Donne, and George Herbert." Journal of Religion. (1989) 36-58.
- Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebwoth. "The Politics of The Temple: 'The British Church' and 'The Familie.'" George Herbert Journal 8 (1984) 1-15.
- Summers, Joseph: George Herbert, His Religion and Art.

- Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1953.
- . The Heirs of Donne and Jonson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970.
- Thirsk, Joan. The Agricultural History of England and Wales. Volume IV: 1500-1640. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- Tillesley, Richard. Animadversions upon M Seldens History of tithes, and his review thereof. London: T. Bill, 1619.
- Tillich, Paul. A History of Christian Thought New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.
- Volosinov, V.N. Freudianism: A Marxist Critique. Translated by I.R. Titunik. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- . Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986.
- Wall, John. Transformations of the Word: Spenser, Herbert, Vaughan. Athens, GA: The U of Georgia P, 1988.
- Walton, Izaak. Izaak Walton's Lives of John Donne, Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, and George Herbert. London: Routledge, 1888.
- Walwyn, William. The Compassionate Samaritane. In Wootton, Ed., Divine Right and Democracy. 247-271.
- Williams, Raymond. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- . Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.
- . "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." In Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays. London: Verso, 1980.
- . Writing in Society. London: Verso, 1983.
- Winstanley, Gerrad. A New Yeare's Gift for the Parliament and Armie. In Wootton Ed., Divine right and Democcracy. 317-333.
- Wootton, David, Ed. Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986.

VITA

Douglas James Swartz was born in Oak Park, Illinois on October 2, 1958, to Donald Swartz and Sue Danenberger Swartz.

He grew up in Naperville, Illinois, and graduated in 1976 from Naperville Central High School.

Mr. Swartz received his B.A. in English from Illinois State University in 1983, and an M.A. in English from the same institution in 1986.

He held a graduate assistantship at Loyola University of Chicago from 1986-1988, was a Fourth Year Teaching Fellow in 1988-1989, and a Schmitt Dissertation Fellow in 1989-1990.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Douglas James Swartz has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Suzzane Gossett, Director
Professor, English, Loyola

Dr. Christopher Kendrick
Professor of English, Loyola

Dr. Allen Frantzen
Professor of English, Loyola

Dr. David Loewenstein
Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertaion and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

This dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/18/91
Date

Suzanne Gossett
Director's Signature