DEFINED BY WINE

A Study of Sacramentalism in

George Herbert's poetry

KEVIN GRAHAM GODDARD

THESIS

Submitted in fulfilment of the

requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Rhodes University

January 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation proposes that George Herbert's poetry may profitably be understood as a sacramental means by which the divine is made present in temporal existence. In order to support this claim, the relation between sacramental symbolism and literary symbolism, particularly Herbert's, is examined from a number of perspectives.

The symbolic meanings suggested by Herbert's title (The Temple), and their relation to sacramentalism are considered in the opening chapter. This includes a consideration of some of the background to the analogical thinking prevalent in both the seventeenth-century and Herbert. It is followed in the second chapter by an examination of some of the modern theories about how literary symbolism may relate to sacramental symbolism, a discussion which is followed by a consideration of this dissertation's argument in relation to modern scholarship. The chapter ends with a reading of "The Flower". The third chapter discusses the poet's attempt to imitate the divine by "copying" both Scripture and Nature, and this includes a consideration of the allegorical and hieroglyphic modes of thought prevalent in the poems.

The concern with imitation encourages an examination of the poet's frequent invitation for God actually to assume the poet's role, and this is the subject of the fourth chapter. The argument suggests that the poet's attempt to "sacrifice" his own writing may be seen in his concern with corporate imagery and corporate (impersonal) structures. The five "Affliction" poems are examined as examples of the

first, while structures such as synecdoche and metonymy are examined as examples of the second. The final chapter considers aspects of narrative time in the poems, particularly the sense often evoked of the eternal being imminent in the present. This involves a consideration of both liturgical imagery, and what may be called liturgical structures as they can be seen to operate in the poems. Particular examples of the latter are the relation between the liturgical anamnesis and the poems, as well as certain narrative structures that may be called "achronistic".

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the writing of this thesis I have incurred a lasting debt to a number of people, only a few of whom can be mentioned here. I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Professor Paul Walters for his inspiring and careful guidance, as well as his deep and generously shared insight into Herbert's poems. An equal debt of gratitude is owed to all the members of the English department, but particularly to Professor Malvern van Wyk Smith for proposing I be awarded a graduate assistant bursary for two consecutive years, to Ms Margot Beard for reading and commenting so usefully on the thesis, and to Professor John Gouws for his useful insights - usually offered before or after games of squash. Of the close personal friends who have been a constant encouragement, only a few can be mentioned. Dr David Gough and his fiancée Miss Gail Gradwell, Mr Tony Schnell, Mr Tim White and the Reverend Doug Torr all have my love and gratitude. A further, very special thanks is owed to Mrs Helen Murdoch not only for her expert proof-reading and lay-out of the thesis, but also for her and her husband Ken's friendship. Finally, the greatest debt of all is to my parents, and I do not presume to be able to express the love, gratitude and admiration I bear them. It must suffice that this work is dedicated to them, as it also is to my brothers, their wives and their children.

INTRODUCTION

George Herbert was born on 3 April 1593 in Montgomery in Wales. He died shortly before his fortieth birthday on 1 March 1633. At the time of his death he had been a priest of the Church of England for just less than three years. If his exclusively sacred poetry is any indication, then the priesthood was a calling he cherished dearly. It was not, however, one whose responsibilities were taken up without a degree of personal conflict. As his biographer (some would say hagiographer) Izaak Walton (Saintsbury Ed., 1950:274) suggested, his appointment in 1620 as Public Orator for Cambridge University, had led to some speculation that he might proceed, as had his predecessor, to the position of Secretary of State. The death of King James I in 1625 seems largely to have put paid to any definite prospects at court.

However, Herbert's deep-rooted faith and his willingness, so attractive to modern sensibility, to contend unabatingly with its many difficulties, preclude one from assuming that he took up in 1626 a position as prebend in Huntingdonshire simply because his prospects at court were no longer favourable. The seriousness with which he viewed his priesthood is recorded by Walton (Saintsbury, Ed., 289).

> When at his Induction he was shut into Bemerton Church, being left there alone to Toll the Bell, (as the Law requires him:) he staid so much longer than an ordinary time, ... that his Friend, Mr. Woodnot, look'd in at the Church-window, and saw him lie prostrate on the ground before the Altar: at which time and place ... he set some Rules to himself, for the future manage of his life; and then and there made a vow, to labour to keep them.

It is Herbert's priesthood, and his position as a member of the Church of England that one cannot ignore when reading his poetry. The title of his volume (The Temple), and its subtitles, are sufficient evidence

It is Herbert's priesthood, and his position as a member of the Church of England that one cannot ignore when reading his poetry. The title of his volume (The Temple), and its subtitles, are sufficient evidence of his concern with worship, and particularly corporate worship. Many poems in the volume suggest this, and perhaps chief among them are those referring to the Church's liturgy, poems such as "The Altar" (p. 26), "Good Friday" (p. 38), "Easter" (p. 41) and "Mattens" (p. 62) among others. It is not only the sense of communal worship that strikes one when reading the poems, however. As C.A. Patrides has pointed out in his introduction to the volume (1974:17), the sense of communal sacramentalism the poems often evoke is equally striking. Time and again one is invited not only to understand the poetry as a form of worship, but more particularly as a form of worship born of a sacramental sensibility. Of the sacraments of the Eucharist and Baptism, the former seems far more important to Herbert in this regard. The opening poem of "The Church" is one in which the poet seeks to raise an "altar" with words, and a few poems further on, in "Good Friday", he requests that God unite his own sacrifice with the poet's chirograph, by himself, as it were, writing the poem, and thereby recording Christ's sorrows not only in ink, but in blood also.

As the title of this dissertation suggests, it is an examination of this sacramental sensibility that is its main concern. The use of the word "sensibility" here, will indicate that the study is not intended to be primarily one of the sacramental imagery (Eucharistic or Baptismal) in the poems - although much of it will obviously be considered. Rather, the emphasis is on the frame of mind one may detect in Herbert, that is able to see the relation between the phenomenal and noumenal worlds as sacramental. In other words, the frame of

mind that perceives the noumenal in and through the phenomenal. While this may seem too broad and ungainly a position to start from, it is one that will be more carefully tempered during the course of the study, particularly by a consideration of the relation one may detect between Herbert's probable understanding of how the sacraments may be said to reveal the divine, and how this may relate to a similar possibility for the phenomenal world in general and Herbert's poetry in particular.

Such an understanding of a poetic sensibility suggests a world-view which one may call unitive - one that detects correspondences between the phenomenal and noumenal, and which thinks (and writes) analogically. Michael Kirkham has recently (1987:122) suggested that such a sensibility may be found particularly in the early seventeenth-century poets, and is hankered after again by Romantics such as Coleridge. It is the kind of sensibility which does not see metaphor as only a comparison between two ideas, but which more or less identifies one idea or thing with and even in another - reveals one thing in and through the other. Kirkham (131) rightly points out that this essentially symbolist language, while it may be somewhat outdated, is nevertheless the language of the Book of Common Prayer, which refers to the sacrament as "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual" grace.

Herbert's specifically Christian poetry and use of sacramental symbolism may be seen to make this relation between sacrament and language even more specific than Kirkham suggests it can be. The relation between the Eucharist as a participation in the Incarnate Word of God (Christ is referred to as the Word of God by St. John), and the poet's life and language which may be seen as an attempt to

participate in the Word, make it possible to understand the poems as means not only by which the poet worships God, but also as an "operative" way in which he is united to God. This idea forms the basis of the opening chapter's proposal, a proposal born out of the sense of analogical correspondence Herbert seems to see between his words and the all-creative Word of God. If the acceptance of such a correspondence is justified, then a number of other facets may be seen to reveal themselves, and each of these may be related to how Herbert would probably have understood sacramentalism.

The correspondence between the poet's words and God's Word suggests an immanence of the divine which may be said to make the poetry a sacramental representation of the divine. This immanence (the main concern of the second chapter) is closely related to the sense one has of Herbert seeing his poetry as a creation not entirely his own, but as the product of the Creator. In one sense, then, the poems may be understood as "copies" of divine revelation (chapter three), and in another as ways in which the poet acknowledges his own creative inadequacies, and copies the divine by "sacrificing" (as Christ did at the crucifixion) his individual talents to a greater One (Chapter four). The poet sacrifices his own personal words for a greater Word not entirely his own. In the life of Christ, and in the general understanding of the Eucharist's function, the sacrifice leads to resurrection and transcendence of earthly limitations - and this is the subject of the final chapter. As sacramental language, operative in uniting poet with God, the poems may be seen to espouse the same kind of transcendence Herbert sees as a function of the Eucharist - "wine becomes a wing at last" ("The Banquet", p. 181). The poet's words, seeking to share in the Incarnated and sacrificed Word, may

also be said to share in his transcendence.

All references to Herbert's poems are taken from the F.E. Hutchinson edition of The Works of George Herbert, Oxford University Press, 1945. In order to distinguish between references to Herbert's poems and references to other texts, those which indicate the page numbers to the Hutchinson edition are marked by a "p." before the number, whereas those which refer to other texts have only the number.

CHAPTER I

POETRY AND THE EUCHARIST

> Mine eye hath play'd the painter and hath steel'd
> Thy beauty's form in table of my heart;
> My body is the frame wherein 'tis held,
> And perspective it is best painter's art.
>
> Shakespeare, Sonnet 24.

The context in which George Herbert writes is the Church of England in the seventeenth-century. From his position as a member of this particular body of believers he draws much of his poetic material, and his existence in the community of believers often, if not always, informs his choice of imagery, and the way he uses it. As the title of this chapter suggests, its purpose is to examine Herbert's use of symbolic imagery in the light of the fact that his context is largely the Church, its worship and its sacramental ceremonies.

Imagery of Christian worship abounds throughout Herbert's volume The Temple. Titles such as "The Altar" (p. 26), "The Sacrifice" (p. 26ff.), "The Thanksgiving" (p. 35), whose title is the English translation of the Greek word for Eucharist, "Easter" (p. 41), and "H. Baptisme" (p. 43), among many others, all suggest an overriding concern on Herbert's part with the ceremonies of the Church as a theme for his poetry. The abundance of this imagery almost inevitably suggests that the poet may not only use the symbolism of the Church and its worship as a theme, but that he may also regard his own symbolism as performing a function similar in kind to the symbolism

used by the Church. Since probably the most prominent symbols recognised in worship by the Church of England in Herbert's time, apart from the Cross itself, are the sacraments of baptism and the holy Eucharist, it is to these one is led in an attempt to understand more about Herbert's use and understanding of symbolism. C.A. Patrides (1974:17) has given credence to this suggestion by saying that the Eucharist is the marrow of Herbert's sensibility.

This idea is tellingly supported by a number of poems, one of which is "Good Friday" (p. 38), whose opening stanza reads,

> O My chief good,
> How shall I measure out thy bloud?
> How shall I count what thee befell,
> And each grief tell?

These lines indicate that the poet (and here one cannot help thinking of him as priest also) seeks to "measure out" Christ's blood (as the priest would do with wine at the Eucharistic service) by "telling", and by implication, writing. The act of writing, then, seems to be regarded as an action of worship, a way in which the speaker of the poem is able to realise more fully his own relationship with God. More particularly, that relationship seems to be interpreted by the poet especially through his combining the experience of worship at the Eucharist with the experience of writing poetry.

This chapter's purpose, then, (and the dissertation's purpose as a whole) is to consider the value of this idea more closely. If the present writer's assumption is correct, then it may be possible to discover that Herbert uses the Eucharist not only as an image of worship, but also as a basis for understanding the function of his own metaphorical language. The exploration of this idea must inevitably concern itself largely with the relation perceivable in the poems

between writing and worship. Perhaps the best place to begin such a discussion of Herbert's poetry, then, is with the metaphor he chooses as his primary one, the title of his volume The Temple. The fact that he entitles his volume of verse The Temple, and the main part of that volume "The Church", suggests that he regards his activity as a poet much in the light in which he is likely to regard his activity as a worshipper of God, and as a priest. This suggests that a closer examination of the possible multi-faceted meanings inherent in the idea of "Temple" as it would most likely have been understood by Herbert, may lead to a deeper understanding of the relation he sees between worship and writing, and, as the present writer hopes to show, particularly between writing and the Eucharist. His work entitled A Priest to the Temple, comprising a number of sententious (in the best sense of the word) rules important for the "correct" living of a priest, is evidence in itself of the extent to which the concepts "Temple" and "Church" dominate Herbert's thinking.

Probably the most obvious meaning of temple for the seventeenth-century Christian reader would be its use in the Old Testament as a place of worship. In the Old Testament the temple is a special, sacred place set apart ("templum" in Latin means to cut, or separate) for worship. While this understanding is largely maintained in the New Testament, it nevertheless also undergoes major changes. The temple is still regarded as a building for worship, but it also comes to be seen as the human body in which God dwells. Whereas in the Old Testament God is regarded as dwelling in the Holy of Holies in the Temple (see Ps. 11:4), in the New Testament that dwelling-place is no longer restricted to the physical temple building (see Mark 15:38), but also becomes the body of the individual believer, as well as the

corporate body of the believers, the Church. In the Gospels, Christ's physical body is referred to as a temple (John 2:21), and in Pauline theology the individual believer is spoken of as the temple of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 3:16).

This somewhat mystical relation is furthered when the community of believers, the Church, is referred to as the "body of Christ" (I Cor. 12:12 & 27), with Christ himself as the "Head" of the "Body" (Col. 1:18). Both Christ and believers are therefore "temples" in which God "lives", so that the Old Testament physical dwelling of God in the temple of brick and mortar is replaced by this new "spiritual" dwelling of God in the individual believer. This is possible largely because of the Incarnation in which God in Christ "dwelt" with man (the way he did in the Old Testament temple) so that man himself is able to become a temple of the divine. The "Head/Body" relation used by St. Paul expresses this perhaps most clearly. Believers and Christ are inseparably linked in both a spiritual and a (mystically) physical way. While the idea is metaphorical, it is nevertheless also believed as an unquestionable theological truth.

Herbert's friend and contemporary, Lancelot Andrewes, expresses the relation between Head and Body in the following way (Ninety-Six Sermons, V. 407).

> for as He is called "The Head of His Church" [Eph. 1:22] He is in heaven, but in respect of His body Which is called Christ [I Cor. 12:27] He is on earth, that is, the Church, may do God's will, even as Christ the Head Who is in heaven hath done it.

Christ's Spirit dwells in man, and that creates an intimate and real correspondence between the two. This correspondence between temporal and eternal, body and head, as well as body and temple, has widespread application in the seventeenth-century, particularly in the form of a

relation between temple and body. Andrewes, in a sermon delivered on 9 April 1615, says, "So we come to have two sorts of Temples; Temples of flesh and bone, as well as Temples of lime and stone ..." (Ninety-Six Sermons, X.). Herbert himself endorses this when he says in "The Parson Catechizing", that the parson's duty is to "infuse a competent knowledge of salvation in every one of his Flock; to multiply, and build up this knowledge to a spirituall Temple" (Hutchinson, Ed., 255).

What is perhaps most important about this for the present dissertation, however, is the fact that the Temple being understood as a human body, and that body being the Incarnate Christ's in which believers share, strongly suggests the Eucharist, because the Eucharist is probably the single most important institution of the Church which celebrates the correspondence between Christ's incarnated body and man's participation in it. This implies that art making use of the Temple metaphor in the way that Herbert's art does, may well take for granted an understanding of itself as sharing the sacramental relation it perceives in the "temple" of the Eucharistic elements.

In many ways this assumption is supported by a use of the temple/body correspondence in both the devotional literature and the architecture of Herbert's day, one that is part of a greater correspondence prevalent in the seventeenth-century: that between the body and the created world and both of these to the divine. John Donne sees the body as analogous to cosmological or divine order. "... the heart in that body is the king, and the brain his council; and the whole magistracy, that ties all together, is the sinews which proceed from thence" (Devotions upon Emergent Occasions, Meditation XII.). In Prayer XIII of the Devotions Donne associates a room with the human body, suggesting that man's creations reflect God's creation (the

body), at the same time that he implies that the temporal and eternal are inextricably joined. "Only be thou ever present to me, O my God, and this bedchamber and thy bedchamber shall be all one room, and the closing of these bodily eyes here, and the opening of the eyes of my soul there, all one act."

This is like making "one place ev'rywhere" ("The Temper (I)" p. 55), and Donne applies the idea to the human body in Meditation IV when he says of man "It is too little to call man a little world; except God, man is a diminutive to nothing.", words which are reminiscent of Herbert's "Man" (p. 90) in which man "is ev'ry thing,/and more:" (ll. 7-8), and "in little all the sphere" (l. 22). This suggests a valuing of the temporal as an analogue to the divine, just as it means a regard for the human body as an analogue to the whole of creation.

This last idea has been thoroughly and incisively explored by Leonard Barkan (1977). He has shown not only how the seventeenth-century held the human body to be a microcosm of the cosmos, but also how the period saw a close relation between buildings, especially those of worship, and the human body. Barkan (127-128) suggests that this latter relation works primarily by analogy. "... the body acts as a bridge between the abstract and presumably God-given geometrical shapes on the one hand and man's creation ... on the other. ... being analogous to both." He cites William Austin's Haec Homo (1637) where the body is moralised as a building.

> it [the body] is made in all the Geometricall proportions that are, or can be imagined: For as all Numbers and proportions, for measure ... are derived from the members, and dimensions of the humane body: so is also the body answerable to all proportions, buildings, and figures, that are.

The scientific age had not so much destroyed the concept of analogy prevalent in the Middle Ages, Barkan (136) points out, but had derived analogy from the study of measurement and proportion of the kind evident in Austin. This is particularly important when applied to the building of temples. An important source of these ideas was the architect Vitruvius.[1]

> The planning of temples depends upon symmetry: and the method of this architects must diligently apprehend. It arises from proportion (which in Greek is called analogia). ... For without symmetry and proportion no temple can have a regular plan: that is, it must have an exact proportion worked out after the fashion of the members of a finely shaped human body.

Unchristian as this idea initially was (Vitruvius lived in the first century BC), the New Testament connection of the body with the temple of the Holy Spirit only served to amplify in the renaissance the sense of proportion or analogy between body and temple.

The artist creating the temple may therefore be regarded as copying the form of the human body and using its symmetry as a basis for his architectural plan, in the belief that he is copying divine form, most perfectly revealed in the human body. Christ having taken on that body at the Incarnation only serves to make the sense of

---

1 Vitruvius, De Architectura, 3:1. trans. Frank Granger (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1955) 1:159. Cited by Barkan (136). Barkan points out that both the Cross and the Ark of the Covenant were regarded in the renaissance as being measured from the human body (142 n. 40). See Donne, "The First Anniversary", ll. 318-320. Other renaissance instances of houses reflecting the form of human bodies are found in Spenser's House of Alma (F. Q. 2.9.22) and Marvell's "Upon Appleton House". Yet another important renaissance use of the body metaphor is that of the body politic, perhaps most remembered from the fable in Coriolanus I. 1. 95ff. The division of the body into various members not only suggests discordia concors (in this case the breaking of concord) but is also reminiscent of St Paul's usage in Rom. 12:4 and 1 Cor. 12:14-27, where the body as a symbol of discordia concors is a figure for the Church.

analogy more complete, so that it may be said that for the renaissance artist concerned to copy divine order is for him to see his art as in some way analogous to or participatory in the Incarnation itself. Barkan (137) explains this analogical relationship in the following way.

> It is no coincidence that this term [analogy] can apply to both the system of proportioning and its ultimate cosmological goal. The same style of thought which scrutinizes the mathematical relations among the parts of the body scrutinizes the relations among the members of God's universal set. And, conversely, if the world can be subdivided so that man, the Creator, and His temples are at once separated and unified by analogy, so too man himself can be separated, unified, and allegorized by the division of the body.

The temple, then, for most renaissance thought, figures the human body and vice-versa, at the same time that they both figure the cosmos. The artist designing a temple or a Church would therefore be likely to have these ideas in mind, so that he would see his work as a copy of divine order. Izaak Walton records (Saintsbury, Ed., 1950:278) that the Church Herbert built at Layton Bromswold was in the form of "an exact Cross," so that it is obvious Herbert himself was aware of the kind of thinking that saw the structure of temples as mirroring that of divine revelation. It is difficult to think that Herbert, designing a "Temple" with words, did not have this concept implicitly in mind. Even so, what is more important for the immediate purposes of this dissertation, is not so much the background sketched thus far, but the implication it has for the kind of language that would go to make up a volume entitled The Temple. Herbert's use of the temple/body correspondence as his central metaphor invites one to consider his symbolism in relation to a similar kind of correspondence. In

other words, if the body is seen as a temple of God, and a representative of the cosmos, and if Herbert calls his poems a "Temple", then it may be possible to interpret the poems as performing a function similar to that of the temple.

Three areas suggest themselves for consideration in this regard. Firstly, the sacralising function of the temple (being set apart for worship) may possibly be applied to the poems, especially since they often seem to uphold themselves as exclusively "correct" interpretations of reality. Secondly, the fact that the body is made a temple because God first "participated" as it were, in human flesh, and thereby joined human and divine, suggests that the symbolic language of The Temple which often seeks to recount this relationship, may also be seen as "participating" in the divine. And thirdly, the closely related idea of the poet's language being analogous to the cosmic order perceived in man and in temples strongly suggests itself, because of the fact that the poems are collectively called a "Temple". This last idea has an important corollary in the relation between the incarnate body of Christ (the fleshly "temple" of God and the collective "body" of believers, the Church) as both a physical body and a "Word" or "Logos" (the Greek term for "Word") which is not only creative of all things (John 1) but also of all words. These ideas are to be examined seriatim as a basis for the essential proposal of this and the following chapter, that it is possible to understand Herbert's poetry as sacramental.

The sacralising nature of the temple seems, in many ways, to be very similar to what Ernst Cassirer (1955:74) has suggested is the central tenet of the mythical consciousness, as opposed to a scientific or empirical one. It has little will to understand the

object of worship by encompassing it logically via a complex of causes and effects, rather, it is content simply to be overpowered by the object of worship. C.H. Dodd's understanding of worship perhaps best interprets Cassirer's meaning. He suggests (Micklem, Ed., 82) that offering is the primary activity of the "temple" (a word inclusive of all the meanings outlined above), but that it is too high an activity to be initiated by merely human effort. God himself must give what must be given to him. In doing so he, as it were, "overcomes" the worshipper's reality in a way similar to Cassirer's understanding of the mythical consciousness. This implies a divine involvement in human offerings of the kind that Herbert's poems themselves often seem to suggest. When he says in "Assurance" (p. 155) "Thou didst at once thy self indite,/And hold my hand while I did write" (ll. 29-30), he attributes to God the function of writing poetry, and by implication of giving the offering (the poem) that the poet himself is giving. This places the poet in the position of one who is a worshipper, and whose worship may be seen to be intimately connected to his writing of poetry.

A corollary of this is the way in which the human or temporal is overcome by the divine, made subservient to it, and therefore regarded as the only "correct" epistemology. By separating itself from what it deems profane, the worship of the temple appropriates for itself the status of being the only "correct" form of existence. This frame of mind is equally evident in Herbert, and it is something of what he means in "Easter" (p. 41) when he says, "The crosse taught all wood to resound his name,/Who bore the same" (ll. 9-10). On the one hand, this suggests that all wood, because it is created by God, resounds with his "name", his "stamp" as it were. On the other hand, however,

wood resounding also suggests a musical instrument, so that all music is regarded as reflecting divine creation, and, because poetry is often associated with music, the implication is that poetry may perform a similar function. The poem suggests, then, that all wood, all music, and all poetry are to be judged in the light of the event on the Cross, celebrated in the "Temple" by the Body of Christ, the Church. This perspective implies that the poem upholds itself as one that, in the context of the "Temple", contains a well-nigh exclusively "correct" interpretation of divine demands, and in doing so therefore shares something of the sacralising nature of the Temple.

A further aspect of Herbert's poetry is important as evidence of a concern with a sacralising consciousness of "templehood". Many poems reveal as one of their themes the covenant between God and man, particularly the covenant in writing - both the old Mosaic one written on stone (Exod. 20) and the new one written in blood (typologically Christ's blood) on men's hearts (Jer. 31:33). The covenant between God and man is regarded as creating the sacralising separation between the temple and what is external to its form of being, because the covenant establishes a relationship between God and a group of people faithful to him. A particular instance of Herbert's use of the covenant idea and its relation to temple is the poem "Sepulchre" (p. 40).[2] The title itself suggests separation of the kind that is sacred, and the opening stanza uses the covenant idea as its base.

> O Blessed bodie! Whither art thou thrown?
> No lodging for thee, but a cold hard stone?
> So many hearts on earth, and yet not one
> Receive thee?

---

2 Other examples are "The Altar" (p. 26), "The Thanksgiving" (ll. 15-16, p. 35), "Good Friday" (p. 38), and "The Temper (I)" (p. 55).

The speaker uses the imagery of the old and new covenants as a means of dealing with his own spiritual struggle. The stone suggests the old, and the heart (implying the new covenant "written" in Christ's blood) suggests the new, but in this case the heart is one of stone, meaning that the speaker feels his spiritual state still to be a reflection of the old covenant rather than the new. The sense of anguished struggle the poem presents, however, depends a great deal on a relation between the body and temple, and the body as temple. The speaker's sense of separation from God is interpreted in relation to his understanding of the idea of "sepulchre". While on the one hand the sepulchre is an uninviting and separating grave, made of stone and suggestive of the old covenant, on the other hand it is also a "bodie" (l. 1). This opening reference suggests that it may be Christ's literal body placed in the stone grave. However, it also suggests, because of the allusion to the hearts which are meant to receive the "body" (ll. 3-4), the corporate body of Christ, the Church. By implication, then, the sepulchre in which Christ's body is meant to dwell is also the "bodies" (hearts) of believers, who are themselves a temple of the divine. The conflict the poem deals with is whether those believers, the speaker included, are "fleshly", vital "holders" of the divine, or stony, hardened ones. If it is the latter, then the separation is separation between believers and God, if it is the former, then the separation is the sacralising one of "templehood" in which the "bodie" is separate from the profane and "contains" the divine.

This last idea, however, only has possible value for the poetry itself because of another strand of meaning evident in the poem's interpretation of "bodie". The two penultimate stanzas of the poem

imply that the "bodie" is not only the physical body of Christ, the corporate mystical one, or even the actual stones of both the sepulchre and temple, but also the words of the poem itself.

> Where our hard hearts have took up stones to brain thee,
> And missing this, most falsly did arraigne thee;
> Onely these stones in quiet entertain thee,
> And order.
>
> And as of old the Law by heav'nly art
> Was writ in stone; so thou, which also art
> The letter of the word, find'st no fit heart
> To hold thee.

The hard hearts taking up stones is suggestive not only of physical stoning, but also of the protagonist's recourse to the old covenant writing on stone, which "falsly did arraigne". This is contrasted with "these stones" - both those of the new covenant sepulchre (and temple, suggestive of a new kind of "arraigning") and the words of the actual poem itself, which "entertain" (in a mystical way) Christ's body in quiet and order. This suggests that Christ himself in some way shares the words of the poem, and it is a suggestion furthered in the last two stanzas.

The "heav'nly art" which wrote the old covenant on stone is able to write the new one on men's hearts, even if the hearts themselves are like stone. By being the "letter of the word" (both of the covenants and the creating Word the Logos of John 1) Christ may be seen as the essence of both the old and new covenants, at the same time that he is able to participate mystically in the words of the poem which are themselves "stones" making up a "sepulchre", a "temple" and representing the covenants. All may be seen as "bodies" of flesh, stones and words, forming a unified and sacred whole in the context of the poet's thought. To recap then, the poem's suggestion that the "Sepulchre" figures collectively Christ's grave, the stone tablets of

the old testament covenant, the (stony) hearts of believers, the "temples" which both they and Christ's body represent, and the "body" of the poem itself, strongly suggests that the poem may be seen as sharing the sacralising function of the temple/body analogy as Herbert would probably have understood it.

The relation between body and poem revealed in "Sepulchre" leads to the second point about the "templehood" of Herbert's poems suggested above. If the poems may be regarded as in some way sharing the temple's sacralising function because they are a "body" born of the Church's "Body" (of which Herbert is a member), which is in turn born of Christ's bodily incarnation, then it may be possible to suggest that the poems "participate", in some way, in Christ. One of the more prominent ways in which this is suggested in the poems is by the numerous references to Christ's actually taking over the poet's writing. Lines 29-30 from "Assurance" (p. 155) have already been referred to, but a fuller reference is illuminating in the present context. "Thou [God] art not onely to perform thy part", says Herbert, "But also mine; as when the league was made/Thou didst at once thy self indite,/And hold my hand, while I did write." The well-nigh anthropomorphic way in which God holds the the poet's hand seems a hint at the importance of the Incarnation as a means by which Christ is able to perform the poet's part as well as his own.

Other poems substantiate this suggestion. In "The Quidditie" (p. 69) the speaker insists that the essence of verse and life itself ("quidditie" means "essence") is the fact that when verse is used it unites poet and God, so that however insignificant verse seems, it can nevertheless be the equivalent of "all" (l. 12). The physically tangible verse is able to be the instrument of union between the

speaker and the eternal God. A similar assumption is made in "Jordan (II)" (p. 102), when the poet is told by a "friend" that "There is in love a sweetnesse readie penn'd:/Copie out onely that, and save expense." (ll. 17-18). The "friend", one suspects, is Christ himself, so that the "love" to which he refers is probably that revealed at the Incarnation. To copy this love, then, is to accept the value of the Incarnation, and by implication, to have one's writing governed by one's relationship to the incarnate Christ. In a sense, it is to have one's poems "pre-written" as it were, by Christ himself. A similar idea is explicitly stated in "Obedience" (p. 104).

> How happie were my part,
> If some kind man would thrust his heart
> Into these lines; till in heav'ns Court of Rolls
> They were by winged souls
> Entred for both, farre above their desert. (ll. 41-45)

The emphasis here is once again on the physical. Not only is the Incarnation suggested by "heart" (provided one takes the "kind man" to be Christ himself), but so is the covenant written on men's hearts, especially that written in Christ's [heart's] blood. The "lines", then, may be seen to share, in some mystical way, the covenantal writing in the blood of Christ and become part of heaven's "Court of Rolls", joining earthly with heavenly. Perhaps it is not by accident that the heavenly "Court" is suggestive of the temple, because the stanza is given an even greater depth of meaning when one considers it in relation to the temple/body correspondence. For Christ, the living temple, to thrust his heart into the lines, is for the lines to share his role of templehood, and by implication to share in his Incarnation as the living temple, the new covenant. The relation can be seen as a thoroughly inclusive one, uniting Christ, Body (his own and the poet's), temple and poem.

The analogy between Christ, Body, temple and poem is, in many ways, dependent on the third of the points mentioned on page 14 above, that the poetry of The Temple may be seen as analogous to divine or cosmic order, especially when the human body and the temple are both seen in similar terms. While this is an idea that will take up a major portion of a later chapter, it is nevertheless important to consider it briefly here, because it is a natural continuation of the present chapter's consideration of the body/temple correspondence, and it is also a way into discussing what this immediate argument is building towards - the possible sacramentalism of Herbert's poetry.

If a Herbert poem may be seen as a "body" sharing in the "living temple" evident in Creation, the Incarnation and the Church, then it may be possible to suggest that poetic language (the kind that is both born of the temple's existence, and which, in a sense, itself builds the "temple" of the Church by helping to add members to it - "a verse may finde him, who a sermon flies" - "Perirrhanterium" p. 6.) is held by the poet to reflect the cosmos that was created, in Biblical terms, by the "Word" of God, or Logos (see John 1). The analogy the renaissance saw between divine creation and human creation that was so prominently displayed in buildings of worship which took as their model the human body, was also evident in theories about poetic language. When John Donne says of God in Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions that "Thou art a figurative, a metaphorical God," he implies an acceptance of a similarity between the nature of God and that of art. His words are perhaps best illuminated by J.A. Mazzeo.[3] The

---

3 J.A. Mazzeo, "Metaphysical Poetry and the Poetry of Correspondence," Journal of the History of Ideas 14 (1953): 229-230. Cited by Barkan (50).

poet's symbolist aesthetic of the seventeenth-century, Mazzeo suggests, presupposes,

> a world full of metaphors, analogies, and conceits, and so far from being mere ornamentation, they are the law by which creation was effected. God wrote the book of nature in metaphor, and so it should be read. ... The universe is a vast net of correspondences which unites the whole multiplicity of being. The poet approaches and creates his reality by a series of more or less elaborate correspondences.

This suggests that the renaissance did not only perceive a correspondence between body, temple and cosmos, but also one between these three and the poet's language. Perhaps the most important evidence for this is the conception during the period of the poet as a "maker", an idea based on the Greek root word for poetry, "poieo". The word has a number of classical meanings - all relevant to Herbert and all undoubtedly known by him as a scholar of the classics. It means, to make or create (both works of art, and things such as houses). It also means to bring to pass or to perform - often the rites of sacrifice - suggesting that creation and sacrifice are inextricably linked, an idea fundamental to Herbert as will be shown in a later chapter. Furthermore, it equally means to beget, as well as, finally, simply to write poetry. When Sir Philip Sidney calls the poet a maker, therefore,[4] all these meanings may be seen to be

---

4 See Sir Philip Sidney's An Apology for Poetry. His notion of poetry as imitation, based on Aristotle's understanding of mimesis, is founded essentially on an analogical world-view.

> Neither let it be deemed too saucy a comparison to balance the highest point of man's wit with the efficacy of nature; but rather give right honour to the Heavenly Maker of that maker [the poet] who, having made man to His own likeness, set him beyond and over all the works of that second nature. Which

included in his definition. In many ways, his notion may be seen to be based on an Augustinian understanding of the world as God's poem (De Civitate Dei, XI. 18), in which the beauty of creation is derived from the beauty and careful arrangement of parts as does a poem (De Musica Sacra, VI. 17. 56), with the corollary that the artist contains the image of God in a special way because he continues God's work (Confessions, VII. 7. 11).

It is not unusual or unique, then, for Herbert to invite God to participate in the creation of a poem, or for him to see his own writing as a copy of God's "writing" in Creation. There is, however, another analogy which seems to be at work in Herbert, one which further confirms the correspondence between the poet's work and God's. This is the analogy between the creating "Word" or Logos of St. John's Gospel, and the poet's words. It is a concept fundamental to any possible argument in favour of Herbert's poetry being sacramental, because the Word of God (the Second Person of the Trinity) is held by St. John to be both the Creator of the universe and the incarnate presence of the divine in human life. For the Church to share in the incarnate life of Christ as Body and Head, is therefore for it to share in the Word which creates the universe and the Church. Poetry of the "Church" (as Herbert subtitles his volume), then, may be said to function as a collection of words created by the Word, because the

---

4 (continues)

> is nothing he showeth so much as in poetry, when, with the force of a divine breath, he bringeth things forth far surpassing her doings, ...
>
> English Critical Texts: 16th Century to 20th Century, eds. D. J. Enright and Ernst De Chickera, (London: Oxford U P, 1968) 9.

poet is himself created by the Word. The Word of God is the incarnate temple of God also, and because the people of God, the Church, share in the temple, they also share in the Word. Herbert's requests for God to take over the writing of his poems, in many ways, take this relationship for granted. Rosalie Colie (199) has spelled out the correspondence succinctly. She says concerning "Deniall" (p. 79),

> One could say that George Herbert has implored his God for a sign of active grace; and that the logos has consented to his plea. Herbert has succeeded in making his Creator show Himself (as He has always been in Greek) a poet, a maker, has persuaded his Maker into collaboration on this poem.

To understand more clearly the force of this relationship between word and Word, one needs to consider some of the antecedents to St. John's interpretation of the Logos as both Creator and Incarnate, some of the interpretations of "Word" in the Bible generally, and something of the collective importance of both of these for the seventeenth-century. While, as David Crystal (1965:119) has pointed out, the Logos idea is an archetypal one prevalent in many myths and cultures where names, speech, writing and so on are taken as symbols of divinity, it is probably only in Christianity that the idea of an incarnate Logos plays a major role. Some important antecedents to St. John's understanding are in the Old Testament. God creates the heavens and the earth by a word (Gen. 1:3, Ps. 33:6, Wisd. 9:1, Heb. 11:3). The law of Moses is a written word (Exod. 34), and the new law promised in Jeremiah (31:33) is one that is to be written on men's hearts. In each case there is a sense in which the Word is made "incarnate". The Old Testament also relates the Word of the Lord to the words of man - particularly that of the prophets. The patriarchs and the prophets hear the word of the Lord before they speak what he

commands (Gen. 15:4, Jer. 1:4, Ezek. 38:1), and this is complemented by the Psalmist's prayer for God to supply the worshipper's praises (Ps. 51:15). The word of God is laid up in the worshipper's heart (Ps. 119:11), and in the New Testament, St. Paul emphasises this idea by suggesting that believers have the Word of God in their hearts and on their very lips (Rom. 10:8).

In other New Testament writers the Word of God is both a commandment of God and the Word of Scriptures (Mark 7:9-13). It is an evangelical Word (Acts 6:7), and a Word which dwells in believers (Col. 3:16), with the corollary that the community of believers may be seen as sharing in the the incarnate Word. While all these meanings are not necessarily part of St. John's interpretation of the Word made flesh, they may nevertheless be seen as a collective base upon which can be built the notion that the words of believers share the Word of God. The various Words - of creation, of God to the prophets, of Scripture, of Christ when he spoke as a man, of believers when they speak as the Church, can all be seen as aspects of the eternal Word whose incarnation makes him a "living temple" of the divine, a Body shared in by believers - who therefore share not only his "templehood", but also his nature as Word. The idea that the words spoken by the Church (both the ordinary Church and those of Herbert's "Church") may participate in the divine Word has, in the seventeenth-century particularly, a further antecedent outside Scripture. It is one important to the idea that the poet as "maker" shares in the divine action of creation, and its basis lies in the Platonic and Neo-Platonic notion that the Logos is divine Reason or Image.

The seventeenth-century tended to see a similarity between the second person of the Trinity (Christ the Logos) and Platonic Reason

(the Greek meanings of "logos" include both "word" and "reason"). Reason, as the means by which the universe was seen to be ordered (an assumption made by both Heraclitus and the Stoics) could therefore easily be associated with the Logos as Creator. St. Augustine tended to assume the connection, and his influence was strong on someone like the seventeenth-century Anglican apologist Richard Hooker. While modern scholars are at odds about the degree to which St. John was influenced by Platonism,[5] earlier thinkers like Augustine did see a relation between the two.[6]

In the Confessions (VII. ix. 13) he makes very pointed reference to the similarity between the Johannine prologue and "certain books of the Platonists", and suggests that while the doctrine of Incarnation is not present in Platonism, the notion of the Word as Creator is. This is developed in De Trinitate (15. 10. 19 & 15. 11. 20) where he suggests that the "word" begotten by an individual mind is an internal word - an idea which exists before it is actually phrased into words - which, when it is spoken, can be compared to the Incarnation. Moreover, this word begotten in the heart or internally is the first

---

5 Scholars are in fact somewhat divided concerning the Hellenistic influence behind St. John's use of the Logos doctrine. The scales tip in favour of those who emphasise the importance of a heterodox (Hellenised) Judaism such as that evident in the early Jewish historian Philo. So; W. G. Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1975) 219., C.K. Barrett, "John", in: Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London: Nelson, 1977) 847. Others, however, accept the possibility of a Stoic influence in which Logos is synonymous with creative Reason. So; John Marsh, The Gospel of St John (London: Penguin, 1977) 97., and A.M. Hunter, According to John (London: SCM Press, 1968) 23.

6 The Jewish historian Philo linked the notion of the world as a sensible image of the world of Ideas (Timaeus, 92) to the Old Testament idea of man created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26). See New Catholic Encyclopedia 17 vols. (Washington: Catholic U of America, 1967) 8:967ff.

step towards one creating anything, just as the Word begotten by the Father is Creator.

While Augustine disclaims Platonism for not holding Reason as incarnate, or for maintaining that faith is essential for a proper use of reason, he nevertheless holds a high regard for the Platonic emphasis on reason and order. He says of the Platonists, "the light of our understanding, by which all things are learned by us, they have affirmed to be the self-same God by whom all things were made" (De Civitate Dei, VIII. 7). Reason (as the creating Word and man's ability to use reason) is what makes man an image of God, and as a result it is possible for him to partake of the divine nature (De Trinitate, XI. 5. 8., XIV. 8 11., XIV. 12. 15). In a similar way, Hooker, in his Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity (I. 5. 3.) affirms that Plato is correct in suggesting that wisdom (reason) is the highest pattern to follow, although Hooker too is careful to assert that there is no proper reason without faith. It is reason, however, which enables man to know truth from falsehood (I. 8. 3.), and that reason or wisdom Hooker sees an synonymous with the Son, the second Person of the Trinity (V. 56. 5). The Incarnate Logos then, for Augustine, for Hooker, and, as far as they are concerned, for St. John, becomes the pattern of divine creation which is everywhere, and is "participated" in by man.[7] It is imitated by him, even to the extent that the human

---

7 James Anderson (1965:57) has shown the difference between Plotinus and Augustine with regard to the idea of "participation", a notion original to Plato (the Greek word is metecho, see Parmenides 132a as well as St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10:17, who uses the same word when speaking of the Body of Christ, the Church). Augustinian participation, according to Anderson, is "existentialist", involving an analogical or proportional relationship between creatures and Creator. The relationship is not univocal, however, because Augustine declares (On the Nature of the Good 1.) that "heaven

body takes on the "proportion" of divine Reason.[8] It is this kind of proportion that may be seen to determine not only the structure of the universe, but also of human creations such as places of worship.

This last idea has a particular importance in the period for poetic or artistic creation. Yet another meaning of the Greek word logos is order, proportion or analogy,[9] and these are terms used by the renaissance rhetorician George Puttenham when describing the relation between art and nature (see Walker and Willcock, Ed., 1970:262).

> Now because this comelynesse resteth in the good conformitie of many things and their sundry circumstances, with respect one to another, so as there be found a just correspondencie betweene them by this or that relation, the Greekes call it Analogie or a convenient proportion. This lovely conformitie, or proportion, or conveniencie betweene the sense and the sensible hath nature her selfe first most carefully observed in all her owne workes, then also by kind graft it in the appetites of every creature working by

---

7 (continues)
and earth are from God because He made them; but they are not of Him, since they are not of His substance". Plotinus, on the other hand, holds the notion of a univocal relation between creature and Creator. The One and its sequelae are "essentially" related. Mazzeo (1964:11) has pointed out that this leads Augustine to see the world as a sublime poem "whose words are things, whose silent voice is the voice of its creator" (De Civitate Dei XI, 18).

8 Barkan (129) cites Francesco Giorgi"s De Harmonia Mundi (1544:182), where the circle figures the outstretched body. (Da Vinci's well-known figure of a man in a circle is, of course, similar). Giorgi sets up a Christian hierarchy on a circular basis, with the Word at one end and man at the other, and all that which is created by the Word in the middle. "This seems more like a straight line than a circle until we realize that man imitates the Word, so that the extremes at which these two stand must be in a continuous line" (Barkan, 129).

9 See Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, Abridged edition, Oxford U P, 1977, Logos - mng. II. 4., "relation, proportion, analogy".

> intelligence to covet and desire: and in their actions to imitate & performe: and of man chiefly before any other creature aswell in his speaches as in every other part of his behaviour. And this in generalitie and by an usuall terme is that which the Latines call decorum.

This description of poetic or artistic endeavour not only takes for granted the correspondence between the human body and the created cosmos - seeing art as an imitation of both - but also, one cannot help thinking, seems to imply a contiguity between the order of the universe created by divine Reason, the order of human art, and the relation of both the creating Logos who is perfect order or proportion. The prominence of classical Greek and Latin in the education of the seventeenth-century is likely to have made this relation between the order of the Logos and of art a commonly accepted one.

When God is invited by Herbert to collaborate in the creation of a poem, then, it is probably the Logos whom Herbert has in mind as the "Maker" not only of poems but also of the universe, a "Maker" who as the Incarnate Logos is the living "Temple" in whom the poet shares. It is one of the fundamental assumptions of this thesis, therefore, that the art of The Temple may be seen to participate in the Logos, who is the Creator of all things, and the Creator of all words. It is by no means a new idea, but it is one essential to the contention that Herbert's poems may be regarded as performing a sacramental function by sharing in the "temple" of the Body of Christ, and therefore participating in the all-creating Word. Rosalie Colie (1966:193) has perhaps most insightfully shown the importance of the Logos doctrine for the art of the seventeenth-century.

> The divine logos, the idea of God, God-the-Word, is the ultimately self-sufficient idea, the idea of ideas which, if understood, satisfies, suffices, fills, makes content. All other ideas, all other words, can be separately dispensed with, since all of them are implied, are folded into, and can be explicated from, that ultimate Word for word that was from the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.

The Word creates and is also the product of divine activity, so that he is the Source of the words spoken by the Church, at the same time that he is the result of those words. John Donne[10] aptly sums up this idea when he says of preaching,

> Our errand ... is to heare, and to heare all the words of the Preacher; but, to heare in those words, the Word, that Word which is the soule of all that is said, and is the true Physick of all their soules that heare.

The Church's words, its reason and even its artistic "proportions" are analogous (to use the word chosen by both Vitruvius and Puttenham) to the divine Word.

With this background in mind one is able to understand better how Herbert is content to accept, with apparently no qualms, the privileged position for his language as something participating in divine nature, and by implication as something sharing the sacramental function of the Church's worship. "The Sinner" (p. 38) and "Deniall" (p. 79) both imply such a participation. In the latter poem, the sense of disorder caused by the broken rhyme figures the disordered relationship between the speaker and God. This suggests that the poet's language is seen as something inextricably bound up with the poet's spiritual state. To be at odds with God is to be at odds with language, an idea which reinforces the suggestion that Herbert's poems

---

10 John Donne, The Sermons of John Donne, eds. G.R. Potter and E. Simpson, 10 vols. (Los Angeles: U of California P, 1959) 5:56.

participate in the Logos. The language of the Christian worshipper symbolises the order and proportion created by the Logos, so that to be at odds with the Logos is to be at odds with language itself.

This is supported in the former poem, where for God to restore his image (l. 12) is for him to hear the speaker's "call" and to "write in stone" (l. 14), a phrase which must be seen in the light of the contrast between the old covenant written on stone, and the new one written with blood (see "Good Friday" p. 38) on men's hearts. The image restored, the poem suggests, is a written one - both of the covenant and, by implication, of the poem itself. For the poet to be restored to the covenant with God is for him to have his language restored, and this, one cannot help thinking, is very much like the work of the creating (and re-creating) Logos who is the incarnation of God's new covenant. The idea of the poem as representing the covenant and Logos is supported by the notion that the "quintessence" (l. 9) of the "circumference earth" and "heav'n the centre" (l. 8) is "The spirit and good extract of my heart" (l. 10). This suggests an analogical correspondence between the speaker and the heavens as it does between the poem (the "good extract") and the heavens. Furthermore, because the analogy becomes, as it were, "realised" in the poem, the words may become the means of revealing and sustaining the revelation of the correspondence between Creator and created.

The relation suggested in "The Sinner" between the "extract" of the poet's heart (literally blood, but also in this case the "quintessence" of the poet's life) and writing, is strongly suggestive of a relation between blood and Word - or Word written in blood. It is a suggestion supported by numerous other Herbert poems, especially those like "Good Friday" (p. 38) which stress the writing of God's new

"covenant in blood", inaugurated by Christ's Incarnation and Passion, on the poet's heart.

> Since bloud is fittest, Lord, to write
> Thy sorrows in, and bloudie fight;
> My heart hath store, write there, where in
> One box doth lie both ink and sinne: (ll. 21-24)

As with "The Sinner", the Logos is here invited to collaborate in the writing of the poem, which is not only the writing of words on a page, but also the writing of the covenant on the poet's heart. The relation between blood and Word in these poems implies an understanding of poetry on Herbert's part whose exploration is to form the root of the present study. It suggests an intimate relation between Herbert's understanding of the sacraments, particularly that of the Eucharist, and his understanding of the function of poetry. This, in turn, may be seen to be inextricably combined to the understanding of the function of the Logos as it has been outlined.

As has been shown, the Logos incarnate is generally regarded in the Church as being not only the physical body of Christ, but as Someone also participated in by the community of believers, the Church as the "corporate" Body of Christ. As a "temple" in which the Word of Christ dwells (Col. 3:16), the Church, as the Body of Christ, may be seen to be a living and tangible participant in the Logos. However, the single most important act which has made this possible is the sacrificial death of Christ, and this sacrifice is most eminently celebrated by the Church in the Eucharist. The Eucharistic symbols of bread and wine represent Christ's body and blood, so that they are the symbols both of his Incarnation and his Passion. The Eucharist may therefore be seen as a means of uniting the Church as the Body of Christ with the Logos, because it symbolises the Incarnation and

Passion of the Logos. A pre-requisite of this idea is that the Eucharist may be seen as a way in which Christ is joined to his Body the Church, and this is in fact the gist of Christ's words at the Last Supper.

The words "Take, eat; this is my body" (Matt. 26:26, RSV) explain, celebrate and in a sense bring about the union between Christ's body and the "members" made up of believers. For believers to share the Eucharist is therefore for them in a sense to "be" the Body of Christ. This is an understanding underpinned by St. Paul (and reiterated in the Book of Common Prayer) when he says "The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread" (I Cor. 10:16-17, RSV). An important function of the Eucharist, then, is to be a primary means by which the Church as the corporate Body of Christ on earth, both celebrates its status as the Body, and has that status continually built up. Dom Gregory Dix (1964:242) expounds this relationship clearly.

> The church corporately, through the individual offertory by each member for himself or herself personally, offers itself to God at the offertory under the forms of bread and wine, as Christ offered Himself a pledged Victim, to the Father at the last supper. The Body of Christ, the church, offers itself to become the sacrificed Body of Christ, the sacrament, in order that thereby the church itself may become within time what in eternal reality it is before God - the "fulness" or "fulfilment" of Christ; ...

This suggests that the symbolical action of the Eucharistic celebration is more than merely a remembrance of a past event, but is by its very nature "instrumentallie a cause of that mysticall participation [between Christ and Church]" (Hooker, Laws, V. 67. 12). This, in turn, may be seen to have very important consequences for the nature

of the symbolic relationship between the Eucharistic elements and what they signify, because the elements as a "cause" of the mystical participation of man in Christ can be regarded as sharing, in some way in Christ's nature and the Church's.

One of the ways in which this may be possible is demonstrated by the unity between Church and Logos. The Word, made incarnate in Christ, and sacrificed on behalf of man, is believed to be mystically participated in by those who share Christ's body at the Eucharist. The sacraments may then be seen as Augustine sees them, a verbum visibile, a visible word, because they are a physical presentation of the Word, just as Christ is the physical Word and the Church which participates in him, the physical embodiment of that Word on earth. The relation between Word, sacrament and life may therefore be understood as an inclusive one in which all three are seen as inseparable from one another. Such a relation has been carefully outlined by Raphael Shulte (Rahner, Ed., 1975:1481-1482). Life itself, Shulte says, is

> an exchange "between" God and man "by means of" the sacraments. By virtue of the Christ-event, all being and life must be analysed and understood in the light of faith in this event. ... [So that] created being - "natural" and "supernatural" - is ipso facto constituted as coming from the Father through the Word of God, ... Since, therefore, it exists through the Word and in the Word, it is itself - by participation - word, and as such each creature "symbolizes" and "proclaims" both itself and others ...

Shulte's words are important for the present discussion because they suggest, in agreement with Augustine and Hooker, a participatory relationship between the Eucharist and what it represents. Furthermore, they also suggest a very special symbolic relationship between Word, sacrament and life itself, implying that each participates in

the other, so that as symbols the elements of the Eucharist are able to point not only to a reality beyond themselves, but are also able to point to themselves as an embodiment of that reality.

Much of what has been said here about the Eucharist and Word may seem to have little to do with poetry, but a brief reiteration of the argument so far will reveal something of its importance, especially for Herbert. Put as simply as possible, the symbolic participation of the Eucharist in the Body of Christ implies a participation of individual believers in the Eucharist, and since the Eucharist may be seen as an embodiment of the Logos, the corollary is that believers share in the Incarnate Logos. If the Logos as incarnate is a "Temple" of the divine, the single most important place on earth that constitutes the dwelling-place of the divine, then those who participate in the Logos equally share his "templehood". For the seventeenth-century which is able to see the temple as an analogy for the whole cosmos and the human body, created as they are by the Logos, the Eucharist may therefore be seen as one of the single most important means by which man is able to share in the order of creation. The "orders" of Creation, Temple, Church, Body, Word and Eucharist may therefore be regarded as inseparably bound, so that for Herbert to call his poems a Temple and a "Church" well-nigh of necessity implies his acceptance of participation in the analogical correspondence between these "orders".

Having suggested the importance of such a correspondence and Herbert's participation in it, it remains to examine, in a more exact way, the nature of that "participation". Three particular areas suggest themselves as points of departure. The first is whether there is any evidence in the poems of Herbert using the analogical corres-

pondences in relation to the Eucharist in the way that has been suggested. The second relates to the Eucharist itself, because before one can suggest any relation between its "participatory" nature in what it signifies and Herbert's poetry, one must explore seventeenth-century understandings about the Eucharist's symbolic action, particularly the Church of England's understanding. The third, however, is perhaps the most important of all for this dissertation, because it is concerned with whether the assumptions made about Eucharistic symbolism can be transferred to Herbert's understanding of literary symbolism.

As far as the first of these is concerned, a brief consideration of the poem "Ana-{MARY/ARMY}gram" (p. 77) will be useful, because almost everything that has been said so far about the correspondences between Temple, Body, Church, Eucharist and Logos can be found in it.

> How well her name an Army doth present,
> In whom the Lord of Hosts did pitch his tent!

Perhaps the most important aspect of the poem is the way in which so many multiple meanings are compressed into so small a space, as it were, something which is symbolic of the poem's concern to emphasise the magnitude of the apparently ordinary event of a woman giving birth to a child. In other words, there is much more to the event, and the poem, than at first meets the eye. The multiple meanings, however, depend for their effect on the analogies perceived between the various facets of religious experience the poem deals with. The poem takes for granted the typological relation between the Old Testament temple of stone, often referred to as the Lord's tent (Ps. 27:5, 61:4), and the New Testament one of flesh, in this case literally Mary's, but by implication also Christ's and the Church's (II Cor. 5:1). "Army", by

being an anagram for "Mary", presents the idea of an earthly body in the present, the one from which Christ takes his fleshly being. However, "Army" also suggests the typological relation between Christ as the new Army, following from the army of God's people Israel (I Sam. 17:45), as well as God's present army, the Church militant (the title of the third part of Herbert's Temple), and lastly, the triumphant army of the Church, Christ and his Body at the eschaton (Rev. 12). Old and New Testaments, Christ, Mary and Church, past, present and future are therefore all implied in a single word.

In the second line this kind of interrelationship is equally prevalent, and here the correspondence is between Temple, Body and Eucharist. "Host" suggests multiple and related meanings. It suggests "Army", with all the above meanings. It also suggests host as a "container" or "nourisher"; and in this sense has further multiple meanings. Mary is the "container" and "nourisher" of Christ's physical body, Christ himself "contains" the Spirit of God, and his body, as it were, "contains" the Church made up of members of his body who live "in Christ" (Eph. 2:21). Both Christ and the Church are a physical and spiritual "Temple" of the divine, another form of "container", and so is Mary, who had the divine abiding in her. Yet a further meaning of "Host" is the Eucharistic bread, which is usually referred to as the "host". It represents Christ's body as the host of God's Spirit, and the Church as the host of Christ (being his physical body on earth), so that as the "Lord of [the] hosts" he is Lord of his Church. Both are figured in the Eucharist, a banquet in which Christ is both the Host and the food itself, at the same time that he is the guest and the Church is the Host, receiving Christ in the form of the Eucharistic elements.

There is, however, another facet to the poem's meaning. The fact that it is Mary's name that presents all these corresponding meanings suggests that what generates them is the value inherent in the word "Mary" - making it possible to suggest that language itself can be included in the corresponding meanings. This is supported firstly by the fact that the Eucharistic allusion implies that the entire poem may be read as a description of what it means for the Logos to be made flesh. And coupled with this, the action of words in the poem imitates the action of the Eucharist, because their ordinary meanings are, as it were, "broken" in the process of the attainment of the multiple meanings that suggest the correspondences described. The upshot is that the poem may itself come to be seen as a "host" because it not only hosts all the meanings of Temple, Church and Body that are evident, but can also be interpreted as part of the Logos who is the Word creative of all words and of the correspondences between Temple, Church and Body. If the poem is a "host", then, its symbolic action may be understood in terms similar to that of the Eucharistic Host, and this is the fundamental issue that remains to be discussed.

While it is clear from the above reading of "Ana-{MARY/ARMY}gram" that Herbert's poems do show a use of the analogical correspondences prevalent in the seventeenth-century, it still remains to be seen how the function of Eucharistic symbolism may influence the function of poetic symbolism. In other words, whether Herbert's probable understanding of Eucharistic symbolism can be seen to apply to his use of poetic symbolism and his understanding of its function. As a basis for this discussion, it will be valuable to examine briefly the more important understandings in the seventeenth-century of the nature of Eucharistic symbolism.

The disputes about the nature of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the Eucharist that raged during the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation have a fundamental influence on how the seventeenth-century saw temporal things being able to express the divine. The great divide between Protestant and Roman Catholic during the Reformation was, in many ways, the result of their respective sacramental theologies. The Roman Catholic view, known as Transubstantiation, was a doctrine espousing the literal, physical change of the sacramental elements into Christ's body. While Protestants were uniform in their rejection of this literalist or realist doctrine, they were by no means uniform as to what doctrine was to replace it. Luther held to a doctrine called Consubstantiation, which is defined by Dugmore (1958:87) as "the consecrated bread and wine are both the body and the blood of Christ and the bread and wine." Zwingli was adamant in his rejection of both these views. "We venerate and cherish the sacraments as signs and symbols of sacred things, not as if they were themselves the things of which they are signs" (Fidei Expositio, i. 2. see Dugmore, 161). Calvin, on the other hand, was able to take up a position generally between these extremes, by referring to the sacraments as a metonymy. "For though the symbol differs in essence from the thing signified ... still, because it not only symbolizes the thing that it has been consecrated to represent as a bare and empty token, but also truly exhibits it, why may its name not rightly belong to the thing?" (Institutes, IV. xvii. 20-21, Lewalski, 1979:77). This middle position is perhaps closest to that taken up by the Church of England. Archbishop Cranmer's reformed Prayerbooks of 1549 and 1552 maintained a very similar understanding.

> And therefore, in the book of the holy communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in the holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished (see Dugmore, 189).

The emphasis both here and in Calvin is on the spiritual reception of Christ's body by the believer at the Eucharist, but neither of these latter doctrines undermines the possibility of a true participation in divine reality through the medium of the sacramental symbols. While neither accepts the literalism of Transubstantiation, neither equally accepts the Zwinglian notion that the sacraments are bare tokens of divine reality. Neither literalist, nor tokenist, the position may be called "Realist-Symbolist", a term used by Dugmore (17ff.) to describe St. Augustine's understanding of the Eucharist.

In the Augustinian doctrine, the "sign" (signum) is to be distinguished from the "thing of the sacrament" (res sacramenti). But the sign can only be called a sign because it bears a certain similitude to the "thing" - the former an object of sense, the latter a pure object of faith. Hence, Christ's spiritual essence is actually partaken of by the worthy receiver of the visible sign. "If you have received well [ie: with faith]", says Augustine in sermon 227, "you are what you have received". This suggests that Augustinian "Realist-Symbolism" is able to perceive analogies between sign and signified on the basis, not of literalising monistic connections, but of faith. Malcolm Ross (1969:55ff.), however, has attacked the Anglican view as one which has the trappings of the analogical system of correspondences but which does not effectually accept analogy. He upholds, though, Thomistic "analogy of being" (analogia entis) as the only

valid form of analogical correspondence, a form which in fact demands a monism in symbolist usage which neither the Anglicans nor Herbert are likely to have accepted.

Apart from the fact that Ross uses questionable theological premises, as Heather Asals (1981:6) points out, he nevertheless also tends to ignore the Augustinian background to the English Eucharistic doctrine, one which seems in fact to be very close to what St. Thomas refers to as the "analogy of faith", (analogia fidei). This doctrine suggests that faith, given by God's grace, facilitates the recreation, in as full a way as possible, of the analogy between temporal and eternal, Head and Body, sign and signified. "Faith makes me any thing, or all/That I beleeve is in the sacred storie:", says Herbert ("Faith", p. 49. ll. 17-18). This usage is evident in James I's 1604 Catechism, which has distinct Augustinian overtones.

Q What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?
A Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.
Q What is the inward part, or thing signified?
A The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

But even more important is the implication that the elements, because of faith, effect the union between Christ and the believer, and even between themselves and Christ. They are not mere signs, but actually participate in Christ. This is supported by the fact that for the English Church of Herbert's time the elements consisted of a heavenly part and an earthly part, and they were not to be separated because the one exhibited and effected the other. In the words of Bishop James Ussher (see Asals, 51),

> Neither are they [the sacraments] to be counted barely significative, but truly exhibitive also of those heavenly things whereto they have relation: as being appoynted by God to be a means of conveying the same unto us into actuall possession thereof.

This is a position not very far from that held by St. Thomas himself. "... we have on the authority of many saints", he says "that the sacraments of the New Law not only signify, but also cause grace." (Summa Theologica, III.Q.62, Art. 1.). In causing grace, the only thing which "Knoweth the ready way,/And hath the privie key," (The H. Communion", p. 52. ll. 20-21) to both the soul and God, the sacraments may be said to become analogous to grace. This is possible, not because they are literally or even ontologically united to God, but because, in the words of Lancelot Andrewes, they are "a seal of faith", a "mutual indwelling" and "a stamp of perfectness". Without faith there would be no proper analogy, but with it the union may be as sure as any union in the Body of Christ can be. Hooker describes (Lawes, V. lxvii. 5-6) the Anglican concept of union with God in essentially these terms.

> Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are effects the cause whereof is the Person of Christ, His body and blood are the true wellspring out of which this life floweth. So that His body and blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men and in every thing which they quicken, but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with Him even as He and the Father are one.

His interpretation here accepts an analogical relation not only between Christ and his body the Church, but also between the sacraments and the created world. Because each is intrinsically related to the other, the sacraments may be seen to participate, by analogy, in what they represent.

The interpretations of the sacraments outlined here, together with the awareness in the period of analogical correspondences between earthly and heavenly, suggest that the Church of England in Herbert's

time generally accepted that the earthly was able to represent the divine. If this is the case, then it would seem to be of fundamental importance for any understanding of the period's literary symbolism, because it suggests that a poet like Herbert who is exclusively concerned with writing about the divine will almost inevitably see the function of his symbolism (the earthly tool he uses most consistently) in similar terms. This possibility has important ramifications for literary symbolism, because it implies that the poet will be able to see his language as sharing the analogical correspondences between human and divine, and having an earthly and a heavenly part in a way similar to the Eucharistic elements. This further suggests a privileging of his language as something bearing divine reality - not only being a sign of something greater than itself, but actually participating, in some way, in what it signifies.

Such a suggestion may seem an unduly presumptuous one to make on behalf of the poet's language. However, it is one that has been made before by someone whose understanding of symbolism is still regarded as of fundamental significance. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's definition of the literary symbol in many ways underpins what this chapter has been saying about the Eucharistic symbol as it was understood in Herbert's context. The symbol, Coleridge says (White, Ed., 1972:30), stretches beyond its own limitations as a temporal entity, and is characterised

> ... by the translucence of the Eternal through and in the Temporal. [So that it] always partakes of the Reality which it renders intelligible; and while it enunciates the whole, abides itself as a living part in that Unity, of which it is the representative.

This is an interpretation very similar to what has been suggested is the sacramental cast of mind prevalent in the seventeenth-century.

Coleridge here values the temporal as more than just a representative of the eternal, he also sees it as sharing in a unitary world with the eternal. Such a view, it seems, is even more appropriate to the renaissance which still openly accepted analogies between temporal and eternal, than to the nineteenth-century where scientific empiricism had, in many ways, well-nigh caused a discarding of any such belief. Coleridge's definition suggests that it is possible to understand the literary symbol as being "exhibitive" in the terms used by Bishop Ussher about the sacraments. The literary symbol, and more particularly its presentation in metaphor, by revealing what may be described as "mysterious" connections between objects and/or ideas, can be seen as the exclusive "exhibiter" of the mysterious connections because, in a sense, it is a discoverer of them. By "discovering" such connections, the symbol may then be said, in a sense, to be a "possessor" of them in the same way that the sacramental elements may be said to be "possessors" (in Ussher's phrase quoted above p. 41) of what they signify.

The possible nature of this "possession", however, needs to be considered at length, and it will therefore take up a major portion of the next chapter. However, as an introduction to that discussion, and a conclusion to the present one, a consideration of Herbert's "The Agonie" (p. 37) in the light of Coleridge's definition of symbol and its relevance for the seventeenth-century, may go some way towards suggesting the extent of value one may place on Coleridge in a reading of Herbert.

The symbolism used in "The Agonie" is of a particularly sensuous nature, a fact which seems almost self-contradictory since the poem seeks to refute what it deems the misguided attempts by philosophers

to measure the immeasurable as if it were capable of being measured by the human senses.

> Philosophers have measur'd mountains,
> Fathom'd the depths of seas, of states, and kings,
> Walk'd with a staffe to heav'n, and traced fountains:
> But there are two vast, spacious things,
> The which to measure it doth more behove:
> Yet few there are that sound them; Sinne and Love.
> (11.1-6)

The sensuous nature of the symbolism, however, is revealed to be of fundamental importance to the poem's meaning, since it offers a vivid picture of Christ crucified as a way of measuring the abstract. In so doing, the poem implies that the things of the senses (including language) may become the bearers of divine and abstract reality. The poet suggests that the would-be searcher (the reader included) "repair" not only his life but also his epistemology and use his senses to judge the correctness of what is being said. In line 8, he says "see, A man so wrung with pains, that all his hair,/His skinne, his garments bloudie be." In line 13 he says, "assay", "And taste that juice", then "say/If ever [you] did taste the like./Love is that liquor sweet and most divine,/Which my God feels as bloud; but I as wine" (emphasis mine). The stress is very strongly on the physical and ordinary as a measure for the abstract, so that one is led to accept the sensuous as more than just symbolic of the divine, but as in fact participating in the divine. The importance of this for the poem's symbolism, is that the only real measure the imaginary seeker or reader has is the poet's own language. In the daring way of all Christian proclamation, Herbert therefore demands not only that the seeker after truth accept the truth of what he says if he is to "see" properly, but because he cannot literally go to Mount Olivet, also accept the poet's own epistemological world as real and true. That

epistemology sees in wine the love and agony of God and in its own metaphorical "telling" the truth that holds together the universe. This implies that the seeker must accept it, not as a picture of what the truth is like, but as a substantive presentation of it. The metaphor is "real", sin is the press and vice, and love is the liquor sweet. There are no options of partialness in this realm of predication - only acceptance or rejection.

Such an understanding of the poet's symbolism, in this poem at least, seems essential, since without it the poet's definition of sin and love would appear flat, ornamental and largely defeated by its own outlandishness. In many ways the symbolism is the "Realist-Symbolist" kind enunciated by Augustine, because while it does not presume to "contain" wholly what it signifies in any monist way, it nevertheless also does not act in a merely tokenist or ornamentalist way, pointing to a reality beyond itself, but not sharing substantively in that reality. From this perspective one may see the poem's symbolism as living up to Coleridge's understanding, because it does demand a recognition of its value as "participatory" before it can be fully appreciated.

This assumption, however, leads the discussion into the next important phase, which is to place both Coleridge's understanding of the symbol and its possible application to the seventeenth-century analogical world-view, in the context of modern scholarship. Two areas will therefore be the concern of the following chapter. A general consideration of Coleridge's relation to modern ideas about the function of literary symbolism, and whether the literary symbol can be seen in sacramental terms; and an examination of Herbert scholarship, with specific relation to its understanding of the

function of his symbolism - leading to some suggestions about the possible value of this study's interpretation of Herbert's symbolism as sacramental.

CHAPTER II

THE WORD MADE IMMANENT

> Since brass, nor stone, nor earth, nor boundless sea,
> But sad mortality o'ersways their power,
> How with this rage shall beauty hold a plea,
> Whose action is no stronger than a flower?
>
> Shakespeare, Sonnet 65.

In the previous chapter some of the background to seventeenth-century understanding of the analogical symbolism relating to the concept of "Temple" was outlined. The application of this to Herbert's poetry led to the discovery that it is possible to suggest with some certainty that Herbert shares the renaissance frame of mind that saw temples as analogous to the human body and both of these to the cosmos. Some important Biblical understandings of "temple" and body, however, further led to the association, and to some extent even the equation, of both of these with the Eucharist. Herbert's use of this equation (demonstrated by a reading of "Ana-{MARY/ARMY}gram") suggested that he may regard some aspects of his symbolism in a way similar to the Church of England's understanding of the function of Eucharistic symbolism. To a large extent, both could be seen to "participate" in what they were held to signify, so that they were not regarded as mere tokens or signs of greater reality, but as sharing substantively in the nature of what they signified. As evidence for this from the point of view of the Eucharist, Augustine's doctrine which has been called "Realist-Symbolism" was invoked, and with regard to the

literary symbol, Coleridge's definition of the symbol as something "partak[ing] of the Reality it renders intelligible;" was suggested.

It still remains, however, to test the validity of these assumptions against modern scholarship, and that is the purpose of this chapter. Two areas will be given priority. The first will be a consideration of the extent to which modern thinking about literary symbolism may be seen to support the possibility of a sacramentalist understanding of some aspects of its function. And the second will be a consideration of some of the ways Herbert scholarship may be seen to have interpreted his symbolism. In other words, it is a placing of the present argument in the context of Herbert scholarship. The chapters following this one will all examine the idea of sacramentalism from the point of view of specific aspects or types of Herbert's symbolism.

Obviously, the range of modern views on the function of literary symbolism far outstretches the limited scope of this thesis, and the present writer does not presume to become involved in any of the major debates that may be outside the immediate concern of this argument. Any conclusions reached about how one may understand the function of the literary symbol as sacramental will therefore necessarily be tentative and, in many ways, personal - but, it is believed, illuminating to a reading of many Herbert poems.

The concern with sacramentalism suggests that probably the best way to begin this chapter is in the same way the previous one was concluded, with Coleridge. His notion that the symbol is able to "partake of the Reality it renders intelligible" does not only suggest a view of symbolic action similar to that espoused by what Herbert is most likely to have understood by sacramentalism - which is able to

see the symbol as in some way "possessing" what it signifies - but also, in many ways, presupposes some aspects of the twentieth-century critical debate about the function of symbolic language. Two strands of this debate are of particular importance for this dissertation, and two of their most eminent representatives are John Crowe Ransom and Paul De Man. Each holds an opposing view about whether the literary symbol and the metaphor are able to sustain as part of their capacity for multivalent meaning, a sense of participating in what they signify. The debate, then, is very similar to the sacramentalist one about whether or not the Eucharistic elements are able to perform a similar function.

In an essay on the ontology of poetic language, John Crowe Ransom (Scully, Ed., 80ff.) has made a distinction between two uses of poetic language which is, in many ways, a description of the issue being dealt with here, and one of those dealt with, either implicitly or explicitly by Herbert scholarship generally. His distinction is between poetic language which is concerned with ideas (thus maintaining the Platonic dualism between idea and reality), and that which is concerned with "things" or "dinglichkeit". The former view sees poetic language as little more than a psychological construct which has hardly any existence outside the mind of the poet, while the latter acknowledges a "miraculism" in metaphorical language of the kind often found in religious experience. "From the strict point of view of literary criticism it must be insisted that the miraculism which produces the humblest conceit is the same miraculism which supplies to religions their substantive content" (102). Something of his meaning would seem to be that the mysterious connections between ideas or even objects that are made in the combination of tenor and

vehicle in a metaphor - or perceived in a symbol's application to a particular realm of being - create a sense of "substantiveness" similar to the sense of divine imminence so often perceived in religious experience. The metaphor, in other words, may be seen to offer a sense of new "meaning" perceived by the poet or writer, one which has an almost miraculous sense of the immanent about it, and in so doing emulates the kind of religious experience which discovers the divine in the ordinary and everyday.

While Ransom does not use the term, this kind of idea strikes one as very similar to that of a sacramental value being placed on everyday things - perceiving in what the metaphor points to something like an immanent presence. Such an interpretation of his meaning is supported by his suggestion that the "miraculism" apparent in metaphor "arises when the poet discovers by analogy an identity between objects which is partial, though it should be considerable, and proceeds to an identification which is complete" (102). This kind of "identification", one cannot help thinking, strongly suggests a similar identification perceived by sacramentalists like Augustine, Richard Hooker and James Ussher in their interpretations of the Eucharist. It suggests an "exhibitive" function (to use Ussher's phrase about the Eucharist) as well as a "possessive" function (to use Hooker's phrase). In so doing it largely supports Coleridge's understanding of the symbol "partaking" in what it symbolises, because the sense of "identification" of which Ransom speaks seems, in many ways, to imply such a partaking. Not surprisingly, then, Ransom suggests (100) that the seventeenth-century metaphysical poets choose this form of poetic language as their mode of expression, chiefly because they inherit from the mediaevals a world-view that values the temporal as partici-

patory in the transcendent.

There is, however, another important view of metaphor which needs to be considered at this juncture. Paul De Man (1971:13) has asserted that the symbol and what it signifies cannot be regarded as in any sense participating in one another because of "the fallen world of our facticity". His suggestion is based largely on an Empiricist and Logical Positivist view of reality which tends to assert that the perceivable phenomenon is the only basis on which man is able to interpret the nature of existence. This view inevitably rejects the kind of "miraculism" Ransom speaks of as dangerously akin to a univocal or monist interpretation of the relation between sign and signified, tenor and vehicle. In the "fallen world of our facticity", such a relation, however desirable, must be unacceptable.

De Man's understanding here may be seen as very similar to the kind of tokenist or ornamentalist one held by Zwinglian Protestants with regard to the sacrament of the Eucharist. The Protestant emphasis on the fall of man and his inherent separation from God tended to stress the fallenness of all created things, so that the earthly could not be seen to "contain" the divine as if there were an analogy between the two. As has been shown, this is not strictly the view adopted by the Church of England in Herbert's time. They tended more towards an acceptance of such analogies, while nevertheless recognising human fallenness, so that Ransom's suggestions about symbolic function may be seen to be closer to theirs than someone like De Man's would. It would seem unlikely, though, that Ransom would choose a monist interpretation of the literary symbol, since this in itself would be limiting to the necessarily multivalent function of literary symbols and metaphors. Such a monism is suggested in the Eucharistic

doctrine of Transubstantiation - and knowing that Herbert's Church of England largely rejected it, it would seem that a mid-path should be sought between monism and tokenism if one is to suggest an influence on Herbert's poetry of the sacrament of the Eucharist.

If one accepts that Herbert most likely espoused the Augustinian position of "Realist-Symbolism" generally held by the Church of England, then it seems that a similar understanding of his use of metaphor and symbolism may be desirable. From this perspective it becomes important to consider the possibility of interpreting the literary symbol as neither monist nor merely tokenist, but as something closer to "Realist-Symbolist". Just over thirty years ago Sigurd Burckhardt (1956:280-281) proposed that what makes the poetic image and what it represents coincide, what gives poetry "the corporeality which a true medium needs", is the fact that the poet, by using metaphors, is able to "drive a wedge between words and their meanings, lessen as much as possible their designatory force and thereby inhibit our all too ready flight from them to the things they point to." The word must first be divested of its limited referentiality (as it is in metaphor) before it can be given, or can give, true "body". By partially breaking social conventions, the metaphor recreates because it becomes "operative" in itself, becomes, as it were, its own priest and consecrates itself to its own new life, so that as a "sign" it does not only point beyond itself, but also to itself.

From this perspective, a metaphor may be regarded as taking on something like a sacramental force by carrying its own referent as immanent within itself. This does not, of course, as Burckhardt is quick to point out, negate the value of traditional associations inherent in the metaphor. Meanings may be changed but "to have any-

thing like meaning they [the words] must have an external pole" (295). This external pole is more often than not, the result of convention, so that the meaning of a word, symbol or metaphor is often governed by what William Empson (1951:341) has called the "pregnant" meaning in a metaphoric vehicle, the convention that means it is able to be understood, and prevents it from existing entirely in the realm of the author's imagination.

In this sense, the literary symbol and metaphor may be seen as very similar in their action, for although the metaphor contains tenor and vehicle which the symbol (literary or otherwise) does not, the "pregnant" meaning in the vehicle suggests that it acts in much the way some forms of symbol do, through being fixed by regular usage (see Wellek and Warren, 189; and Wheelwright, 93). What this suggests is that even on the level of literary symbol and metaphor, connections may be made by means of analogies, because the writer perceives an analogy between one aspect of experience and another, even though the two may not usually be associated. By making the connection he is forging a new insight on the basis of commonly understood ideas which have not previously been combined in quite the same way. Much literary creation, therefore, may not be ex nihilo, but in many ways the product of the discovery of analogies, similar in kind to the analogical world-view of the seventeenth-century and earlier. Even on the "microscopic" levels of language such as metaphor, then, it may be possible to assume an ability to detect an order or proportion (an analogy and a Logos - since they both mean the same) in the universe which both allows for and even facilitates analogical combinations.

If this is the case, then a view of the metaphor as being able to

share something of the analogical function attributed to the sacraments in Herbert's time is not impossible. It may be seen as "participating" in an analogical frame of mind that sees language as "proportionate" (in the sense used by Puttenham quoted in Chapter I, see pp. 28-29) to divine creation. One of the questions that needs to be asked, then, is whether the discovery in much literary creation of analogies between things or ideas necessarily implies a literalising monism, whether the "corporeality" Burckhardt speaks of can be found only in a univocal connection between image and idea, sign and signified. Someone like De Man would say this "corporeality" is impossible because of the fallen world of facticity, as would most Positivists and Empiricists. On the other hand, Ransom's distinction between "idea" and "thing", and his emphasis on dinglichkeit suggests such a corporeality. Furthermore, it is one that seems to be strongly supported in numerous Herbert poems which, as the reading in Chapter I of "The Agonie" showed (see pp. 44-46), concentrate on the physical and earthly as a means of revealing the divine.

The demand for such a corporeality or "dinglichkeit" may be seen, however, to lead to a number of important objections, and they are especially important in a consideration of the possibility of achieving an "exhibitive" function of the symbol without slipping into monism. Firstly, if one accepts the Augustinian and Hookerian "Realist-Symbolist" background to Herbert's understanding of Eucharistic symbolism, and suggests that it is possible to see a similar understanding at work in his use of metaphor and poetic symbol, then one almost inevitably allows his language the very privileged position not only of representing, but also of effecting divine presence (as seems the case when he invites God to take over his writing), and this

appears to be a somewhat presumptuous statement to make, especially in the face of De Man's emphasis on the fallen world of facticity. Secondly, a corollary of this is that the person assuming this possibility may be said to be limiting divine reality to the human. And thirdly, while one could hold in response to this that faith in God's action is what unites him with man (as the seventeenth-century Anglican Church undoubtedly would have said), it may be counter-argued that one is dealing with discourse, and that the function of discourse should not be understood in terms of something as indefinable and subjective as human faith. Each of these possible objections must be dealt with, and each will be discussed in turn.

The basis of an answer to the first of these lies in the earlier statement that literary creation (especially seventeenth-century poetry) need not be ex nihilo, but can be seen to depend largely on the conventions of corporate experience for many of the ways (especially its use of analogical correspondences) in which it achieves meaning. As has been suggested, the corporate experience prominent in Herbert's poems is the life of the Body of Christ, the Church, so that Herbert can be seen to write particularly from the perspective of a participant in the Body. The Temple - Body - Word relation outlined earlier may, then, be regarded as making the words of the poem as much words of worship as any spoken in formal worship, implying that they perform a similar function. If worship may be seen as a sacred event, one making the divine immanent in the present, then this suggests that the language of Herbert's poems may also be seen as a sacred "event", made so especially by its context as the language of The Temple.

The parables are often seen in similar terms, and Robert Funk

(1966:161-162) has defined the parable in a way particularly illuminating to Herbert's poetry. The parables, he says,

> ... are language events in which the hearer has to choose between worlds. If he elects the parabolic world, he is invited to dispose himself to concrete reality as it is ordered in the parable, and venture, without benefit of a landmark but on the parable's authority, into the future.

Like the parable, Herbert's poems often suggest themselves as such language events, ordering their own reality in a way that is closely akin to the sacralising function seen to be at work in the "Temple". In the context of the Body's worship they demand an adherence by the reader to their particular perspective, governed by their particular context. This is one of the central meanings of "The Agonie", as has been shown in the previous chapter.

The poem, then, by being a "sign" of its context may also be understood as an embodiment of that context because it is an event which is effected by the context. Herbert's poems can therefore be held to embody their truth not only by offering a representation or reinterpretation of it from the point of view of their particular context, but also by upholding themselves as the effect of an encounter with that (transcendent) Truth. This suggests that they can be seen as <u>effective means</u>, as it were, by which that transcendent Truth is to be apprehended. This is something of what Herbert means when he says in "The Elixir" (p.184),

> 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. (ll. 9-12)

The poem, the parable and the mirror not only reflect what is seen in them, but in the context of a revealed reality in which they participate, become the means <u>through</u> which that reality may be apprehended

and also the context in which it can be apprehended.

The language of "in" and "through", it will be remembered, is Coleridge's language, used in his description of symbolic action. A symbol is characterised "above all by the translucence of the eternal through and in the temporal." It is also the language Murray Krieger chooses (1964:3) when suggesting that the symbol is both a window through which its essence may be grasped, and a mirror in which that essence can be seen.

> - to see the mirrors as window too, to see the poem as both trapping us in the looking glass and taking us through it - this is to move beyond the New Criticism, to get through the poem's closed context back to history and existence ....

This is very much a view supportive of the idea that the poem "effects" the reality it points to, one implicitly suggested by Coleridge's understanding as well. Even so, Krieger is himself not too far off the New Criticism when he asserts that the poem exists only in the strength of its own context and that the union sacramentalists seek can be achieved only in a kind of "dream" created by the poem's exclusive context, and supported by the symbol which is a "surrogate reality" (Bloomfield, Ed., 1981:21-22). He is claiming for poetic language much the same "dinglichkeit" that Ransom claimed earlier when he said, (Scully, Ed., 101),

> We may consult the dictionary, and discover that there is a miraculism in the metaphorical assertion if we are ready to mean what we say, or believe what we hear.

However, Krieger's claim is based on the notion that the poem must become a self-enclosed entity, creating its own reality. Whatever "miraculism" is possible in the metaphorical conjunctions achieved, making the poem in some way a means of effecting what it

points to, must necessarily be a "surrogate" one, realised only in the selfenclosed context of the poem. While Krieger emphasises the poem's ability to reach beyond De Man's "fallen world of our facticity", he nevertheless sees it possible only because the poem does so by creating for itself a complex of intramural relations "strong enough to transform its language into new meanings that create a system that can stand up on its own" (1964:30). However, while this may be true of the "secular" poem, and to some extent of the religious one, building its "corporeality" (to use Burckhardt's phrase) on its own terms and demanding to be accepted ("believed") on those terms, it does not seem to be entirely true of the religious poem, or at least not of Herbert's.

While Herbert's poems do have their own individual contexts and do demand an acceptance of the "miraculous" powers of metaphorical conjunction, their essential context seems to be that of the wider Christian tradition such as that outlined in the Temple - Body - Word correspondence, which ensures that they positively cannot stand alone, or be read as "surrogate" realities which have been self-created. The participation of God in the temporal makes it possible for the poem to share, albeit imperfectly, in divine reality without it having to create its own dream-like separation from reality. This suggests that the Christian symbolist poet, while he lives in the temporal, dualistic world of the present, nevertheless exists in a state of tension between the present and the future. That tension is between the present perception of his relation to the divine, and the hope of a future perfection of that relation. In many ways, the present realisation depends on the hope of future perfection, as St. Paul implies in Romans 8:24 when he says that Christians are saved by hope. The

symbol then, by being an embodiment of hope (or "belief" in the terms used thus far), may be able to make the divine, or signified object as substantively real in the present as it is possible for it to be. This would not be possible, one cannot help thinking, if, as Krieger suggests, it must stand entirely on its own, self-created and therefore, by implication, self-limited. Rather, what seems to facilitate the belief or faith, is the poem's part in a wider context of spiritual experience that is greater than the individual poet (or reader), yet one on which he depends. In other words, a religious poet like Herbert borrows the symbolism of his faith because it is chiefly that symbolism which he believes represents most fully the substantive nature of the relationship he has with God. Its substantiveness comes from the fact that it is the product of communal experience and not just individual experience.

Again, one can point to "The Agonie" (p. 37) as an example. Whatever claims the poet makes in favour of his own perspective (over that of the "philosophers") as affording the reader or seeker a sense of the immanent presence of the divine, is supported by a use of the traditional liturgical symbolism of wine for blood. To describe the indescribable (love) the poet uses a commonly understood liturgical metaphor. He does not need to forge the analogy between the two, it is taken for granted, and the force of the poem rests on that acceptance, so that his language is able to share the role of bearer of the divine love because it shares the common understanding of what that love is.

This leads to the second of the three problem areas outlined earlier. The privileged union spoken about, so close to the monism both De Man and Krieger are rightly wary of, is dangerously near the

Gnostic heresy of limiting the eternal to present human perceptions of it. It comes close to holding the external phenomenon and underlying reality as one, in a way that no great philosopher from Plato and Aristotle to Genesis and modern Positivism has fully accepted. In answer one need not turn to mysticism or take refuge in the mysterious. Science itself may be used to provide some illuminating insights. Janet Martin Soskice, in a recent work on metaphor (1985), has pointed out that metaphor works in much the same way that any scientific critical realism does.

Unlike Logical Positivism, which limits language to a description of observable phenomena (what Soskice calls "naive realism"), metaphorical language as espoused by what she calls the "Critical Realist" accepts that some phenomena are not observable in their essence, but are nevertheless present and need therefore to be referred to. On the basis of observed effects, Critical Realism can posit models to describe what it believes to be true, and thereby carry out research and make particular reference to the underlying phenomenon. It does not claim to describe, with perfect exactness, the reality it refers to, but is perpetually aware of its own inexactitude and the possibility of having to change. At the same time, however, the models of reality posited by Critical Realism must be accepted as fairly near the truth if they are to be used as a means to an increased knowledge. The result of the fusion of these two apparent opposites is a form of agnosticism which preserves predication, both scientific and literary, from either the demand for a monistic oneness between sign and entity, or from an unbridgeable dualism. "The agnosticism of our formulations", says Soskice (140),

> ... preserves us from this presumption [that we actually describe God], for we do not claim to describe God but to point through His effects, and beyond His effects, to Him. It is, hence, of the utmost importance to keep in mind the distinction, ... between referring to God and defining Him.

Metaphor, like the scientific model which regards one thing in terms suggestive of another, speaks of one thing in a language which is suggestive of another (50-51), but in doing so may be seen to bear reality because it becomes the only means possible for gaining any knowledge about what it refers to. From this one may suggest, then, that the metaphor "God the Father", for example, refers to God both in terms of similitude (one of God's attributes is similar to what one knows as fatherhood), and in terms of a more precise knowledge, because man's experience of God is not only that he is <u>like</u> a Father, but that he <u>is</u> a Father. This does not limit his nature to Fatherhood, neither does it pretend to capture the whole of man's experience of God, but it does offer what is regarded as a truth, on the basis of human experience. That experience, provided one believes in God in the first place, is the effect of his causal action, and the theory or predication that results from it, like scientific theory, provides an "epistemic access" (to use Soskice's term) to divine reality.

This does not mean that one's theories are necessarily always correct; they are based on fallible and incomplete perceptions, but they are nevertheless the best one has, until experience leads to more complete perceptions and fuller truths. The transitive model, then, as well as metaphor and symbol, may become the raw material of knowledge about the intransitive. The compact collection of metaphors and symbols making up a poem like "Prayer (I)" (p. 51), are therefore, more than just a collection of fictions to the Critical Realist.

Their sustained refusal to allow the reader to grasp their exact meaning does generate a sense of the mysterious and the feeling that the action of reading is in fact one of being muddled by inexplicable (as prayer often seems) fictions. However, the rich symbolical tradition out of which the metaphors are born - suggested by words like "banquet", Angels", "breath", "heart" and "pilgrimage" - refuses to allow them to stand exclusively on their own, and gives to each a reality sustained by continual appreciation of these experiences as effects of an encounter with the divine. In other words, it is human experience of the divine that may be seen to make the language into something bearing divine reality. This suggests that if the reader of "Prayer (I)" does not share the poet's experience he does not fully understand the poem.

This, of course, raises the third possible problem mentioned. Discourse, because it purports to be as objective a representation as possible, ought not to depend for its meaning on subjective faith. For someone like Krieger, Platonic dualism in language can be broken only by the "waking dream" of unity in which a poem "earns its way to its own union within the self-enclosed walls of meaning that poetic devices have tightly constructed" (Bloomfield, Ed., 202). However, the analogical universe that still governs Herbert's thinking and expression gives to his symbols a reach sufficiently pervasive for him not to need, like later generations, even those represented by Coleridge, to create for himself the reach of his symbols. Belief in the analogical universe, as Tuve (1952:106) has pointed out, is essential if one is to take seriously the claims of a poem like "Prayer (I)", where each metaphor presumes to describe not only prayer, but the way it affects both heaven and earth. There is something "miraculous"

about this, and Krieger himself makes the point (1964:4-5), that metaphor is similar to "miracle" in its mystical leap between tenor and vehicle. He suggests that there is a logical untraceability of the steps the vehicle takes one through, so that it is totally in and not merely through the relations within the vehicle that the new metaphor is perceived.

If this in relation is to be achieved only by "miracle", a position the present writer does not dispute, then it seems reasonable to say that the miracle, like all miracles, is apprehended as being such only by faith. The poet must "believe" his own intuition and the tradition out of which he is writing in the same way that a scientist must believe the evidence before him before he can take a further experimental step. The result is that it seems acceptable to adopt both Ransom's and Krieger's conclusions about metaphor working by "miracle" to achieve the substantive in relation spoken of, without limiting the acceptance to Krieger's demand for a "waking dream" of union between sign and signified which is created only within the exclusive realm of the poem. The analogical world Herbert is still part of suggests that the same can be achieved in his poetry if one accepts that he shares the Realist-Symbolist tradition of symbolic usage. The "miracle" of Herbert's language, then, may be seen as founded on faith in this tradition. This emphasis on faith in metaphoric language is one supported by Northrop Frye (1982:55) who says penetratingly,

> The sense in Christianity of a faith beyond reason, which must continue to affirm even after reason gives up, is closely connected with the linguistic fact that many of the central doctrines of traditional Christianity can be grammatically expressed only in the form of metaphor.

While this perspective may seem unacceptably subjective, it must be pointed out, as Janet Soskice does, that even in the most apparently objective scientific experiment, the theory on which the experiment is based at best offers a putative explanation of what is happening - and it cannot presume to be infallible (118ff.). On the basis of observed effects it proffers possible causes, and if the theory and experiment are to be of value they must be believed. So then, it does not seem unreasonable, in describing a Herbert poem, to speak of (adopting Krieger's term) the "realism of miracle". Or, to use the more conventional language of sacramentalism, return to Augustine's "Realist-Symbolism" which, as far as this writer is concerned, is really as close as it could be to St. Thomas's "analogy of faith".

The argument thus far has suggested that by being aware of the sense of the "miraculous" in metaphor, one is able to posit, on the basis of faith or belief, a view of metaphor and the literary symbol as "corporeal" or "substantive" - sharing, in some (however mysterious) way, in what they signify. In doing so, it is suggested, the metaphor - especially the religious one based on a tradition of corporate worship, as Herbert's generally are - may be regarded as bearing divine reality, and thereby performing a sacramental function. Furthermore, the faith that makes possible an acceptance of analogies between human and divine, resulting in a "Realist-Symbolist" interpretation of the Eucharist - where the elements are seen as both in some mystically "real" way the body and blood of Christ, and also symbols of his body and blood - makes possible, it is suggested, such an understanding of the poetic metaphor and symbol. From this perspective, there is no need for a demand either for a literary monism on the one hand, or a mere tokenism on the other, and one may embrace Coleridge's

interpretation of symbolism as "partak[ing] of the Reality it renders intelligible" as being the explanation most suited to Herbert.

It is this last point, however, that remains to be discussed, and it is perhaps the most important concern of all - the possible value the above understanding of the literary symbol and metaphor, one that the present writer has chosen to call "sacramentalist", may have for a reading of Herbert's poems. Such a discussion inevitably involves one in an analysis of the relation between the present argument and those of the major critics on Herbert. Before considering at length, then, a single poem's use of symbolism as evidence of a sacramentalist understanding of Herbert's poetry, a fairly detailed examination of how some of the more important critics understand the function of his symbolism is imperative.

Critics have, in many ways, fallen into one of two camps. Either they have tended to regard Herbert as a Neo-Catholic with respect to his use of symbolism (seeing his use of it as close to mediaeval analogism), and as markedly mediaevalist in a world-view favouring the order of correspondences, or they have tended to see him as more Protestant in his bias. From this perspective, his chief concern as a poet is seen as the expression of his individualistic struggles with the divine, and his symbols are regarded as tools aiding this expression, but not so much as instruments which are means in themselves of resolving conflict.

For some, he is the epitome of an Anglo-Catholic, finding in the symbols and ceremonies of the Church, and the freshness of nature the true "temple" of the divine. A child of the Church, his poems are "a reflection of that form which was everywhere present, although often hidden to eyes that could not 'see'" (Summers, 1954:93). For others,

he is much more the individual concerned with his own salvation and "justification by faith" (the primary tenet of Lutheran and Calvinist Protestantism), and seeking God in a temporal world whose value as a reflection of the divine he can no longer trust. In one reading of this kind, Herbert is seen to associate art with sin (Strier, 1983:31-32), and in another, his poetry is seen (in particularly Platonic terms) as "the transformation of the soul-mind into an instrument capable of seeing things in the phenomenal world for what they really are ..., imperfect and inferior reflections of a higher reality whose claim on our thoughts and desires is validated as earthly claims are discredited" (Fish, 1972:7). Those who associate him with the older scholastic order, tend to see his symbolic language as more inclusive, and therefore lean more towards an acceptance of analogical correspondence between divine and human, whereas those who are concerned to point out his Protestant bias, emphasise the gap between earthly language and divine reality.

Rosemond Tuve (1952) is one of the earliest representatives of the former group. She responded to William Empson's assertion (1977:226) that "The Sacrifice"(p.26ff.) is the product of "successive fireworks of contradiction, and a mind jumping like a flea.", by showing that the poem is based largely on the mediaeval "Reproaches" or Impropreria used in Good Friday liturgies. Her emphasis is on the traditional nature of Herbert's symbols, which he uses in a way "precisely similar to the liturgical way of using [them]: it is a characteristic mediaeval way, patristic, homiletic, literary" (61). By this she means that Herbert, in typically mediaeval analogical fashion is able to "read the spirit in the letter, Not into but in;" (103), and that his symbols as inclusive and intrinsic to his epistem-

ology are unquestioningly "believed". This is not to suggest a complete reciprocity in the relation between man and God, as she shows in a later essay (1959:22), but it is suggestive of the idea that the earthly can imitate the divine, if only because divine grace has made the imitation possible.

Tuve's position has been endorsed by a number of later critics. Joseph Summers (1954:78) has suggested that one of poetry's greatest potential values for the seventeenth-century "was that God could employ it as a means through which man might perceive those [essential human-divine] relationships." Margaret Bottrall's reading (1954) is similar, though she emphasises Herbert's mediaevalism more than Summers does. The orthodox Anglican of the time, in her view, tends to think metaphorically and to work by analogy, since he believes that a divine purpose sustains and informs all things. Consequently, he is able to discern, for instance, the symbol of the resurrection "equally in the flowering of a daffodil and in the upspringing of joy in a heart grown accustomed to pain or torpor" (83).

Bottrall builds here on a view of Herbert's imagery as sacramental, a term first used by Helen White in describing Herbert's poetry as bridging the divine and temporal by "making the things of the senses become the occasions, the humble instruments and vehicles of the divine grace," (1962:23). One of the results of this Anglo-Catholic privileging of the temporal has been the rise of a sacramentalist perspective on Herbert's poetry, which has applied to his verse what the "Countrey Parson" says of the sacraments, "for thou [God] art not only the feast, but the way to it." (Hutchinson, 257-258). Louis Martz (1954) offers a reading of the poetry as "mental communion" based on Ignatian and Salesian models of meditation. The art of mental com-

munion is the art of thinking in symbols and believing (to use Tuve's term) in their power to render present what is being meditated on. A similar perspective has most recently led Heather Asals (1981:7) to suggest that Herbert's language is to be seen as sacramental in the sense that it "attempts to make what is manifestly here and on earth (the outward hieroglyph of the poem itself) relate to heaven and the beyond. ... it builds a ladder to heaven and creates an ontological bridge to the Being of God." This is a view very close to Coleridge's understanding of the symbol, because it suggests an inclusivism that accepts the symbol and bearing divine reality.

Another school of criticism has arisen in recent years, however, taking its cue wittingly or unwittingly from Empson's stress on the ambiguity of Herbert's language and concentrating on the nature of the individual speaker's selfhood. For critics like Stanley Fish (1972 and 1978), Barbara Lewalski (1979), Barbara Harman (1982) and Richard Strier (1983) the Protestant tradition stressing the individual's salvation by faith is the one chiefly informing Herbert's aesthetic. His emphasis on reader-response theory leads him to stress the ambiguity of language and into a tendency to devalue its ontology. "Wherever one looks in these texts one finds instability, not of the simple and comforting kind that offers itself as an ontology, but of a kind that operates to prevent interpretive interest" (1978:67). Fish's reading, predicated as it is on an essentially post-Romantic Kantian epistemology (with its emphasis on the limitation of human perspectives) generally disregards the sensible in favour of the transcendent. He suggests that "the individual soul is asked to reject as partial and distorting the version of reality yielded by the senses and by a merely rational wisdom and raise itself to the point where

the truly and wholly real one again comes into view." (1972:7).

Fish's stress on the provisional quality of the poet's language is endorsed by Barbara Harman, who is equally concerned with the individual speaker's spiritual and psychological autobiography. Her reading of the poems as narrative structures through which the speaker seeks to render past interpretations of experience defective, focusses not so much on the symbolical or metaphorical range of the language as on its dissolution. Like Fish, she sees that dissolution in mainly Protestant terms of the speaker taking up the mode of Scripture "readie penn'd" by Christ Himself (47-48), rather than placing an equal stress on the phenomenal world as an image of the divine.

Barbara Lewalski has been perhaps the most convincing exponent in favour of Herbert's Protestantism. Her work (1979) is written primarily as a response to Martz, Tuve and others who emphasise the Neo-Catholic tradition behind Herbert's verse. The Temple, she suggests, celebrates the love relationship between Christ and the Calvinistic elect soul. The speaker is a new covenant figura of David and the poetry an allegorical version of the Song of Songs. Because of the radical inequality between himself and Christ, the speaker must continually "give over his foolish and presumptuous (Catholic) efforts to achieve an imaginative identification with the crucified Christ and to participate in his sacrifice by imitation, turning instead to a proper Protestant concern with the meaning of Christ's sacrifice for his own redemption and his spiritual life" (294). Lewalski's stress on the individual leads her inadvertently into agreement with Malcolm Ross (1969) as far as Herbert's use of symbols is concerned.

Ross, who sees Protestantism as the cause of an impoverished use of symbols, argues for the breakdown of their "analogical validity" in

the seventeenth-century and in Herbert particularly. He holds that the Protestant revision of Catholic Eucharistic dogma meant that the religious symbol became far more ornamental than intrinsic to the poet's way of thinking. The result is an ever-widening distinction between rhetoric and the dogma that ostensibly underlies it, "a widening cleavage between idea and fact, between the conceptual and rhetorical levels of expression" (70). Nature, and all the symbolic fullness it offers is enjoyed "contemplatively rather than experientially", and in the end it is to be transcended, (see "The Forerunners", p.176, ll.28-29). In the same way, Ross avers, Herbert spiritualises the Eucharistic sacrifice so that it becomes a "sacrifice of the heart", and as a result is "a religious interiorism amounting, in the end, to full-blown psychologism ... inevitably induced by the exclusive emphasis on communion as apart from sacrifice" (170). While Ross's view sees a close similarity between Eucharistic dogma and the interpretation of poetic symbolism, it nevertheless accuses the metaphysical poets of creating a disjunction between their dogma and their actual usage.

Rosemary Freeman (1967) has tended to take an ornamentalist view of Herbert's symbolism, and like Fish and Harman, stressed the psychological apprehension of symbolic meaning. In her discussion of the importance of the emblem in Herbert's work she draws a distinction between an emblem which <u>equates</u> a moral meaning with a picture (the moral usually taking the form of a short poem beneath the picture in the emblem books of the time), and a symbol which is <u>identified</u> with what it symbolises (1967:27). The emblem, she says, is more an arbitrary type than an intrinsic symbol, and as such acts more on the intellect than the emotions. Instead of rendering its own meaning,

meaning is imposed upon it. Of Herbert's imagery she says, "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Herbert's images remain emblems and at no time encroach upon the wider provinces of the symbol" (163). As Bottrall (111) has pointed out, this seems something of an overstatement. Even so, it is a view essentially supported by Helen Vendler (1975). Her concern with Herbert's "reinventing" existing traditions and states of mind in his poetry of "spiritual autobiography" leads her to suggest that the effectiveness of metaphor and symbol lie in their emotional content, the response they generate in the reader and what they reveal about the poet's state of mind or soul. Consequently, the opening lines of the sonnet "Prayer (I)" (p. 51) are seen as flat and "without affect" because "they are the expression of the man who sets himself to pray frigidly, out of duty, drawing his metaphors not from feeling but from doctrine" (38). The poem's closing words "something understood" refer to the abandonment of reciting theological cliches as well as the expunging of the need for explanatory metaphors. "Metaphor, Herbert seems to say, is after all only an approximation: once something is understood, we can fall silent;" (39). There is something of the ornamental view of metaphor and symbol here: they are means of embellishing ideas, but are extraneous to the essence of the poem, conceits used for an intellectual pleasure which the poet must eventually give up. Finally, Vendler's ideas are in some ways continued by Richard Strier (1983) who, although not chiefly concerned with symbolic action, propounds an ornamental view of it by suggesting that Herbert is Lutheran in outlook and therefore against any form of imitatio Christi which man in his fallen state is unable to achieve (50). As a Lutheran, Herbert sees artistic ingenuity as egotism and an attempt at evading God (31-32).

He views his sexual imagery with alarm (39) and strives to cease from intellectual effort which, because reason is innately evil, can only damn him (47).

Some important issues are at stake, then, with regard to how scholars interpret certain aspects of the function of Herbert's metaphors and symbols. Many of the more important issues are closely related both to each other and to the main concern of this dissertation - the contention that Herbert's poems may be understood as essentially sacramental. Perhaps the most important divide in this regard is between those scholars who endorse a Neo-Catholic interpretation of how Herbert tends to understand the value of the temporal, and those who endorse a Protestant one. The former tends to place a value on the temporal as an analogue to the divine, while the latter, in its emphasis on human sinfulness and fallenness, stresses division between temporal and eternal. In many ways, this is similar to the argument prevalent among critics on symbolism - the temporal may be seen as able to "partake of the [eternal] Reality it renders intelligible" (Coleridge), or it must give way to "the fallen world of our facticity" (De Man). A correlative of this is an interpretation of metaphorical expression as either inclusive of the meanings it suggests (implying a sacramentalist function of "participation" in what it points to) or exclusive (separated by human fallenness). The former, it seems to the present writer, would seek to claim what Freeman has called "identity" with what it signifies, while the latter would probably do no more than claim an "equation" with what it signifies.

These perspectives need to be tested against what may be seen as Herbert's own demands on his metaphorical language, and perhaps one of the more useful poems to choose in this regard would be "The Flower"

(p. 165), because the flower metaphor is more "personal" than theological or liturgical. The first two stanzas of the poem read:

> How fresh, O Lord, how sweet and clean
> Are thy returns! ev'n as the flowers in spring;
> To which, besides their own demean,
> The late-past frosts tributes of pleasure bring.
> Grief melts away
> Like snow in May,
> As if there were no such cold thing.
>
> Who would have thought my shrivel'd heart
> Could have recover'd greenesse? It was gone
> Quite under ground; as flowers depart
> To see their mother-root, when they have blown;
> Where they together
> All the hard weather,
> Dead to the world, keep house unknown. (ll. 1-14)

Perhaps the most important theme of the poem is the poet's sense of separation from God and the reconciliation that is achieved, and this theme is expressed by comparing the "death" and "rebirth" of a flower to the poet's experience. While the opening stanza suggests a fairly simple comparison between the poet's experience and the blossoming of a flower, the second stanza makes this comparison much more complex. The natural attributes of the flower ("shrivel'd" and "greenesse") are referred to as the speaker's as well, so that the speaker and flower well-nigh become one. This suggests a relation between the speaker and the flower that may be more than one of mere similitude. It is possible that the speaker perceives an analogical correspondence between himself and the flower, as if each revealed a part of the other.

Such a view implies a "participatory" relationship between the things the flower refers to or symbolises and the speaker, of the kind Coleridge asserts is the essence of symbol. An opposing view may see the flower as an image descriptive of the speaker's experience, but not in any way responsible for the reconciliation effected between the speaker and God. One such reading comes from Barbara Harman, who

suggests that the words "we are but flowers that glide" (l. 44) imply unnatural flowers (1982:168). "The flower of this poem is a shifter from the start", an idea which appears to endorse a particularly ornamentalist or tokenist view of the flower image, because it does not accept the importance of its natural attributes. This suggests what perhaps most aids one in making a choice between the two opposing positions suggested above: the multivalency of the flower's symbolic attributes, as something not exclusively limited to a single meaning.

Harman's reading tends towards an emblematic interpretation of the flower image, one which, by implication, ought not to be "identified" with the speaker, but only "equated" (to use Freeman's distinction) with him. Her reason for this is that "the speaker must see his own experiences from a distance" (64). It is this perspective that encourages her to suggest that in most Herbert poems the writer is "already in possession of a finished story" (73). However, the numerous meanings given the flower image in the poem, suggest that one must consider its role more carefully.

The first stanza suggests that the poet sees the flower as a symbol not only of the return of nature's freshness at spring, but also as one symbolising the "return" of God to the poet, from whom he seems to have been separated. There is, therefore, some kind of equation between the flower, freshness, spring and the return of God, and the end of grief. As has already been suggested, however, in the second stanza the relation between the flower and the poet seems more than one of mere similitude. While the "shrivel'd heart" metaphor does not imply that the poet's heart is literally shrivelled, it nevertheless suggests that the poet is unable to see his own experience in any terms other than its relation to the flower. Likewise, his heart may

not be literally "green", but the application of the metaphor suggests that the poet sees his participation in the created world of nature as a license for using one idea (greenesse) as explanatory of another (heart).

Other meanings for the flower are suggested in the remaining stanzas. The flower symbolises "Killing and quickning" in line 16, it suggests to the poet both chiming (its "rising") and a passing-bell (its "dying") in line 18, and in line 24 it is the poet himself ("I shoot up fair"). Such a multivalency strongly encourages an interpretation of the flower as a symbol participating in a correspondence that binds all the various meanings together. In this sense, the flower may to said to be analogous to all the meanings inherent in it.

This last idea is perhaps the most important of all in the poem, because it presumes a relationship between the poet and the flower that seems closer to identification than equation. If this is the case, the flower (and all it is a symbol of) may be said to have the kind of "corporeality" Burckhardt speaks of, and the kind of "dinglichkeit" emphasised by Ransom. Perhaps most supportive of such an idea is a suggestion implicit in the third stanza.

> These are thy wonders, Lord of power,
> Killing and quickning, bringing down to hell
> And up to heaven in an houre;
> Making a chiming of a passing-bell.
> We say amisse,
> This or that is:
> Thy word is all, if we could spell.

The last three lines suggest that an important theme of the poem is not only the relation between the flower, the poet and his spiritual experience, but also between the flower and the action of writing ("spelling"). The flower, then, may be seen as the poem itself, so that it is possible to see the same kind of correspondence between

title and poem here that one can see between the title of the volume (The Temple) and the poems in it. If this is the case, then it seems suitable to examine the relation in the poem between the flower and writing. If the symbol has the "corporeality" it seems to have, then it means that the poem as "flower" shares that corporeality, and by doing so necessarily participates in the creating force that made the flower.

Clearly, the problem for the poet in the third stanza is that of trying to unite his own way of seeing with God's. He must (and does) acknowledge that this is an impossible feat ("We say amisse"), but the question remains whether the symbol of the flower (as something created by God) is able to bridge the gap for him. Those who see the flower as an emblem that is equated with the poet's experience but not identified with it, will tend to see it in more ornamentalist or tokenist terms, so that the flower as the poem itself must necessarily be seen as more descriptive than "operative". In other words, the poem, as Harman (163-169) suggests, is a description of a past event and not a participant in it - and the symbol used is an embellishment to the description. Stanley Fish's reading may be seen as, in some ways, similar to this. His suggestion is that "say[ing] amisse" is the actual function of the poem (1972:156ff.). In this view, whatever corrections to "say[ing] amisse" the poet aspires to, can only take place outside the realm of the poem, since the poet's imperfect language must be transcended before he can properly "say aright". The poem itself then, according to these two critics, is an act of saying amiss, because acknowledging the imperfection of one's way of seeing and hence one's language, is the only way of beginning to transcend it. Language must be used up rather than used, so that its own nega-

tion can lead to a unity with the divine. While this view does explain much of Herbert's struggle with language in poems like "Jordan (I)" (p. 56) and "The Forerunners" (p. 176), it nevertheless suggests that language is little more than ornamental because it suffers from a Platonic dualism (helped by a Protestant abrogation of "worldly" things) that sees it more as a sign of the otherworldly (one to be transcended) than as a vehicle revealing and bearing the otherworldly.

There seems no reason, however, why this radical distinction should be made, for while the poet acknowledges that his "say[ing]" is inadequate, he also affirms that his task as a poet is to "spell ... Thy word". If this is so, it is reasonable to assume that the poem is itself an attempt at such a spelling. The first four lines of the third stanza may therefore be seen as a description of what Herbert understands this spelling of "Thy word" to be. While sharing in the language of God's word involves "Killing", it equally involves "quickning", and while it is a "passing bell", (my emphasis) it is also one that God causes ("Making" in the phrase of the poem - one almost undoubtedly containing all its meaning as the Greek for "poem" or "poet") to "chime". Herbert consistently holds these twin aspects of his religious and aesthetic experience in tension. There is more than just loss here, there is life also, not outside the language, but in it. This is equally evident in the use of metaphorical language. The traditional equation between language and music (prominent throughout the musician-poet Herbert's work), suggests that "chime" refers as much to language here as it does to music, and with this possibility in mind it may be said that the poet is using a metaphor which itself suffers a "Killing" and "quickning" because it is a fusion of disparate meanings in such a way that each word loses its

customary usage and gains a new one.

The customary is what, in fact, gives the flower symbol much of its weight in this poem. The second stanza of the poem is important in this regard. Most striking are the combined images of heart and flower in the metaphor "shrivel'd heart" (l. 8). The connection is so startling it defies full cognitive apprehension, but the tone and feeling of mixed anguish and joy demand a response which goes beyond the limits of the purely cognitive or intellectual, into something almost tangibly apprehensible. This seems something of what Archibald MacLeish (1960:67) means when he says that the function of metaphor is to "realize" 'truth' as "something more immediate than knowledge, something tangible and felt, something as tangible as experience itself, ..."

This seems true of the "shrivel'd heart" metaphor, because in it the poet takes a piece of knowledge from one realm of experience and uses it as a means of interpreting knowledge from another. The knowledge he takes is not individualistic, or the metaphor would not make sense to anyone besides himself. Rather, he values the symbolic attributes of "heart" (the essence of things, both understood or mysterious, and the lifeblood) for what they naturally imply, more than as an emblem or picture suggesting a specific moral lesson, which is attached to (equated with) the poet's experience after it has happened. Rather, it seems to the present writer, the poet sees one part of experience through the eyes of another because the two form, for him, a natural connection. The blood of the heart and the sap of the green plant are the gift of the same God, and one of the only ways to make sense of his experience is to identify each in and through (to use Coleridge's terms) the other - to see the two as connected. This

suggests that the very act of writing, then, of "spelling" (l. 21), becomes an "operative" means of "seeing" (l. 44) and "relishing" (l. 39) and making sense of the intimate connection between himself and God.

To see the flower merely as an emblem embellishing the poet's understanding of a past experience is, then, to limit its meaning to such an extent that the full range of its metaphorical multivalency is not taken into account. It is also to lessen the force of the poem's meaning as something that may be seen as operative in relating the divine to the human - bearing divine reality - because its metaphorical nature may be seen as inclusive of the analogical correspondences that were regarded in Herbert's time as joining temporal with eternal.

This kind of operativeness seems to be something of what Rosemond Tuve means when she says of symbolical language:

> It is typical of a symbolic image that the details into which it breaks are physical or sensuous ..., and would seem fanciful, quaint, and more ingenious than moving, if not seen instantly <u>as</u> what they signify.

The image must in some way <u>be</u> what it purports to be an image of; an idea reminiscent of Archibald MacLeish's phrase "A poem should not mean/But be" ("Ars Poetica", ll. 23-24), and by implication the poetic symbol should "partake" (to use Coleridge's phrase from <u>The Statesman's Manual</u>) "of the Reality it renders intelligible". This is, in turn, a conception very similar to one by Cecil Day Lewis, who has suggested that "poetry's truth comes from the perception of a unity underlying and relating all phenomena.", an idea very similar to the notion that much of the poet's genius is perceiving correspondences between ideas and phenomena that are not usually perceived, and using his poem as a vehicle for revealing the participation of all parts in

one whole. In other words, the fragments of experience are in truth, no matter what appearances may be, parts of one whole, and that whole is not apprehended purely on the cognitive or psychological plane, but on a much more all-inclusive one that may include the psychological and the ontological.

The reading of "The Flower" which acknowledges its language as having the capacity to be operative in bearing divine reality, in many ways sums up what the last two chapters have been trying to say. In the context of the essentially ecclesiastical nature of Herbert's poems, it is difficult not to see this operative quality in his language as sacramental. As a conclusion to these two chapters, then, and a basis for what is to come, it will be useful to restate briefly the main points of what is understood in this dissertation by the term "sacramental" when it is applied to Herbert's poems.

A sacrament may be seen as something ordinary and everyday (water, bread or wine) that is sanctified by its use among the body of worshippers as something able to reveal the presence of the divine in the temporal. The sacraments were generally understood in Herbert's context in the Church of England to function in "Realist-Symbolist" terms - a two-pronged structure in which the "Realist" part suggests the actual presence of the divine, and the "Symbolist" part prevents any notion of an infallible definition or "containment" of the divine. To apply this interpretation of symbolism to Herbert's poems suggests that one may see his language as presenting the divine in the temporal, being a vehicle for divine presence, but not presuming to have an all-inclusive ability to define the eternal. This dissertation suggests that one of the chief reasons such an understanding of the sacraments may be applied to Herbert's poems, is because as the poems of

"The Church" they may be seen to be a product of the all-creating Logos - the Word Incarnate whose sacrificial death inaugurates both the Church and the sacraments. As a poet who tries to "spell" what he calls "Thy word" ("The Flower"), Herbert can be seen to invite the Logos to appropriate (take over and "dwell in") his Temple - both the temple of the poems (individually and collectively) and the "temple" of the poet himself.

Herbert's belief in such an appropriation, revealed in just one instance by his acceptance of God's writing the poem in his stead ("Assurance"), means that it may be possible to regard his poems as bearing divine reality, because their "word" participates in the Word. In doing so, they may be seen as performing a sacramental function by partaking of what they represent, and revealing it in the temporal. Such a "partaking" substantiates Coleridge's understanding of symbolic action as one in which the symbol partakes of the reality it renders intelligible, so that, in some way, the symbol shares the essence of the thing it symbolises. This suggests that the symbol (and Herbert's symbolic language in particular) may be accorded an "operative" quality that enables it to be a "bearer of divine reality" in the same way that the sacraments are held to be such bearers.

CHAPTER III

THE WORD COPIED

> "Wording it how but by him that present and past,
> Heaven and earth are word of, worded by? -"
>
> G.M. Hopkins, The Wreck of the Deutschland.

The previous two chapters endeavoured to show something of the importance for Herbert's poetry of the kind of thinking one may call analogical. The strong sense engendered in the poems of participation in a corporate life, particularly the life of the Body of Christ, the Church, suggests a frame of mind on the part of the poet that sees his poetry as sharing in the sacred life of the Church. Consequently, the poems may be seen as sharing in the analogy understood in the seventeenth-century to be prevalent between the Church and Christ, and both to creation. Such a participation in the Church's sacred life, and the correlative sharing in the analogical correspondence between the Church and creation (both perceived as creations of the divine) suggests, this dissertation proposes, that the poetry may be understood as sacramental. The individual poet's work may be seen to take much of its "life" and meaning from its sharing in the corporate experience of worship in the Church or "Temple", and as such may perform a function of uniting poet (and reader) with both the corporate body of worshippers and with God. Such a function may be understood as an "operative" one in which the poem can be seen as instrumental in uniting the individual poet with the Church, and

because the Church is the Body of Christ, the individual poet with Christ.

This chapter will concern itself with some of the ways in which such an "operative" function may be seen to work in Herbert's poems, and in what ways that function may be understood as sacramental. As has been suggested (see chapter I above), man's worship of God is not to be seen as an action generated exclusively by himself - God must inevitably supply what the human worshipper lacks. To offer one's poetry as an instrument of worship, then, (as Herbert may be seen to do) is in many ways to share in, or "copie" (in the phrase of "Jordan (II)"), what God has already supplied. If this is the case, then the poet may be seen to endeavour to copy divine revelation. Such a view is supported by Herbert's longing to "spell" God's "word" ("The Flower" p. 165), a Word which may be seen as the creating essence of the universe, revealed in the Incarnation and in creation. The first form of revelation has been considered in the previous chapters, and it remains to consider the impact of the second on Herbert's poems. There is, however, a third form of the revelation of the Word which is of equal importance - the Scriptures, which were generally regarded in Herbert's time, especially among Protestants, as a primary form of divine revelation. Herbert's concern with copying the Scriptures is evident from a poem like "Jordan (I)" (p. 56), where the closing words, "My God My King.", as a quotation from Scripture (see Ps. 5;2; 68:24; 84:3), are contrasted with the elaborate language of the rest of the poem. The implication is that the "plain" language (to use Herbert's phrase from the poem) of Scripture is the kind that is to be copied, in preference to the ornate "purling streams" (l. 8) of the language of the ars amatoria. This chapter will therefore be a con-

sideration of some of the ways Scripture and nature as, forms of revelation, may be seen to be copied by Herbert.

Two modes of thinking may be seen to have influenced the seventeenth-century understanding of the revelation of the divine in nature and in Scripture. The analogical frame of mind still prevalent at the time made allegory a mode of thought that remained available to the renaissance mind (see particularly Tuve (1952) and Lewalski (1979) among others), and may be seen to have influenced the understanding of revelation in creation, as well as the interpretation of Scripture. A related mode of thought, one forged into a poetic form in many of Herbert's poems, is the hieroglyph (see Summers 1954). It too may be seen to be based on a way of seeing reality as analogical, and as such may be interpreted as a way of copying the analogical correspondences perceived in creation. Both of these need to be considered, then, as ways in which Herbert may be seen to copy divine revelation as he may have interpreted it.

To suggest, however, that either of these could be material for Herbert's apparent effort to "copie" the divine, is immediately to become forced into dealing with the somewhat vexed problem of imitation in Herbert's verse. A constant question in the poems is <u>how</u> the poet will be able to do justice, both in his life and his writing, to God's grace. An equally constant realisation is that he cannot. "The Thanksgiving" (p. 35) addresses this problem with phrases such as "how shall I grieve for thee,/Who in all grief preventest me?", and "But how then shall I imitate thee, and/Copie thy fair, though bloudie hand?" "The Reprisall" (p. 36) suggests that "There is no dealing with thy mighty passion:" "Good Friday" (p. 38) asks "How shall I measure out thy bloud?/How shall I count what thee befell,/And each

praise thee, Lord! how should my rymes/Gladly engrave thy love in steel,".

These lines all suggest that two forms of imitation may be apparent in Herbert's poems. The first is the one common to most theory of poetry since Plato and Aristotle, that all poetry is a form of imitation in the sense that it reveals a verisimilitude to its subject. It becomes a medium through which the subject may be apprehended. A second sense, however, is suggested by the references to Christ's blood. They remind one that the goal of the Christian life may be seen as the imitation of Christ, one which includes an imitation of his suffering. The fact that Herbert is a Christian poet, then, suggests that these two strands may be brought together in his poems, because his expression as a poet may be seen to be a way in which he seeks to imitate in his life, the life of Christ. When he speaks about failures to imitate Christ properly, as he does in the poems quoted above, the implication is that he refers not only to his own life not being able to imitate the divine, but also his poetry.

The poet's inevitable failure to imitate Christ both in his life and in his poems may lead one to suggest that he holds the attempt at such an imitation to be fruitless and even wrong. Some scholars, one of the most recent being Richard Strier (1983), have endorsed this, suggesting that Herbert's final position is that imitation of Christ is impossible, and the attempt even sinful. Strier (1983:50) quotes Luther, who asserted "We will admit no examples, not even from Christ himself", and consequently suggests that "The Thanksgiving" is an example of a poem where Herbert ridicules the idea of imitation.

Other scholars, however, among them Rosemond Tuve (1959), have

suggested that one of Herbert's chief aims is imitatio Christi. Tuve (1959:318) emphasises that while Herbert never perceives the love relationship between himself and God as reciprocal, and that he may of his own strength achieve imitation, he nevertheless is constantly aware of that divine grace which has enabled him to be "in Christ", or to "put on Christ" in the Pauline term (Gal. 3:27) and therefore to be able to imitate him. The religious imitation of Christ is made possible by grace, and this suggests that the poetic imitation may have the same grace bestowed upon it. It is an imitation generated by the "participation" of God in man and man in God, brought about by the Incarnation. These two well-nigh diametrically opposed views of Herbert's attitude to imitatio Christi lead one to consider more closely some of the more prominent ideas concerning imitation, both religious and artistic, that were prevalent in Herbert's time.

The Platonic and Aristotelian ideas on the subject were perhaps most influential. Plato's conception of poetic imitation (mimesis) held considerable prominence in its Augustinian, Christianised form. Plato's theory that the artist merely imitates a reflection of true reality (The Republic X. 1.), that he works "at two removes" ("Jordan (I)", p. 56) from the ideal, may be seen to have been largely substantiated by Augustine's doctrine of use and enjoyment (De Doctrina Christiana, I.3). As Tuve (1959:305) has shown, the doctrine influenced St. Bernard, Richard Hooker and Herbert. From this point of view the things of the temporal world are to be used as means towards knowledge of the divine, but are not to be enjoyed for their own sake because they are temporal and therefore imperfect. Hooker uses the notion when he says "...it is not the possession of any good thing that can make them happy which have it, unless they enjoy the

thing whereof they are possessed. Then are we happy when fully we enjoy God ..." (Lawes, I. xi).

For Augustine, as for Plato, images are almost always images of an absolute reality made up of pure forms. There are two kinds of "verba" therefore, those which are man-made and conventional, and those which are the internal, silent words of the inner Teacher Christ. The first are to be used towards an achievement of the second which alone can truly be enjoyed, and which are in fact silent (De Magistro, III. 5-6, XI. 36ff.). Herbert's awareness of this epistemology is evident from "The Quidditie" (p. 70), where he refers to language as "That which while I use/I am with thee, and most take all." These words suggest a preference for the Platonic-Augustinian notion that the temporal can do little more than reflect the eternal. What they do not show, however, is the Reformation's characteristic leaning, perhaps most evident in Luther (and emphasised by Strier), towards a contempt for the "fallen" world of temporality and the equally "fallen" world of human reason - the kind that does not accept the possibility of poetry imitating the divine. The doctrine of use and enjoyment may be seen to place at least a fundamental, even though not an ultimate, value on the temporal, something which suggests that the two dominant strands of philosophy and theology in the seventeenth century (Augustine's Platonism and Aquinas's Aristotelianism), were not as clearly separable as it may sometimes be convenient to maintain.

In Hooker particularly, the Aristotelian valuing of the temporal is placed side by side a Platonic transcendentalism. Participation in God is the equivalent of "seek[ing] the highest", the "cause of all things" (Lawes, I.5.2.), at the same time that it is "as though our

verie flesh and bones ... be made continuate with his [Christ's]" (Lawes, V.56.7). This is not all that far off the Aristotelian theory of imitation. It is primarily imitation of men's actions (On the Art of Poetry, ch. 2), not so much of transcendental realities. While Plato takes exception to poetry as something removed from truth, Aristotle's answer is that in its concern with universal truths, poetry is more valuable than history, which is more concerned with particulars. Imitation of the temporal is therefore given equal standing side by side imitation of the transcendent.

In the Thomistic formulation there is "proportion" or analogy between the imitation and the original (ana - logon = "according to proportion"), and this too suggests an equal value accorded to temporal and transcendent. Aquinas holds (Ramsey, Ed., 44) that whenever a word is used analogically of a number of things, it is used because of some order or relation those things have to some central thing. Thus, one cannot explain what one means by a "healthy" diet without mentioning the health of the man of which it is the cause. Similarly, one must understand "healthy" as applied to a man before one can understand what is meant by a "healthy complexion", which is a symptom of that health. For Aquinas, knowledge of creatures enables man to refer to God (a concern central to Augustine's understanding of allegory and Scriptural interpretation, as will be seen later), because the only knowledge available is to be found in the temporal.

From this perspective, the divine Architect may be understood to have designed the universe analogically, according to a proportion derived from an elaborate set of correspondences which relate the temporal created in the "image" of God, to the transcendent. What is perhaps most important for the renaissance theory of imitation, how-

ever, is that despite the Platonic (and even Hebraic, which tended to see an unequivocal disjunction between divine and human) trend towards negation of artistic value, total negation and total disjunction between Creator and created never really hold full sway. They are inevitably offset by their Aristotelian counterpart. Even Augustine is unequivocal about beauty, which he holds to be a reflection of the divine, particularly of divine order. The world is God's poem (De Civitate Dei, XI. 18), and the beauty of creation derives from the beauty and arrangement of parts as does that of a poem (De Musica Sacra, VI.17.56). The artist contains the image of God in a special way because he continues God's work (Confessions, VII.7.11), and all beautiful objects, whether natural or artificial, are means towards the achievement of self-subsistent beauty (De Vera Religione, XXIV. 45). Augustine identifies beauty with symmetry, and symmetry, in the Platonic conception, is the top of the scale of being. Beauty and symmetry of things temporal are therefore able to be analogous, proportionate, even though in a depleted sense, to the beauty and symmetry which originally created and now sustains the universe. Whatever their differences theologically then, Augustine and Aquinas do share a largely common appreciation for the earthly as an ordered reflection of the divine. Each sees the earthly as a means to God, as an analogy of the divine to be copied and used, if not fully enjoyed for itself, at least accepted as a means of reaching the final goal - God.

Sir Thomas Browne takes much of this for granted when he argues in favour of art not being at odds with nature, and that nature is itself a servant of Providence. He says in Religio Medici (Patrides, Ed., 1977:81),

> Now nature is not at variance with art, nor art with nature; they being both the servants of his providence: Art is the perfection of Nature: Were the world now as it was the sixt day, there were yet a Chaos: Nature hath made one world, and Art another. In briefe, all things are artificiall, for nature is the Art of God.

This is an acceptance, as Patrides points out in his introduction to Browne's works (49-50), of the sacramental nature of language and art which "participates" in creation and the imparting of grace at the Incarnation, and in so doing may become, in Augustine's terms, "the visible sign of an invisible grace". Tuve (1947:36) has said much the same thing about the renaissance interpretation of art and nature; "the poet who imitates not the visible world but the intelligible as manifested in the visible will not consider that the use of artifice to emphasize form makes imagery less 'true to Nature'".

Browne is able, in Patrides' words (1977:50) imaginatively to "correlate words with The Word", and this is strongly suggestive of an acceptance of analogy between human words and the divine "Word". Rosalie Colie (1966:141) has suggested much the same in her discussion about the importance of the Logos in Herbert's poems. God's problem in creation, she says, was to make flesh of the Word. The poet's (as far as the seventeenth-century is concerned) is to make words of the flesh, and thereby imitate creation by actually turning it back upon itself and reworking it to its original. In other words, allowing one's own imperfect language to be "redeemed" by becoming part of God's perfect Word. For a poet like Herbert, whose model may be said to be divine love (Tuve, 1959:303), his words may be seen as offered not only as a participation in the gracious action of the divine, but also as part of the Art that reworks the old and disproportionate into something new, decorous and corresponding to the model of divine love.

Such a participation may be seen to make his poems "operative" in making the divine sacramentally present in the temporal.

> O smooth my rugged heart, and there
> Engrave thy rev'rend Law and fear;
> Or make a new one, since the old
> Is saplesse grown
> And a much fitter stone
> To hide my dust, then thee to hold. ("Nature", p. 45)

"Engrave" here implies as much the poet's creation as it does God's, and by inviting God to "make a new one", the poet is actually inviting him to make not only a (spiritually) new person, but also a new poem. The retrogression from sap (a living organism), to stone, to dust, becomes an implicit acknowledgement that nature, especially organic nature, is the model with which the poet must strive to achieve union, but it is a union he knows can only be achieved for him by a creator Who will recreate ("Engrave") what has lost its vigour. The very use (in the Augustinian sense), however, of the images of nature's growth, decay and rebirth (as in "The Flower" p.161) becomes an imitation of the natural model and a start towards achieving union with it. Also, God's chirographic action equally suggests the poet's willingness to have his "word" correlated (through grace) with the Word.

What has been said thus far suggests that Herbert and many of his contemporaries are able to value the temporal as revealing the divine, and by implication as possibly imitative of it. This forces one to disagree with the stringency of Richard Strier's argument in favour of a view that seventeenth-century Anglican writers like Herbert hold imitation of the divine to be an impossibility and a sin. Even among Protestants, there is evident an understanding of the natural reflecting or being analogous to the spiritual or divine - suggesting that the supposed divide between the two is not as prominent in the period

as Strier's argument may lead one to suppose. One of the most important instruments revealing such an analogy is held by at least one Protestant writer to be the Scriptures themselves. Henry Lukin's Introduction to the Holy Scripture (1669:101-102) stresses this idea.

> ... the Scriptures ... [show] the Analogy which is between Natural things, and Spiritual; and how the invisible things of God are clearly seen, and understood, from the things that are made, Rom 1:20.

This interpretation is supported by Barbara Lewalski (1979:86) who concludes in her examination of the Protestant influence on the interpretation of Scripture in the seventeenth-century, that for Protestant exegetes Scripture is generally understood to be grounded on some form of analogy between natural and spiritual things, with the Word itself giving apt and authoritative formulation to the analogies. Such a view suggests what may be seen as a fundamental form of poetic imitation for the religious poet of the seventeenth-century - the imitation of the Scriptures.

For virtually any Christian poet of the time, to copy the techniques and the concerns of the Scriptures would be one of the foremost ways of participating in God's Word, and therefore imitating his revelation. Such a view invites one to examine possible parallels between the probable exegetical methods of the time, and how a poet like Herbert may be seen to understand his own attempts at imitating the Scriptures. As suggested earlier, (p. 84) his attempt to imitate them is clear from a poem like "Jordan (I)" (p. 56), where he attempts to deal with the problem of what the appropriate style of writing ought to be for a Christian poet. The conclusion to the poem suggests that Herbert seeks to choose as his style the "plain" one of the Scriptures, free from unnecessary ornamentation; "I envie no mans

nightingale or spring;/Nor let them punish me with losse of rime,/Who plainly say, My God, My King." The emphasised words are a quotation from Scripture (see Ps. 5:2; 68:24; 84:3), so that one is invited to conclude that, for Herbert, the language of Scripture is one of those he seeks most to "copie" (in the phrase of "Jordan (II)" p. 102) as a revelation of the divine. How the seventeenth-century interpreted Scriptural language, however, is not an uncontroversial issue.

Perhaps the most important question in this regard is the extent to which Protestants like Herbert and his contemporaries may have been influenced by the Reformers' emphasis on the literal meaning of a text over its possible figurative or allegorical meanings, or whether they were still influenced by the mediaeval thinking that deemed it quite acceptable, and even essential, to allegorise Scriptural texts. As Barbara Lewalski has shown (1979:6-7) both groups can be seen to use Augustine's exegetical methods as a basis. Protestant exegetes would tend to stress Augustine's emphasis on the value of the literal event the Scripture recorded, whereas the Mediaevals tended to stress the allegorical interpretations based on the literal event. For Augustine, words are "things" (res) which point to a greater reality (Mazzeo, 5). This applies as much to ordinary reality as to language. As Erich Auerbach (1953:171) has said, for Augustine "The world beyond ... is God's design in active fulfillment. In relation to it, earthly phenomena are on the whole merely figural, potential, and requiring fulfillment." This leads Augustine into a "twofold" method of exegesis in which he is able to emphasise both the literal, historical event spoken of by the Scripture, at the same time that he is able to allegorise its meaning as something "spiritual". A famous "snake allegory" is a case in point. Augustine allegorises the snake (De

Doctrina Christiana, II. xvi) as the Body of Christ, suggesting that just as the snake is seen to protect its head at the expense of its body, so the Church (the body), should suffer for its Head (Christ).

An important antecedent to his emphasis on the literal is, as Auerbach has shown (63), the Incarnation. Christ's advent as a lowly man, and the often colloquial nature of the gospel narratives, were seen as incompatible with the classical notion of the separation of "higher" and "lower" styles. To copy the style of the Scriptures is therefore to copy the "lower" and more "plain" (to use Herbert's term) of the styles.

The reformers emphasised the literal text, and denounced the kind of allegorising that seemed to them to have no foundation in the text itself. Lewalski suggests that Augustine's notion of words as "things" which point through a system of correspondences to a greater reality (De Doctrina, I. xxxvi. xl) was reworked by the reformers. "The movement is through the words to a silent, intuitive grasp of divine reality", she says (75) of Augustine's theory, and adds that the reformers eschewed any notion of an "intuitive" grasp of reality because it could lead to the arbitrary allegorising prevalent in the Scholasticism they were reacting against. This means that the reformers adopted Augustine's concern for the literal text and largely rejected his sense of the "intuitive" which led to the adding of, as it were, extra-Biblical allegorical meanings. Applied to Herbert, this leads Lewalski to the suggestion that he understands the events and figures (people) of Scripture more literally than allegorically with the result that the individual speaker can be seen as a figura either of Christ, or more particularly (because Protestantism would not easily support the imitatio Christi), of a new covenant version of the

Psalmist David (301-302). As "copies" of the Scriptures, Herbert's poems are to be read as a new version of the "Song of Songs", an allegory (permissible in this sense, because the "Song of Songs" is usually read as an allegory, so that the poet is not adding to the Scriptures what does not seem to be there) of the relationship between Christ and every elect soul, and as reconstructions of the poetic forms of complaint, lament and praise found in the Psalter (300).

In order to consider the value of this perspective more closely, it is important to examine the primary mediaeval method of exegesis and its possible influence on Herbert. Such an examination will go some way towards facilitating a decision about whether Herbert may be seen to understand imitation of Scripture in stringently Protestant terms, or whether a more hybridised form of exegesis, blending with the allegorism of the Scholastics, is evident in his thinking. The traditional mediaeval four-fold method of Scriptural interpretation (see Aquinas, Summa Theologica, I. Q. 1, Art. 10) holds that the text is interpreted as having a literal meaning, a tropological or moral meaning, an allegorical meaning, and an anagogical or spiritual meaning. Hence, in the case of John Cassian (ca. 370-435) for instance, the city of Jerusalem may be interpreted four ways. According to history it is the city of the Jews, according to allegory it is the Church of Christ, according to tropology it is the soul of man, and according to anagogy it is the city of God in heaven (see Lynch, 220f.). While the literal meaning of a text is valued, it is nevertheless not regarded as the final or full meaning. The system of analogical correspondences prevalent in the thought of the time invites a search for further moral, spiritual or allegorical insights, based on the idea that most things are analogous to one another. This

form of exegesis supports the value of literal objects as a help with interpreting Scripture, in the way used by Augustine with the snake allegory.

Closely related to this is the accepted similarity between words and things. The use of words as "things" revealing hidden and transcendental meanings, could lead to the prevalence of the Augustinian doctrine of difficulty and pleasure. Pleasure in interpretation, suggests Augustine (De Doctrina, II. vi. 8; IV. vii. 15) is gained only through difficulty, and difficulty is primarily achieved through a use of the figurative as a means of interpreting the literal. As Bernard Huppe (1959:16) puts it, the "'aesthetic moment' comes when the shell has been with difficulty opened to reveal the contents". The "shell" of the figurative, for Augustine, needs to be broken before the "kernel" of literal meaning can be attained.[1] This means that Augustine sees the "beauty" of the figurative as existing in a completely functional relationship with "truth". The difficulty of interpreting the figurative is a way of reaching the "truth" of meaning, which is pleasurable. The combined action of finding truth through difficulty and pleasure is, then, a form of attaining beauty.

The question is whether this kind of "four-fold" thinking is evident in Herbert, and whether any of his poems may be seen to use the Augustinian difficulty/pleasure aesthetic. Once again, the "Jordan" poems suggest themselves, because it is there that Herbert perhaps most obviously seeks to come to terms with imitation of the divine and of Scripture in particular. While each poem stresses the importance

---

1 For a discussion of this idea in Augustine, see Bernard F. Huppe, Doctrine and Poetry, (New York:1959) 16ff.

of copying what is, in the phrase of the second, "readie penn'd" (suggesting Scripture and creation), the poems themselves are by no means as straightforward as they tend to suggest poetry ought to be. Not only do they themselves demand some careful deciphering, but their titles are in many ways riddles which need to be "cracked" before the full meaning may be appreciated. The phrase is not immediately understandable in the context of the poem, so that it becomes a puzzle to be deciphered, and as such lives up to the Augustinian difficulty/pleasure formula of exegesis. Probably the most obvious way to decipher the title is by considering the figurative meanings inherent in it, all of which originate in Scripture.

Apart from the literal river itself, Jordan suggests the entry to the Promised Land (Josh. 3 & 4), physical healing because of the curing in the river of Naaman's leprosy (2 Kings 5:10), and the spiritual healing of baptism, especially that performed by John the Baptist (Matt. 3, Mark 1:5, Luke 3:3). The Jordan then becomes a figure for the proper kind of holiness and spiritual purity, but it is only so because of the figurative meanings placed on the literal object, meanings undeniably similar to the spiritual, allegorical and moral ones suggested by the four-fold method of Scriptural exegesis. Allegorically the Jordan is both the entrance to the Promised Land (as it was literally) as well as to the New Covenant Church (through baptism). Morally (tropologically), it becomes a figure for the cleansed soul, and spiritually (anagogically), a figure for the "promised land" of eternity. One may not see this as plain language, but as far as Herbert is concerned he is using the language of the Scriptures and doing nothing more than he promised to do in "The Thanksgiving" (p. 5, ll. 45-47), turning it back on God.

The presence in these poems of both a sense of the value for a literal object (Jordan) and its possible figurative meanings suggests a more all-inclusive Augustinian approach to reality that reads it essentially in terms of the "Realist-Symbolism" that is the basis of Augustine's interpretation of the sacraments. It values the literal, but it is also prepared to range across the breadth of analogical correspondences in an endeavour to perceive greater spiritual insights. The poet is able to do this because he believes it is the way the Bible understands reality - a sacramental way that sees both the Scripture (and therefore the poem which copies them) as making present the divine in the temporal. Herbert may therefore be seen to hold in tension a Protestant emphasis on the literal and a more Scholastic regard for the value of possible figurative meanings that may be found in the Biblical text. This suggests a regard not only for the text as a revelation of the divine, but also of ordinary "things", so that the poetry, by imitating Scripture, may be seen to support Henry Lukin's assertion quoted earlier, that the Scriptures reveal the analogy between natural and spiritual realities.

The importance of the figurative in the understanding of the Scriptures is, in many ways, the subject of the two poems on the Scriptures, "The H. Scriptures (I)" and "The H. Scriptures (II)", (p. 58). Herbert's poems can be seen to work in much the way they suggest the Scriptures do.

> Ladies, look here; this is the thankfull glasse
> That mends the lookers eyes: this is the well
> That washes what it shows (I:ll. 8-10)

Scripture is only figuratively a "glasse" as it is only figuratively "thankfull", but its figurative nature becomes used as an "embodiment" of reality (the looker) outside itself. In other words, by being a

metonymy for the looker, the Scriptures as a mirror not only reflect, but change what they reflect, completely overwhelming the looker's literal reality by their own figurative one. To look into their "mirror" is to be "mended" because their nature is such that anyone who is able to see his reflection in them would be aware of his inadequacy and would therefore be taking the first step towards "mending".

The same applies to the well image, where the "unclean" person would not be able to see himself reflected in the water or well of the Scriptures, only the person who is ready to be "washed" could. This means that the Scriptures as a figurative reflection of the person "looking" actually become the only reality by which the person, a literal entity, is judged. Also, the poem's suggestion that words are the equivalent of water, places the burden of meaning on the figurative by implying that the Scriptures (and the poem, since "here" in the opening line suggests the poem as well as the Scriptures) act in a sacramental way by "washing" what they come into contact with. In the same way that the Scriptures work by opposing their figurative reality to man's literal one, so does the poem, and this not only allows the poem a "sacred" function as part of the "Temple", but also suggests that its figurative nature draws the "looker" or reader into it in the same way the Scriptures do, living up to the assertion in "Perirrhanterium" (p. 6) that "A verse may finde him, who a sermon flies,/and turn delight into a sacrifice".

A similar "operative" quality is evident in the language of the second "H. Scriptures" sonnet, one which suggests a reflective relationship between Scripture and poem which may be seen to make the poem very much a window through which the divine is perceived, but also a mirror in which the divine is reflected. In doing so it fulfils

Coleridge's demand of a symbol being something both in and through which reality is revealed.

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

The relationship between Scriptures and poet is one of mutual interpretation and parallelism, but the only way this mutuality is achieved is by the Scripture "opposing", "finding out" the poet and restructuring his reality. The poem can be seen to perform virtually the same function, because it is offered as a reflection of the reflective relation between Scripture and poet. The Scriptures, by offering figurative parallels which interpret the poet's existence for him, do just what the poem does, because it offers figurative parallels which interpret both the actions of the Scripture and the poet, "make me understood". The poem, then, becomes the focal point in a three-dimensional relationship between Scripture interpreting poet, poet's life interpreting Scripture, and poem interpreting both by being an emanation from a life which is a reflection of the Word of Scripture. As with so much of Herbert's poetry, object and subject, cause and effect, become blurred as the mimesis becomes more pronounced.

Herbert's use of figurative and allegorical modes in his style of "copying" Scripture suggests his acceptance of an analogy not only between the Word of Scripture and the words of his poems, but also between his language and creation, since a use of the four-fold method of exegesis such as that revealed in the Jordan poems suggests the prevalence in his writing of the analogical world-view which sees the earthly as corresponding in some way to the divine. This in turn suggests that his use of the figurative, and particularly the allegor-

ical, may be seen as a way of "copying" divine creation, because in many ways allegory may be seen to depend, as will be shown, on an understanding of reality as supportive of analogical correspondences. A closer examination of Herbert's use of allegory, then, will go some way towards revealing the extent to which he takes for granted the analogical world-view, and the extent to which one may regard his use of allegory as sacramental.

Allegory is a symbolic mode that may be understood to share the same sign/signified relationship that any symbol does. It is also metaphorical, or, in the rhetorical terms of the Renaissance used by Rosemond Tuve (1947:105ff.), it is a "continued metaphor", because it exhibits the normal relation of concrete to abstract found in metaphor, but takes the shape of a series of particulars with further meanings. In other words the complete allegory is a series of metaphors, even though the central metaphor remains the same. It thus becomes a continuation and enlargement of metaphor. The allegory of the body in Coriolanus I.1. is a good example, where the central metaphor is the body for the state, but other ideas are attached to it, such as "storehouse", "shop", "river", "court" and "seat". "Love unknown" (p. 129) serves as an example in Herbert, where the heart is an allegorical synecdoche for both the body and soul, but the figure is only used as a base on which to develop other, more complex ideas. Allegory then becomes, in the words of the Renaissance rhetorician Henry Peacham[2], a "constellation", whereas metaphor is only a "star".

Of importance for the relation between allegory and analogy, as

---

2 Henry Peacham, The Garden of Eloquence (1593:27). Cited by Warren Taylor, Tudor Figures of Rhetoric, (Wisconson:1972) 65.

well as allegory and sacramentalism, however, is the sense of "physicality" that may be seen in many allegories because of their concentration on a specific physical image as the embodiment of a moral or spiritual meaning. In Herbert, this may be seen to be evident in a number of forms, but a preliminary example that will be considered at length later is "The Church-floore" (p. 66). Here the abstract idea "Patience" is given what may be termed an "embodiment" in the phrase "square & speckled stone", and that sense of embodiment is intensified when the stone becomes further suggestive of the people of the Church. Similarly, in "The Pilgrimage" (p. 141), the allegory "cave of Desperation", both personifies "cave", and reduces the abstract idea "Desperation" to a concrete ("physical") image. In both these instances the allegory may be seen to work in a reductive way, stressing the physical and the temporal as an embodiment of the abstract.

By "reductive" is meant that whereas a symbol, be it public or personal, is full of a plethora of meanings, allegory often focusses sharply on a single, closely defined meaning, in many cases a moral one which is given "embodiment" in an image of something physical like a stone or a cave. The analogy between abstract and concrete is maintained, but the reach of reference may be reduced to a particular idea, more often than not one which pronounces the physical aspect of the image at the same time that it imposes a moral meaning on it. Allegory, then, may be seen as in many ways the language of the temporal, because its emphasis tends to be strictly on the physical apprehension of an abstract idea. Far from being anti-sacramentalist, this may be seen to encourage a sacramental view of reality and of the poetry that depicts it, because the emphasis on the physical suggests an understanding of the temporal, and the allegorical image, as being

analogous to, or "containing" the abstract idea. This is supported by the way in which the allegory implicitly accepts its own moral standpoint as correct and as bearing divine "truth", and in a sense appropriates for itself what may be called a "sacralising" function by forcing all other perspectives into its own - the same way that the "Temple" (in all its relevant forms) may be seen to do.

However paradoxical it may seem, the imposition of specific meaning on the allegorical figure is an implicit acceptance of the broad-ranging set of analogies the allegorist sees as inherent to existence. Meaning may be said to be discovered, but it is, in many ways, discovered in an imposition, and while this may lead to a questioning of its value, the allegorist surmounts this problem by simply ignoring it. He refuses to explain his apparently arbitrary impositions of meaning, and does not see the need to, because the imposition is based on an accepted system of correspondences which he expects everyone to share. The result is that most allegory works chiefly in the context of a fixed moral or philosophical framework. The poet makes comparisons and attaches moral significance to them without really being exploratory. He can do this, however, largely because of the fixed framework, and this suggests that he perceives an analogy between image and moral idea, and expects the reader to accept what is presented, without the need for explanation.

Such an interpretation of reality may justly be termed "sacramental", because it implicitly accepts an "operative" role for the allegorical image which can be seen as both containing in itself the analogy perceived between temporal and divine, concrete and abstract, at the same time that it can be seen to "make present" (as a sacrament is held to do) the eternal by imposing itself as the only "correct"

reality. In the allegorical world the concrete entity, be it heart, or stone or church floor, becomes a sign of a greater signified reality, a sacramental connection imposed by the poet but implicitly accepted by the reader. There is thus a widening of the scope of analogical relationships in allegory because the poet implicitly suggests that however outlandish the analogies may be, they are nevertheless true and are outlandish only to limited human perspectives.

The emphasis in allegory of the physical suggests a world-view in which the physical and spiritual are co-terminous, and this is much of what Helen Vendler (1975:60) means when she suggests in a discussion of "Love (III)" (p. 188) that Herbert is cavalier with his allegory, because he feels free to "give away" his "sentence" by having "dust" and "sin" be co-terminous with one another. Instead of "dust" figuring "sin", Herbert presents the two simultaneously, so that the reader can hardly decide where the locus of reality lies in the poem. It is this particularly that makes Herbert's use of allegory an integral part of his participation in the Logos. Figurative meanings become so clipped and specific in their reference to a particular moral assertion, that they are reduced almost to the realm of the literal, so that the analogy between image and idea, sign and signified becomes well-nigh "physicalised" in a way suggestive of sacramentalism. The picture of divine reality imposed upon the subject, because of its strict and almost literalising application, may be seen to take on the reality bearing property of a sacrament. While opposing the divine to the natural, the allegory nevertheless offers itself as the only viable reality and in doing so becomes a means by which the divine is incarnated in the natural.

"Love-joy" (p. 116) shows how this works, even to the point where

the speaker's "misreading" of the allegorical picture printed in the window becomes the equivalent (because of the divine imposing itself upon the natural) of a correct reading.

> As on a window late I cast mine eye,
> I saw a vine drop grapes with J and C
> Anneal'd on every bunch. One standing by
> Ask'd what it meant. I, who am never loth
> To spend my judgement, said, It seem'd to me
> To be the bodie and letters both
> Of Joy and Charitie. Sir, you have not miss'd,
> The man reply'd; It figures JESUS CHRIST.

As Vendler suggests (70), had the bystander said "Sir, you are wrong", he would have maintained the opposition between divine and natural, but by saying "Sir, you have not miss'd", he implies that continuity by which one can see heaven through the window, an idea furthered in "The Elixir" (p. 184). The lack of opposition (which, paradoxical though it is, seems almost imposed), means that the natural object (grapes), its pictorial presentation in art (the window), its moral or tropological meaning (Joy and Charity), and its divine import or spiritual meaning (Jesus Christ), all inhabit a continuum. Here again, the alignment of interpretation meets that of the four-fold exegetical method. Literal, allegorical, moral and spiritual meanings are not to be separated, so that the poem actually becomes "the bodie and the letters both" (l. 16), figuring both its own self, the "letters", and Jesus Christ, as well as Joy and Charity. In the form of the Logos, the Word (Christ) both creates (poet and poem) and is the Product of its own creation (Christ and poem). Subject and object become blurred in a single essence.

In many ways, this is the result of the fact that the strict one-to-one relation in most of Herbert's allegory between image and meaning, with its correlative lack of ambiguity and imposition of a moral

framework, may be sseen to make the physical plane on which the image works, the "embodiment" of what it figures. In general, the allegory may be seen to impose a kind of physical substantiveness based on the reduction of an image to a specific moral meaning, while ordinary metaphor is more exploratory and less definitive. This kind of imposition and resultant "embodiment" of meaning are evident in "The Church-floore" (p. 66). "Mark you the floore? that square & speckled stone, /Which looks so firm and strong,/ Is Patience:" (ll. 1-3). While the stone is given the fixed allegorical meaning "Patience", that meaning is imposed in the face of a number of other symbolical allusions inherent in "stone". It takes on the exploratory range common to any fullblown symbol, because it refers not only to the building, but also, in the context of the poem, to the people worshipping in it. Moreover, the various Biblical allusions inherent in "stone" cannot be ignored. It suggests the tablets on which the Mosaic covenant was written (Deut. 9), it suggests Christ as the Cornerstone of the Church (Ps. 118:22; Isa. 28:16;Eph. 2:20; 1 Pet. 2:6), as well as Peter the Rock on which the Church is built (Matt. 16:18), and Christ the typological Rock following Moses and the Israelites in the desert (1 Cor. 10:4). It equally suggests the stones that will cry out God's truth if no human words will (Luke 19:40). The stone may be seen to represent, therefore, both the structure and the function of the Church. All these meanings Herbert reduces to a single explanation, "Patience"; an act which appears both arbitrary and presumptuous, but which nevertheless reveals a complete confidence in his own perception of and participation in the moral scheme he espouses. By reducing the ambiguity inherent in the image to a personification, Herbert fixes the symbol's action in the poem's particular moral framework, and

thereby makes it the embodiment of the moral. To use Henry Vaughan's term, it becomes a "bodied idea", completely self-supporting. Without the wider symbolic references that go to make up the exploratory aspects of the poem, the reduction to an acceptance of the moral ascendancy represented by the allegory would not be possible. The closing couplet is therefore fully justified. "Blest be the Architect, whose art/Could build so strong in a weak heart.", transfers all the action to the human heart and forces the poet to give up his exploratory sensibility in favour of a more fixed scope of reference ordered by an "Architect" who is not the poet himself.

The analogical frame of mind that is able to use the formal parallels evident in allegory between image and idea, is the frame of mind that could easily take the formalisation a step further, into a visual one. This is particularly the case when the poem is seen in the analogical thinking of the renaissance as a copy of a divinely ordered and carefully structured reality. Joseph Summers (1954:82) has called this frame of mind "hieroglyphic", in which sensible images "shadow" divine reality. Summers's idea is close to what has been discussed as the essence of allegory in Herbert's poems, because the concentration by the poet on formal structures figuring divine creation is, in fact, a way of reducing the exploratory sensibility to a fixed structure regarded, in Platonic terms, as an image of the perfect Idea. Summers (145) defines the hieroglyph in Herbert as

> ... a fusion of the spiritual and the material, of the rational and the sensuous, in the essential terms of formal relationships. ... to Herbert the hieroglyph did not exist as a total mystery or as isolated beauty, but as a beauty and mystery which were decipherable and related to all creation.

This is strongly suggestive of the analogical correspondences which

may be seen at work in Herbert. The religious poet using the hieroglyphic technique sees little or no difference between form and content, and sees both as a reflection of, and as the present discussion will endeavour to show, an embodiment of, divine reality. As an allegorical method, the hieroglyph makes physical and/or rhythmic shape a symbol for meaning, and in doing so may be seen as similar to Augustine's allegorical method which, as seen already, regards the whole world as a set of symbols of the divine, a sublime poem whose words are things, and whose silent voice is the voice of its creator (De Civitate Dei, XI. 18). Earthly reality is a copy of the divine, but it is in a code, in Augustine's terms, which must be "cracked". To copy it is to produce a poem whose "code" or "shell" is to be "cracked".

This makes the hieroglyphic poem, and particularly the shaped one, an example of a largely Augustinian aesthetic which sees an intimately functional relationship between external form and internal meaning. A poem such as "The Call" (p. 156) offers a repetitive rhythmic code whose structure is, in many ways, responsible for its meaning.

> Come, my Way, my Truth, my Life:
> Such a Way as gives us breath:
> Such a Truth as ends all strife:
> Such a Life, as killeth death. (ll. 1-4)

The repetition not only suggests a liturgical, prayer-like rhythm, but it builds the sense of urgent imploring suggested by the title. The structure therefore becomes an image in itself, not only picturing but also containing meaning. To understand the rhythm is to understand the poem, to crack its code. The formal relationship between image and idea is even more pronounced in the shaped poems such as "The

Altar" (p. 26) and "Easter-wings" (p. 43). Summers (140) describes carefully the rationale behind their forcefully visual structures.

> In "The Altar" and "Easter-wings" Herbert extended the principle of the hieroglyph to a third level. If the natural or religious hieroglyph was valuable as content (used either as the object the poem explained or as the image which crystallized the meaning of the poem), and if the poem could be constructed as a formal hieroglyph which mirrored the structural relationships between natural hieroglyph, the poem and the individual's life, it was but a further step to make the poem a visual hieroglyph, to create it in the shape which formed an immediately apparent image relevant both to content and structure.

Angus Fletcher (175-177) calls the shaped poem a "summation scheme", which rounds off or closes the rhythmic code, an optic device which completes the ritual created by the fixed rhythmic structure. Such a poetic form may be seen as a well-nigh unparalleled reduction of the exploratory to a specific shape, and as such one which claims for itself an almost supreme role as a "copy" of the divine. As an aspect of allegory, it may be interpreted as being a "copy" of Scripture which is interpreted allegorically. It may be more profitably seen, though, as a "copy" of divine creation, because the shape specifically figures an aspect of creation. Herbert's "The Altar" (p. 26) is reductive in the sense that it works more on a picture language than on the logical progression of ideas. The conclusion of the argument is present in the shape of the poem, and the shape is immediately apparent, so that it pre-empts, as it were, any argument the poem can offer. The premise, therefore, is (almost syllogistically) the answer, and the poem becomes allegorical not only because its moral is reduced to a physical plane, but also because the concentration of ideas into shape limits their symbolic range to such an extent that they reach a one-to-one relation.

The figurative becomes literalised to the point of extremity, and both language and shape point so unambiguously to each other that the poem as symbol chiefly symbolises itself. Metaphysical idea or moral "O let thy blessed SACRIFICE be mine,/And sanctifie this ALTAR to be thine" (ll. 15-16), and their physical presentation become wholly inseparable. The altar is "this ALTAR" (my emphasis), the poem itself, and by implication the speaker's sacrifice then becomes the poem itself. The result is a fusion of the physical with the linguistic that makes the words of the poem and its shape so much an embodiment of their meaning that it is difficult not to see the poem as sacramentally "operative" in presenting the divine. Heart, altar and frame are fused in the shape of the poem's words. "Wherefore each part/Of my hard heart/Meets in this frame,/To praise thy Name:" (ll. 9-12), suggests that Herbert drives his language to the point where it not only defines the parameters of existence, but actually participates (to use the sacramental term) in fulfilling existence. In other words, it may be read as an effect and a definition of experience, but also, by being a means to its fulfilment, a cause of it. This is something of what Barbara Harman (188) means when she suggests that "The Altar" is the poem with "greater physical presence" than any other in The Temple".

> But the crucial premise of the poem is the absolute equation that has been effected between the speaker's body and his verse (the stones of the altar are the pieces of the heart), crucial because it represents the complete collapse of the distinction between narrator and narrative work ...

She means by "equation" what Rosemary Freeman (1967:27) means by "identification", and the idea is particularly important for the sacramentalism of hieroglyphic poems where the shape signifies meaning.

This poem, like other "hieroglyphic" poems such as "Easter-wings" (p. 43), "Deniall" (p. 79) and "The Collar" (p. 153) among others, reveals a functional relationship between form and meaning of the kind that Augustine (as has been shown) sees as both essential to true beauty and to an understanding of universal order. The poem may therefore be seen as a "copie" of divine creation - even more than this, it can be seen as an act of divine creation since it is "thy hand" (God's) that is the "frame" and, by implication, the framer (l. 3). This invites one to see the poem as a product of the Logos, a notion supported by the fact that it may equally be seen as a "copie" of the Scriptures. Hardly a phrase in the poem is not taken from Scripture, as Fish (1972:210), Summers (142) and Vendler (63) all point out. Obvious references are Exodus 20:25, Deuteronomy 27:2-5; 2 Samuel 24:18, Psalm 51:17, Luke 19:40 and 2 Corinthians 3:3. While this does not mean that the poem is based wholly on traditional material, it does mean that Herbert is able to see his words as a copy of the Word of Scripture, and therefore as something both signifying and sharing in the Logos.

There are, however, more specifically allegorical modes which help to shape the hieroglyphic poem. Fletcher (151ff.) suggests that allegorical symbolism takes two specific forms, battle and progress. Both of these are evident in Herbert, and both may be seen to serve as ways of making his poetry a sacramental hieroglyph of divine reality. The progress motif is most commonly represented in literature by the quest or journey. Two obvious examples in Herbert are "The Pilgrimage" (p. 141) and "Redemption" (p. 40), both of which extend the idea of a physical journey into that of a spiritual one. It is the spiritual quest which is often most prominent, certainly in Herbert, and in

this sense even such poems as "The Collar" (p. 153) can be regarded as allegorical.

One of the most important facets of the progress motif, however, is its ritualistic form. The catalogue of metaphors in "Prayer (I)" (p. 51) is a progression from generalised impression to a more specific "something understood". It is also a ritualistic progression, which moves from one aspect of Church experience to another with a sufficiently incantatory rhythm to suggest that it is to be, like most liturgical prayer, regularly repeated. The final statement need not be understood as eternally absolute. Even so, Herbert seldom uses the progress and ritual motif on its own. It is almost always joined with the battle motif, a common style in allegory. Debate and dialogue are the most prominent structures of the battle motif, and the effect of their use is not exactly one of ritual (although it does not rule it out), but rather one of symmetry, stasis and balance. Fletcher (159) suggests that whereas ritual implies continuous unfolding movement, symmetry and balance suggest stasis - conflict caught at a given moment in time. The psychomachic battle in a poem such as "Justice (I)" (p. 95) may therefore be heightened by the symmetrical juxtaposition of words such as "make" and "woundest", "wound" and "relieve", but is controlled and led to resolution by the ritual progression the poem offers.

> I cannot skill of these thy wayes.
> Lord, thou didst make me, yet thou woundest me;
> Lord, thou dost wound me, Yet thou dost relieve me:
> Lord, thou relievest, yet I die by thee:
> Lord, thou dost kill me, yet thou dost reprieve me.

The structural opposition, combined with the ritual (both depicted in the repeated "yet"), may be seen as another form of poetic reductionism, because the poet is in fact reducing a very complex moral dilemma

- the opposing moral frameworks that cause so much difficulty between man and God - to a clearly defined rhythm that gives an ordered structure to something by nature disordering. This is in many ways a form of the deus ex machina that Fletcher (148-150) shows is essential to allegory. The divine, in a sense, imposes his own form or will on the conflict and the language expressing it, or in Fletcher's terms (150), the allegory is "structured according to ritualistic necessity, as opposed to probability,". The ritual represents a shape willingly imposed upon the conflict, and as such becomes a hieroglyph not only imitating divine order, but holding itself to be part of it.

The poem may therefore be seen to work by contraries in a way similar to Herbert's understanding of the Scriptures, as revealed in his two "H. Scripture" sonnets (see above pp. 99-101). It also adheres to an Augustinian tradition which sees the universe as "an exquisite poem set off with antitheses" - so that the poem may be said to be copying divine order. Augustine says in Dei Civitate Dei, XI. 18.,

> As, then, these oppositions of contraries lend beauty to the language, so the beauty of the course of this world is achieved by the opposition of contraries, arranged, as it were, by an eloquence not of words, but of things. This is quite plainly stated in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, in this way: "Good is set against evil, and life against death: So is the sinner against the godly. So look upon all the works of the Most High, and these are two and two, one against another".

One need hardly say that such a concern with contraries is as much Pauline as it is Augustinian, as is suggested by Romans 7:15ff. "I do not understand my actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate .... For I do not do the good I want, But the evil I do not want is what I do." (RSV) Herbert's structure may therefore be seen as both a "copying" of Scripture and the acceptance of a deus

ex machina.

Fletcher (172-174) observes a further aspect of allegory which is important to the Augustinian aesthetic Herbert may be seen to use. He calls it "rhythmic encoding", and suggests that the author of an allegory does not communicate only by content but also by rhythm. The repeated rhythm or ritualistic repetition establishes an "iconographic" code which is deciphered on the basis of a knowledge gained from the repetition. One hears strains of Augustine's emphasis on difficulty and pleasure gained through "decoding" or "cracking the shell" when Fletcher says "such techniques cue the reader to think in terms of riddles. The technique is formal; the content is not especially enigmatic in itself" (174). This kind of formality is found in "Trinitie Sunday" (p. 68), a poem to which the Augustinian idea of pleasure or truth gained from the difficulty of solving the riddle set by the rhythmic code is usefully applied.

> Lord, who hast form'd me out of mud,
> And hast redeem'd me through thy bloud,
> And sanctifi'd me to do good;
>
> Purge all my sinnes done heretofore:
> For I confesse my heavie score,
> And I will strive to sinne no more.
>
> Enrich my heart, mouth, hands in me,
> With faith, with hope, with charitie;
> That I may runne, rise, rest with thee.

The fixed rhythm and rhyme scheme, coupled with the tripartite stanza structure, form a code whose structure and shape actually figure the subject of the poem - the Trinitie. To engage the poem is to "decode" the rhythm and discover which line refers to the action of the Father, which to that of the Son and which to the Holy Spirit. In the first stanza each line refers to each respectively. The code also works as a form of resolution, however. The fixed structure suggests

both balance or stasis and progressive ritual, and both are instrumental in the presentation and resolution of the individual's struggle to be incorporated into God. The sense of battle is depicted in the clipped, confessionary use of words, and the balance of ideas ("purge", "confesse", "strive") which suggests conflict caught in a given moment in time. However, the ritualistic code set up by the rhythm leads simultaneously to resolution because it controls the agon by affording a carefully ordered structure through which it can be fought. Furthermore, by using incantation the poet extends an individualistic struggle onto the level of the communal and thereby creates a further sense of resolution. It is similar to the liturgical rhythmic code which resolves the conflict in "Peace" (p. 125).

> Take of this grain, which in my garden grows,
> And grows for you;
> Make bread of it: and that repose
> And peace, which ev'ry where
> With so much earnestnesse you do pursue,
> Is only there. (ll. 37-42)

The Eucharistic allusion (to the language of the Book of Common Prayer) resolves the individual's struggle by placing upon it the fixed rhythmic code of communal experience recorded in the liturgy. Both poems may therefore be understood as "copies". The one enacts in its structure an aspect of the relation between the members of the Trinity, and the other copies the words of Scripture used in liturgical worship.

Two syntactic structures are of particular importance to the progress and battle motifs, especially as they are revealed in the form of rhythmic encoding. Fletcher (162) suggests that parataxis "the structuring of sentences such that they do not convey any distinctions of higher or lower order", in which there are few relative

clauses or subordinating conjunctions, is a syntactic means by which ritualistic progression is achieved. Another technique often supporting the ritualistic is anaphora, in which "rhythm ... works ... against the expression of fact, and instead creates a sort of incantatory sermon," (169). Both are important Biblical modes of speech, and their use by a poet like Herbert is evidence of an intention to copy Biblical models. That parataxis is an important Biblical mode is emphasised by Thomas Merrill (1976:15). "God talk", he says

> can often be detected by its "open" texture. Its surface is often literally riddled with holes - gaping caesuras, lacunae, pregnant pauses and mysterious omissions. Carl Michaelson [The Hinge of History, (NY,1959) 35] has called these holes "paratactic gaps" because they witness a deficiency of connectives. ... In the Bible, for example, we find statements like: "God said, Let there be light! And there was light"; "Once I was blind. Now I see". The gaps in the middle of these assertions are repositories of religious mystery. They defy conceptual analysis at the same time they invite interpretation.

As a specifically Biblical mode of speech, parataxis is equally important for St. Augustine (see Confessions, I. 8; De Doctrina Christiana, 4. 18; De Civitate Dei, 15-18). As Erich Auerbach (1953:62-63) has pointed out, the classical hypotactic or "higher" style lost its precedence over the paratactic "lower" or "plain" style when Scripture, which used the paratactic, came to be regarded as the most fundamental document of all.

> Parataxis serves Augustine to express the impulsive and dramatic, most often in matters concerning the inner life. ... the inner, tragic and problematic event embedded in concrete contemporary reality. The age of separate realms of style is over.

With Augustine's "kernel" idea in mind, it is not difficult to see how parataxis as a form of ritualistic progression used in Scripture, constitutes a rhythmic code that must be "cracked" for meaning to be

gauged. The gaps, as repositories of religious mystery, are created by the code of opposite or balanced ideas that form the rhythm of the piece of writing, be it Scripture or poem. Herbert's use of the method may be seen as one of the ways in which he copies the Scriptures.

Parataxis rounds off "The Temper (I)" (p. 55), suggesting a careful balance of forces that are reconciled after having clashed.

> Whether I flie with angels, fall with dust,
> Thy hands made both, and I am there:
> Thy power and love, my love and trust
> Make one place ev'ry where. (ll. 25-28)

The paratactic gaps breaking each line both enhance the sense of difference between "angels" and "dust", and emphasise the balance between the two, both controlled by God. They therefore become almost a visual, emblematic presentation, an embodiment, of the divine control of both opposites. Similarly, "Vertue" (p. 87) offers a carefully balanced catalogue of images describing nature in such a way that each image holds equal weight, as if each were balanced by parataxis against another. The sense of ritual incantation that develops from this suggests an inexorable movement towards final destruction, so that the poem's structure emblematically embodies its meaning. A similar motif can be seen in "The Quidditie" (p. 69), where parataxis becomes emblematic of the poem's theme, which is about poetic meaning itself.

> My God, a verse is not a crown,
> No point of honour, or gay suit,
> No hawk, or banquet, or renown,
> Nor a good sword, nor yet a lute: (ll. 1-4)

Here too, parataxis acts paradoxically, giving each idea an equal weight and thereby emphasising fragmentedness. At the same time, though, the sense of balance between the images that parataxis cre-

ates, suggests that while the poem is none of these things individually, it is all of them together. To make "use" of them, as the last line says, is to share in their combination. Similar cataloguings, with accompanying paratactic gaps, can be seen in such poems as "The Agonie" (p. 37), "Nature" (p. 45) and most important of all, "Prayer (I)" (p. 51). They can all be seen to live up to Carlo Levi's description of paratactic language, offered in Of Fear and Freedom, and quoted by Fletcher (171).

> ... every word, every image is closed in itself, complete, without ties, and equal in its value to every other one. The images, all equally symbolic, stand side by side, without correlation or opposition: discourse is a mosaic. The stress falls upon every word; all of them are on the same plane: there cannot be perspective. Furthermore, as there is no syntactic relationship, every word must contain in itself the entire concept:

This is particularly true of "Prayer (I)", where the "something understood" of the last line depends for its effect on the paratactic gaps that hold each of the poem's images in equally weighted parallel, and which are themselves (the gaps) repositories of religious mystery too profound to be put into words. This, Herbert suggests, is what prayer is; the ritualistic incantation of symbolically charged words, but also the apprehension of the mysterious in such a way that words are found wanting. This, then, becomes one of the ultimate forms of "copying" - the realisation that one's own language is insufficient for its task. Herbert acknowledges the same linguistic deficiency in "Praise (I)" (p. 61).

> To write a verse or two is all the praise,
> That I can raise:
> Mend my estate in any wayes,
> Thou shalt have more.

I go to Church; help me to wings, and I
Will thither flie;
Or, if I mount unto the skie,
I will do more. (ll. 1-8).

The paratactic gaps such as those in line 5, symbolise not only the "gaps" in the speaker's praise, but also the sense of the mysterious that makes the speaker aware of his deficiency and God able, as it were, to fill the vacuum. It is this quality of the mysterious that makes parataxis so much part of the allegorical and hieroglyphic styles. Just as allegory may be seen as a reduction of the abstract moral into concrete, often ritualistic, language, so parataxis is a reduction and formalisation of abstract mystery into a rhythmic coding that itself embodies meaning. In the same way, parataxis is hieroglyphic because the gaps and balancing actually figure the structure of the experience. It is an imposed structure, a form of deus ex machina, but it is also an imitated one whose Ideal is both the human experience of the divine and, more particularly, the experience of the divine presented in Scripture.

Anaphoric repetition is the second of the syntactic structures which is particularly evident in Scripture, and creates a sense of ritualistic progression. Puttenham, in his The Arte of English Poesie (1589), calls it "the figure of report" (see Willcock & Walker, 1970: 208), suggesting, as Fletcher says (168, n. 32), the catalogue, the inventory or the list. Three of the most prominent instances of anaphoric repetition in Scripture are the Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3-11), the catalogue of times in Ecclesiastes (3:2-9), and St. Paul's "hymn" to love in 1 Corinthians 13. In all of these an incantatory sermon develops because of the repetition. In each there is the sense of the rhythm resolving an inner spiritual or moral struggle in the same way

that a hieroglyph does (Summers, 1954:135), by restructuring it into an orderly progression. As Fletcher (169) suggests, the rhythm renders the piece more symbolic and less specifically expository, even though incantation predominates. Anaphora may, then, be seen not as an expression of mere fact, but as a symbolical identification of rhythm with meaning, a form of "shaped" poem in whose form resides a large part of its meaning.

This structure is as evident in Herbert as parataxis is. Like parataxis, anaphoric rhythms often act as a deus ex machina, resolving conflict by imposing fixed rhythmic structures on it - and thereby creating a sense of the poetry as something actually embodying the divine to whom it, as it were, succumbs. In Herbert's case, the imposition of the deus ex machina is not entirely arbitrary because, like the paratactic rhythms, the anaphoric ones are imitated from Scripture, making it possible to read Herbert's allegorical language as a "copy" of the divine Word. "Antiphon (I)" (p. 53) offers as its two "voices" not only the chorus and the verse, but also opposing "verses" set firstly in anaphoric and then in hypotactic rhythm. The initial "verse" is suggestive of calm confidence because of the regularity of the trimeter line.

> Vers. The heav'ns are not too high,
> His praise may thither flie:
> The earth is not too low,
> His praises there may grow. (ll. 3-6)

Repetition at the beginning of each line adds not only to the sense of regularity and calmness, but also creates a steady progression and resolution, endorsed by the assertion that praise will encompass both heaven and earth. The second "verse" contrasts with the first by resorting to a hypotactic rhythm and introducing a sense of argument or

battle which needs to be resolved.

> Vers. The church with psalms must shout
> No doore can keep them out:
> But above all, the heart
> Must bear the longest part. (ll. 9-12)

The calmness and progression is broken because there is no repetition and because the imperatives suggest a possible defiance and a struggle towards resolution. Resolution is achieved, however, by the chorus, which not only echoes itself, but Scripture as well (Ps. 84:3 etc.). "Chor. Let all the world in ev'ry corner sing,/My God and King." The repetition of the chorus closes the battle motif by continuing the sense of progression through anaphora. Conflicting voices become reconciled not so much by what is said, but by the regular, repetitive rhythm that keeps all under control, and suggests a union between speakers and God, one actually effected by the reconciling power of the rhythmic verse itself.

Anaphora achieves resolution of conflict in the second "Antiphon" (p. 92), but more through a repetition of rhythm than of language.

> Chor. Praised be the God of love,
> Men. Here below,
> Angels. And here above:
> Cho. Who hath dealt his mercies so,
> Ang. To his friend,
> Men. And to his foe; (ll. 1-6)

The repetitive dimeter lines given to angels and men unite what are usually regarded as opposing forces. The language is hypotactic, but the rhythm is anaphoric, and the two together create a sense of argument or battle which is controlled and extended to a steady progression, and therefore resolved. When, therefore, the poet says in the last two lines "Praised be the God alone,/Who hath made of two folds one." (ll. 22-23), the reader has the sense that the shape of the poem itself actually mirrors both the conflict and the union between the

temporal and eternal, and that, in a sense, the poem is itself the work of the unifying God.[3]

This chapter has come some way in the exploration of possible ways in which Herbert's poems are "copies" of the revealed "Word", particularly that of Scripture and of divine creation. Space prevents a further, more detailed examination of the role of allegory in the poems, although aspects of allegory, such as typology, will be explored in later chapters. An important aspect of the copying of the Word remains to be examined in the next chapter, however, and it is one suggested by much of what has been said here. The sense so often gained on reading Herbert's poems of the poet having "copied" another "Word", coupled with his use of a specific and unquestioned moral framework to which he submits, as well as his use of allegorical and hieroglyphic structures reflecting a process of artistic creation he feels he only shares in, all suggest an understanding of poetic language as something to be "given over" to the divine. The reduction in allegory of the symbolic image from the exploratory to a more closely defined visual picture or rhythmic code, is one way in which the poet allows his sense of the exploratory to be controlled by what he believes to be greater than himself - the Word of revelation. There are a number of other ways in which Herbert's poetry reveals this frame of mind, and the examination of these will take up the bulk of the following chapter.

---

3 Further poems using this mode are; "Sighs and Grones" (p. 83), "Unkindnesse" (p. 93), "Justice (I)" (p. 95) and "The Call" (p. 156).

CHAPTER IV

THE WORD SACRIFICED

"To give away yourself keeps yourself still,"
Shakespeare, Sonnet 16.

The previous chapter endeavoured to show some of the ways in which Herbert's poetry may be understood as a "copy" of divine revelation, especially the revelation evident in the Scriptures and in creation generally. An implicit assumption in the chapter was that the poet by seeking to have his poetry become a copy of a reality greater than himself was, in a sense, abdicating from full responsibility for his own creation and placing the burden of it on God himself. To some extent, the examination of "The Altar" made this idea explicit: "Whose parts are as thy hand did frame", as did the discussion on Herbert's use of allegory as a way of reducing his own exploratory sensibility to one which is limited to a fixed moral or philosophical framework which it unequivocally accepts as the "correct" one. Such an understanding of Herbert's poetry suggests not only that he sees it as something sacred in which the divine shares (God first giving what the worshipper must give him in return), but also that the poetry may be seen as performing a sacramental function by uniting the divine and the human. In other words, if the poems may be understood as a "copy" of divine revelation, then they may equally be understood as instruments revealing the divine, particularly because of their often explicit suggestion that they are the work of the divine and the human.

The purpose of this chapter is to consider in greater detail how the poet's effort (paradoxical though it may seem) to "abdicate" from full responsibility for his own creation, may be understood as sacramental. Explicit evidence of Herbert's desire for such an "abdication" may be found in such poems as "Assurance" (p. 155), where the poet remembers how God did "hold my hand while I did write", and "The Forerunners", (p. 176) where an expression such as "Farewell sweet phrases, lovely metaphors.", suggests a willingness on the poet's part to discard his own language as inevitably too blemished by human limitations to be a true representation of divine perfection. Scholarship has shown this to be a fundamental trait of his aesthetic. Summers (1954:119) has pointed to the line quoted above from "The Forerunners" in the same regard, and both Stanley Fish (1972:199) and Barbara Harman (1982:48) have shown that the two "Jordan" poems are concerned with the author "weaving" himself into the text, and then trying to "weave" himself out of it by allowing Christ to take over in the final lines. Helen Vendler (1975:25ff.) has spoken of the poetry's provisional quality, a result of the fact that the speaker's perspective is continually being "reinvented" in order for the poetic persona and the language to be submitted to God. And Heather Asals (1981:6ff.) has offered a reading of Herbert's language as itself a "creature", consecrated and "broken" by the poet/priest (an idea endorsing Sigurd Burckhardt's understanding of metaphor in general, 1956:279ff.) in the same way that the Eucharistic elements are broken and shared.

These all suggest that the poet understands his poetry as a means by which he may seek to emulate the divine. The impossibility of such an emulation from merely human strength suggests that perhaps the

greatest emulation of the divine is to give up one's own individual existence, in the same way Christ did at the crucifixion. A temporal entity (poetry included) may be seen as operative in joining human and divine only because of such a faculty being bestowed upon it by the divine. In this sense, then, a poet like Herbert's endeavour to imitate the divine must necessarily involve some sort of willing suspension of his own creative powers in favour of a power greater than his - Christ's. The lines already quoted above show that this is a trait central to Herbert's aesthetic, and in many ways, it may be seen as the ultimate form of imitatio Christi, since it seeks not only to imitate Christ's sacrifice of himself, but actually to be appropriated by that sacrifice.

Two aspects of Herbert's endeavour to "abdicate" from or "sacrifice" (in the phrase chosen as the title of this chapter) full responsibility for his own writing will be dealt with in this chapter. The first will be the rejection of individualistic language structures in favour of a more communally based or, to coin a phrase, tradition sponsored one. The second will be the poet/speaker's renunciation of certain interpretative perspectives, a renunciation which, in Herbert, also involves the reader. The latter is generated by the fact that critics like Fish and Harman have concentrated on the psychological interrelationship between the three "personae" (ie poet, speaker and reader) evident in the reading of a Herbert poem, and have suggested that much of the sense of provisionalness in the poetry is the result of the speaker's continued restructuring of perception about an attitude or event, one in which the reader (particularly in Fish's argument, 1972:156-7) shares.

The paradox of attempting to write oneself into silence, as it

were, is by no means original to Herbert. An important source may be found in the theologians he would have known and in the tradition of worship he probably practised. Nicolas Cusanus, St. John of the Cross, St. Augustine and St. Thomas all emphasise the provisional nature of language. By the Middle Ages and the early renaissance religious language especially, came to be seen as the kind that could not assume an ability to define God in any exact sense, and so would use only the terms for God that themselves suggested the impossibility of definition - terms such as Infinite, Eternal, Omniscient etc. They are essentially negative terms, and the linguistic/theological structure became known as "Negative Theology" or the via negativa. "Negative theology ... is so indespensable to affirmative theology" wrote Nicolas Cusanus (ca. 1401-1464), "that without it God would be adored, not as the Infinite but rather as a creature, which is idolatry, or giving to an image what is due to truth alone" (Heron, Ed., 1954:59-60). Augustine (De Doctrina, I. 6.) is no less emphatic.

> God must not even be described as unspeakable (ineffabilis), since by the very use of this term, something is spoken. ... Yet God, since nothing can be worthily spoken of Him, accepts the service of the human voice, and wills us to rejoice in praising Him with words of our own.

This harks back to his use and enjoyment idea (see Chapter III above), in which the earthly is to be used but not enjoyed for its own sake. Still, its central tenet is the same as that of Cusanus, as well as that of Plotinus, who held that the One would always be beyond full human comprehension and expression.[1] St. John of the Cross, in The Ascent of Mt. Carmel (I. 13) uses an anaphoric structure of

---

1 For a fuller discussion of the origins of Negative Theology, see Ramsey ed. (1971).

negatives in his description of a properly ordered life, a form of logic he unabatingly insists on.

> In order to arrive at having pleasure in everything,
> Desire to have pleasure in nothing.
> In order to arrive at possessing everything,
> Desire to possess nothing.
> In order to arrive at being everything,
> Desire to be nothing.[2]

Aquinas (Summa Theologica, Q. 13) deals at length with the problem of language defining or referring to God. God cannot be referred to literally, he asserts in Article 3, but only metaphorically, since all man's terms are taken from his understanding of creatures. In Article 2 he says "We speak of things as we understand them. But in this life we do not understand what God is, and so we can use no words to say what he is" (Ramsey, Ed., 38). Aquinas's final position is the negation of language altogether. He says, in the translation by G.K. Chesterton, "I can write no more. I have seen things that make all my writings like straw" (St. Thomas Aquinas, N.Y., 1933:172).

The Jewish theologian Moses Maimonides vehemently berates those who presume to address God casually or refer to him literally, because this means that they would inevitably ascribe to him attributes which are far below his nature (Ramsey, Ed., 23ff.). God is to be referred to metaphorically, because no-one can presume to have a literal knowledge of him. But perhaps the most carefully expounded reason for referring to God by what he is not rather than by what he supposedly can be, comes from Cusanus himself (Heron, Ed., 11-12).

---

2 Taken from F.C. Happold, ed. Mysticism: A Study and an Anthology (London: Penguin, 1985) 361. First impression, 1963.

> It is clear, therefore, that all we know of the truth is that the absolute truth, such as it is, is beyond our reach. The truth, which can be neither more nor less than it is, is the most absolute necessity, while, in contrast with it, our intellect is possibility. Therefore, the quiddity of things, which is ontological truth, is unattainable in its entirety; and though it has been the objective of all philosophers, by none has it been found as it really is. The more profoundly we learn this lesson of ignorance, the closer we draw to truth itself.

The kind of ignorance Cusanus speaks of is similar to the Coleridgean "willing suspension of disbelief", or even simple faith, because it specifically undermines the assumption that objective reality can be fully apprehended by the senses or by reason. Furthermore, its emphasis on paradox and self-negating opposition as a means to gaining knowledge, again underscores Coleridge's understanding of the imagination as something working through "the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities;". The continued balancing of one idea against another becomes a style or technique used specifically because of the individual writer's awareness of his own limited perceptions and linguistic mechanisms.[3] George Steiner (1985:58-59) puts it well. "It is just because we can go no further, because speech so marvellously fails us, that we experience the certitude of a divine meaning surpassing and enfolding ours. What lies beyond man's word is eloquent of God."

Of necessity, then, the poet writing from the perspective of the via negativa does not presume to define God and therefore, in a sense,

---

3 For a further examination of Herbert's relationship to Coleridge's notion of the reconciliation of opposites, see William Halewood (1970:3ff.). Also, Rosalie Colie's (1966) emphasis on paradox in seventeenth-century poetry is based on a similar understanding - that the poet uses paradox or opposites as the only valid substitute for a full knowledge of the transcendent.

does not depend entirely on his own senses, since the via negativa asserts that definition depending on the senses is imperfect. What this means, however, is that the poet must see his own predication of the divine as, on the one hand, necessarily limited, but on the other hand, participatory in the divine, because one of the only ways he can predicate God is by taking on a form of language or definition that is not original to himself. In other words, he must give up his own individualistic frameworks of interpretation, limited to his own senses, in favour of one not limited to them. Herbert can be seen to work through this aesthetic in the poem "Submission" (p. 95).

> But that thou art my wisdome, Lord,
> And both mine eyes are thine,
> My minde would be extreamly stirr'd
> For missing my designe.

For the poet to make God his "wisdome", "eyes" and "designe", is to place himself in a position where any independent predication of God has value only in its own negation. By allowing God to be his "designe", he accepts the paradox of being defined in terms essentially opposite to him, because God is by nature perfect and man imperfect. This means that the rhetorical positions of subject and object in the poem are no longer as clearly separable as they usually are, so that while there is a negation of human structures of definition, there is nevertheless also a movement towards integration of the human with the divine. "But when I thus dispute and grieve,/I do resume my sight," (ll. 9-10) uses the paradoxical language of the via negativa because the language means its own opposite. In the context of the poem, for the speaker to resume his own "sight", is for him to lose his position as one submitted to God, and the poem would return to predication in terms of subject and object, forcing the distinction

between God and man.

Another important way in which Herbert may be seen to appropriate a form of language not original to himself, however, is by the fact that his poems, by participating in the "Temple" of the corporate Body of Christ, the Church, often use the Church's symbols and metaphors. Such a use of images and symbols governing corporate worship suggests that the individual poet seeks to have his own predication of the divine share in that of the Church - to become that of the Church, so that the individual can be seen to submit to the corporate experience of God. Such a submission makes it possible to understand the poems as having the same "operative" or sacramental function of most of the Church's language of worship - because it shares in the Logos, made Incarnate in Christ and participated in by the members of his body the Church.

The poem "Conscience" (p. 105) may be seen to combine the methods of the via negativa with the use of corporate symbolism. It uses the Cross, perhaps the foremost Christian symbol, as a "negative" by means of which to overcome yet another "negative" - conscience.

> Peace pratler, do not lowre:
> Not a fair look but thou dost call it foul:
> Not a sweet dish, but thou dost call it sowre:
> Musick to thee dost howl.
> By listning to thy chatting fears
> I have both lost mine eyes and ears. (ll. 1-6)

The poem is one very much in the via negativa tradition. The poet here seeks to negate the negatives imposed by conscience, with their accompanying "chatting fears". Conscience comes to represent the negatives of the Old Testament law, the "thou shalt not's" which work by creating "fear". The "pratler" does not desist from "chatting", disclaiming the value of the figurative or artistic, so that "fair"

becomes "foul", and music "howl(s)". This is the dry negating epistemology of the old order that focusses on itself as its own end, not on its own negation. In answer Herbert offers a negative that neither presumes literal knowledge of the divine, nor one that insists on the value of speech. The cross of Christ becomes a figure in the poem that subsumes into itself all literalising speech and which leads to the silence of a language independent of debate (whether fair is foul) and at one with the communal. "Besides my physick, know there's some for thee:/Some wood and nails to make a staff or bill" (ll. 20-21). This suggests that the limitations of human knowledge, and of its representation in poetry, are transcended only by a submission to a way of being that puts an even further limitation on knowledge by consigning it to a physical tasting of Christ's blood and experiencing of the nails of the Cross.

As with "The Agonie" (p. 37), the particularly physical images, here it is wood and nails, replace and negate the enterprise of abstract philosophy. The figurative takes the place of literal language by being superior to it as a definition of the divine, because the Cross, as the ultimate negative - taking the life of God and the "life" of believers - becomes the symbol that silences all negatives, the figure that supersedes all literalising opposition between creator and created. By using a figure whose meaning exists essentially outside the poem itself, determining its own confines, the poet willingly presses all his own ideas into the figure's confines and thereby gives up his independent perspective and language. In its own way, the figure is as compact and self-enclosed as any paradox, working "like a noiseless sphere" (l. 8) towards becoming boundless in and through the confines of its own bounds. In the tradition of the Logos, the figure

becomes a Word in which all other words are implicit. In the words of another Herbert poem, "The crosse taught all wood to resound his name, /Who bore the same" ("Easter" p. 41).

The idea that the movement towards silence is a movement towards a figurative reality outside the mind of the poet or even the immediate framework of the poem, needs to be explained further. The silence that "speaks for itself" by being dependent on the figurative, may, in many ways, be seen as the result of what was earlier referred to as "tradition sponsored" language - the kind that may be seen to have a traditional base which the poet taps. It is what Coleridge, when discussing the reconciliation of opposites as an essential part of poetic language, refers to as the reconciliation of "the individual, with the representative; the sense of novelty and freshness, with old and familiar objects;". Much of what has been said in previous chapters reveals the extent of Herbert's use of such language. The paratactic gaps discussed in chapter three and the allegorical reduction of an idea or image to a specific, often physically shaped representation, are examples of a conscious movement from the poet's individualistic perception of reality to one determined by participation in the communal. In Herbert's case, the communal, or tradition sponsored language may be seen to be governed largely by his participation in the world of analogical correspondences. The communal symbols of worship and the language of Scripture exist independently of the poet's individual endeavours towards union with the divine. By making use of them the poet may be seen to allow both himself and the reader to be drawn into a reality outside themselves.

In many ways, this is what Stanley Fish means when he proposes that the awareness that God's word is "all" ("The Flower") "is <u>self-</u>

destructive, since acquiring it involves abandoning the perceptual and conceptual categories within which the self moves and by means of which it separately exists" (1972:156-157). Fish's analysis has important ramifications for any theory of Herbert's "abdication" from or "sacrifice" of language, because it introduces the problem of the distinction between the poet's creation and the reader's perception of it. While this is an issue that will be dealt with in greater detail later, it nevertheless engenders a problem which must be considered here because it influences one's understanding of Herbert's "abdication" from responsibility for his own language as well as his rejection of his own individualistic frameworks of interpretation.

The poetic "self" in Fish's analysis is particularly the psychological construct making up reader and poet, and it is on the psychological that Fish concentrates, suggesting that he sees it as the locus of poetic meaning and symbolic action. His assertion that causes (literary or otherwise) can be measured only through their effects (1980:57) is very similar not only to Aristotle, but also to Aquinas's emphasis on figurative language as useful for referring to God "negatively" because it is based on the observance of the effects (creatures) of his creation (Summa, Q. 13, A. 1). In Fish's case, the reader's response is that effect, with the result that he assumes the text to be, in a sense, given meaning by the reader. It has no objective "meaning" of its own. "The objectivity of a text is an illusion and, moreover, a dangerous illusion, because it is so physically convincing" (1980:43). The "silence" or "abdication" Fish sees as essential to Herbert, then, is the kind that not only incorporates reader, speaker and poet, but that, of necessity, cannot be gained outside the psychological or cognitive experience that unites these

three. This is a view important to Herbert, as will be shown later. However, it leads to a particular danger regarding one's understanding of Herbert's attempt to "sacrifice" his own individualistic language in favour of one not entirely his own.

Fish's emphasis on the psychological, subjective experience of language, and his insistence that the reading experience is "the source of literary power and meaning" (1972:4, emphasis mine), comes dangerously close to the notion that an object does not exist outside the individual's apprehension of it. The experience of reading, of language, and therefore of symbols and metaphors, becomes limited to the psychological, without any independent nature of its own. This leads Fish to transfer the reader's experience of the provisionalness of language onto the language itself. A self-consuming artefact, in his terms, is the end result of a process which begins with successive rejections of interpretative frameworks, and progresses to the rejection of the artefact itself. "The final rung, the intuition which stands ... because it is the last, is of course the rejection of written artifacts, a rejection that, ... is an exact description of what the reader, in his repeated abandoning of successive stages in the argument, has been doing" (1980:40, see also 1972:13). This tends to link artefact and interpretation as if they were virtually the same thing.

Apart from implying (in its extreme form) that there is no ontology outside subjective human experience, this is nevertheless a position which many psychologists of language do not accept. For example, a psychoanalytic reading of a text, like the one offered by Robert

Rogers (1978),[4] concentrates on the writer's unconscious - the "primary process mentation", which is the basis of imagination and even of the use of metaphor, but which is ordered and controlled by "secondary process mentation". It is this secondary process that the reader and writer are aware of, but the primary has just as great, if not a greater force, albeit an unconscious one. The inability of both reader and poet to comprehend fully their own primary process mentation (which is not the same as "thinking", which implies conscious activity), suggests a presence of traditional, archetypal, communal, libidinal, mythopoeic (whichever framework one cares to give it) ideas or forces which have a reality outside the individual poet/reader's conscious psychology. If there is a movement towards the discarding of the individual's interpretative framework then, it is (at least in Herbert's case) almost inevitably a movement towards inclusion in the tradition that generates the text, but from which the writer feels he has drifted. This is evident in Herbert's repeated invocation of Scripture, of liturgy and the symbols of corporate worship in general. The movement may be seen as one from the individual to the communal, which often results in the abandonment of the individual's independent existence (poet, speaker and reader) but seldom, if ever, in the complete abandonment of language as an entity with an ontological value of its own, generated by its use (in the Augustinian sense) as a part of worship.

---

4 Norman Holland (1975:xv) makes a similar distinction, even though much of his work agrees with Fish's conclusions. He stresses (65-66) the loss of boundaries between the reader and the work, but becomes more acceptable than Fish because he sees the work of art as non-functional (71) and as working primarily in the realm of fantasy (72). While one need not necessarily agree with this view, it nevertheless is more acceptable than Fish's because it does not equate psychological with ontological reality.

In a sense, Fish admits a gap in his own argument when he says that the poet in "Jordan (II)", "admits the failure of his attempt to achieve poetic humility" (1972:189). The poet "fails" here only because he does not adhere entirely to Fish's demand for a complete loss of language or the loss of the first person voice (1972:190). Fish does not (could not) take the idea of a self-consuming artefact to its logical conclusion, if he did, there would be no poetry at all. Herbert would, like Aquinas, give up all language as "straw". In answer, Fish proposes that Herbert's technique is to make God "prepossest", so that the poems become, as it were, God's word and not the poet's. "By acting not in one's own, but in God's name, one transfers the responsibility and the credit to him, makes him 'prepossest' and gives the action 'his perfection'" (1972:190).

This seems the only valid explanation for Herbert's effort to ensure that "God writeth" ("A true Hymne." p. 168). However, that poem itself suggests that Herbert takes the paradox of an effort not to write even a step further, by implying that the poet must <u>give up</u> his effort <u>not</u> to write.

> Whereas if th' heart be moved,
> Although the verse be somewhat scant,
> God doth supplie the want.
> As when the heart says (sighing to be approved)
> <u>O, could I love!</u> and stops: God writeth, <u>Loved</u> (ll. 16-20)

The sighing and complaining about his own inferiority and the scantness of his verse must "stop" before God will supply the want. The poet moves, then, not to an utter rejection of written artefacts, but rather to an acceptance of them as provisional, and as a means, in true sacramental fashion, to his participation in God. He does not abandon his art because it is imperfect, instead, he finds God in it; making use even of imperfect human creations - "that which while I use

/I am with thee, and most take all. ("The Quidditie." p. 69).[5]

This still leaves one with the question of just how Herbert allows God to make use of his language. The earlier suggestion that his language moves from a concern with the individual to an incorporation into a communal or tradition sponsored language is, the present writer suggests, one of the chief means by which he allows God to do so, because it is the primary way in which the poet is able to "participate" in God - by participating in his Body, the Church. This participation may be seen on the level of imagery, as well as on the more formal and basic level of structure.

Before examining some of the ways in which a concern with the communal affects the structures Herbert uses in his "self-immolating" aesthetic, it will be worthwhile enquiring into possible ways in which Herbert's imagery reveals the same frame of mind. In this regard a reading of the series of five "Affliction" poems is very revealing. Daniel Rubey (1980:105-123) has shown how the "Affliction" poems show a progression[6] in their imagery from an agonised self-centredness struggling towards proper love and self-sacrifice, to a calm, almost serene acceptance of human inabilities, an acceptance which allows the fullness of Christ's love to be revealed. This may be taken as a base

---

5 It seems preferable to talk of the transformation of both language and the poet/speaker/reader, rather than complete annihilation, because each is incorporated into the community of believers, and not totally destroyed. This is a view endorsed by J.L. Klause in his article "George Herbert's, Kenosis and the Whole Truth", in Bloomfield, ed. (1981:217ff.).

6 Rubey argues cogently in favour of taking these five poems as a logical, if not a chronological progression. The manuscript evidence, he says, suggests that "Affliction (I)" and "Affliction (V)" were written fairly early, and present two opposite poles in Herbert's understanding of affliction. The other three, he suggests, were later integrated into their present order so as to form the sense of progression.

from which to examine the progression in the poems from a selfconscious use of the first person, "When first thou didst entice to thee my heart,/I thought the service brave:" ("Affliction (I)", p. 46), to the use of the plural "Affliction then is ours" ("Affliction (V)", p. 97). This itself is the result of a growing appreciation on the speaker's part of the value of corporate symbols and corporate worship.

"Affliction (I)" is filled with the imagery of corporate Christian experience, but it is imagery used by a presumptuous, self-interested speaker who is unable to see the corporate value of the language he uses. He is casual about his own relationship to the symbols of worship. "I looked on thy furniture so fine,/And made it fine to me." The food he takes is "milk and sweetnesses", which he regards as the best any can receive, but fails to see that both of these are the gift of the Old Testament (Lev. 20:24) and not the New Testament sacramental gift of blood. As Rubey points out, this conception is corrected by the time "Affliction (V)" is reached. The particular concern for his own fleshliness leads the speaker not only into a desire for the pleasures of the ars amatoria ("My dayes were straw'd with flow'rs and happinesse;/There was no moneth but May."), but also into the notion that suffering is exclusive to him. "Sorrow was all my soul; I scarce beleeved,/Till grief did tell me roundly that I lived." This individuality is supremely illustrated in his failure to see in the imagery of bowling ("cross-bias") and "tree" figures for the Cross, figures which include suffering in any good they serve to bring about. Again, this is an understanding corrected in the later "Affliction" poems.

"Affliction (II)" (p. 62) largely continues this individualistic

understanding of God on the part of the speaker, but it begins to be discarded by the time "Affliction (III)" (p. 73) is reached. Here the speaker reveals an awareness of both his and Christ's parts in a corporate Body and a corporate suffering.

> Thy life on earth was grief, and thou art still
> Constant unto it, making it to be
> A point of honour, now to grieve in me,
> And in thy members suffer ill.
> They who lament one cross,
> Thou dying dayly, praise thee to thy losse. (ll. 13-18)

Not only is the need for continued suffering accepted, but oneness with Christ no longer means, as it tends to in "Affliction (II)", a transcendence of the sufferings of everyday. Suffering fuses the community of Christ together. The poet's sighs become God's, his very breath is united with God's, as is his body (see "Josephs coat", p. 159). The "rod" of "Affliction (I)" becomes a sceptre and the struggles toward a "repayment" of God in "Affliction (II)" become a simple "Thou knowst my tallies;".

The suffering depicted in "Affliction (IV)" (p. 89), then, is a suffering experienced from a position within the corporate Body, by a speaker who knows the value of the analogical link between his own experience and Christ's. Affliction is the result of "dismemberment" as a part of the Body, but even this dismemberment is described in terms suggestive of Biblical imagery, implying a further sense of unification in the corporate. "Broken in pieces all asunder", not only suggests the Biblical image of the broken Body, but also harks back to the "earthen vessel" imagery of the Old Testament (Ps. 31:12; Jer. 18: 4ff.; 48:38), as does the idea of the persona as a "wonder" (Ps. 71: 7). It is "scatter'd smart" which most wounds the speaker and keeps him in a precarious position between "this world and that of grace".

"This world", then becomes one in which "attendants" (such as those at the Eucharistic feast) are at strife, and the "elements" (both those of nature and those of the Eucharist) are "let loose" to abandon the corporate unity they represent. In true via negativa fashion, however, the negative conflict in the poem is paradoxically resolved by a further negative. Dissolution is transformed from something that destroys to something that builds; "dissolve the knot,/As the sunne scatters by his light/All the rebellions of the night." From death comes life, and proper grief is the beginning of a new unity with God.

In "Affliction (V)" therefore, suffering has been transformed from that which estranges man from God, to that which unites the two. The unity is made clear primarily through the corporate worshipful setting of the poem's imagery.

> My God, I read this day,
> That planted Paradise was not so firm,
> As was and is thy floting Ark; whose stay
> And anchor thou art onely, to confirm
> And strengthen it in ev'ry age,
> When waves do rise and tempests rage. (ll. 1-6)

Perhaps the strongest indication of the poet/speaker's sharing in corporate experience is the fact that the typology and allusion used are the kind that are understood only by those sharing in the corporate worship. "Ark" was in the seventeenth-century a commonly understood type of the Church, as is shown by the baptismal rite in the Book of Common Prayer.[7] Similarly, the anchor was a type of the Cross, and an

---

7 The introduction to the baptismal rite in the 1611 edition reads:

> Almighty and everlasting God, which of thy great mercy diddest save Noe and his family in the Arke from perishing by water, & also diddest safely leade the children of Israel thy people through the red sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptisme: & by the baptisme of thy welbeloved Sonne Jesus Christ,

emblem of hope.[8] Furthermore, the food imagery of the previous poems is drawn together here in the allusion to the Eucharist. Whereas in "Affliction (I)" the speaker received "milk and sweetnesses", now he "boards" with Christ at the communion table ("board" in the sense of eat regularly and dwell) because Christ first "boarded" with him in the Incarnation and Crucifixion. Also, the tree imagery of the previous poems is used now not to refer to a nest against life's storms, but to the Cross, the symbol of sacrifice. This reading suggests that the poet/speaker may be seen to give over his exploratory use of imagery to a more fixed use of a traditional imagery of sacrifice. In a sense, then, the poet sacrifices his own individual "word" in favour of a greater Word, which has itself been sacrificed.

Space has not afforded more than this brief examination, in just one series of poems, of the progression from the use of "individualistic" to corporate imagery. In many ways, this whole dissertation is a concentration on various ways in which Herbert emphasises the corporate in his imagery. The use of Scripture discussed in the previous chapter is an example, as is the language of the hieroglyph in which

---

7 (continues)

> diddest sanctifie the flood Jordan and all other waters to the mysticall washing away of sinne: We beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully looke upon these children, sanctifie them, and wash them with thy holy Ghost, that they being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the Arke of Christes Church, ...

8 In this regard see Izaak Walton's The Life of Mr George Herbert. Walton reports that Donne, having made certain seals containing the engraven image of Christ upon an anchor, sent a number to his friends just before his death. One of these, he says, was found near Herbert on the day of his death (see Patrides, ed. 1983:101). Also see the discussion by Helen Gardner in her John Donne: The Divine Poems (Clarendon: Oxford U P, 1952) Appendix G.

the poet is copying divine order. A further, perhaps more obvious instance, is Herbert's use of liturgical language, and that will be discussed in some detail in the final chapter.

What remains in this chapter, however, is a consideration of the use of the corporate on the level of certain aspects of the structure of individual poems. There is a sense in which the structure of individual poems reveals a marked preference for the use of "corporate", tradition sponsored symbolism and linguistic forms, which suggests an acceptance of the less individualistically exploratory use of language as a proper and even godly means of writing verse. In other words, the poet's sacrifice of his own exploratory use of language may be found in some of his structures, as much as in his imagery. In both one may see at work a form of expression that chooses, in true via negativa fashion, a reduction from the presumption of an individual exploring the nature of the divine - to one accepting a role as participant in a more specific, but also a more all-inclusive tradition. As will be shown, that tradition may be seen as very much the sacramental one of Christian sacrifice itself, because it is the tradition of the Church which is the result of the sacrifice of Christ.

As suggested in the first chapter, what William Empson (1951: 341) calls the "pregnant" meaning in the vehicle of a metaphor, is what may be seen as the communal symbolic aspect of the vehicle that enables the reader to understand the tenor. In other words, inherent in most metaphors is a base of meaning that facilitates the link between vehicle and tenor. To call prayer a banquet, as Herbert does in "Prayer (I)" (p. 51), is to see an analogue between the two kinds of activity, but it is also to invoke a common knowledge about banquets, and use that in qualifying what one means by prayer. The new insight

depends on the older, more common association - Coleridge's reconciliation "of novelty and of freshness, with old and familiar objects;". To some extent the working of the metaphor depends on an "informed reader", to use Fish's term (1980:46-47), but the communal nature of the knowledge essential to making the link between vehicle and tenor also means that the language prevents an exclusively individualistic impression of it. Its use of real objects gives it an ontology which is independent of the individual reader. This idea leads to an important theory about the nature of metaphorical language and its "communal" base, one which is of considerable value in an examination of Herbert.

Umberto Eco (1984) has shown how metaphor generally has a metonymic base which is itself the result of cultural convention, and which consequently becomes a strong determining factor in the meaning of the metaphor. Any metaphor, he says "can be traced back to a subjacent chain of metonymic connections which constitute the framework of the [linguistic] code and upon which is based the constitution of any semantic field ..." (68). Such a view suggests that at the base of any exploratory or metaphorical sensibility is a foundation of conventional meaning giving the exploratory something to work from. In Eco's words, "A metaphor can be invented because language, in its process of unlimited semiosis, constitutes a multi-dimensional network of metonymies, each of which is explained by a cultural convention rather than by an original resemblance" (78). In many ways, this suggests a use of analogical correspondence at the very heart of language - and particularly poetic language.

Of all tropes metonymy, and the related one of synecdoche, imply the embracing of an analogical perspective of reality. In synecdoche

the part represents the whole analogically, (Body represents members and vice-versa in the Christian paradigm) and in metonymy the name of one thing is transferred to another as if the two were analogically, if not univocally combined. This means that these two tropes may be seen to play a central role both in the creation of metaphor and in the use of the corporate evident in Herbert's poetry. Both tropes can be seen to be based largely on a form of thinking that is not essentially exploratory, but which rather emphasises its role as part of communal or conventional experience. As such they can both be seen to support aspects of the via negativa, at the same time that their participation in corporate experience (especially the Christian experience used by Herbert) may enable one to see them as facilitating a sacramental use of language. Their specific use as parts of conventional language makes them reductive in the sense that they are anti-individualistic or exploratory. As such they may be seen as forms of the via negativa. They adhere only to what is "known" by the corporate body. To understand their function better, however, a brief examination of some recent theories about the tropes will be useful.

While both tropes have most often been examined as aspects of metaphorical expression (Abrams, 1971:62), or aspects of the same trope though distinct from metaphor (Jakobson, Selected Writings, 1971, 2:239-259), they have recently been examined as two distinct, though related tropes. This last, by Hugh Bredin (1984:239-259), proves particularly useful in illuminating Herbert's use of the tropes as a function of the via negativa. His theory is largely linguistic, but the present use of it will be more broadly philosophical in order to show the function of the two tropes as a means of revealing Herbert's preference for language which has its base in the corporate

"Body of Christ". Synecdoche will be discussed first because it is probably more basic than metonymy in its dependence on a holistic view of language.

It is commonly described as a figure whose essence resides in its representative quality, revealed mostly by the function of the part representing the larger whole (so; OED, Burke, 1973:25ff., and Asals, 1981:75). Bredin, however, suggests that it is a particular example of what he calls "structural relations", relations between particulars within a specific single structure. Structural relations are therefore described as "... the relations of an object to the parts of which it is composed, or the material out of which it is made, ..." (53). It is easy to see how synecdoche, when described in these terms can be regarded to some extent as the poetic equivalent of sacramentalism, because it suggests the use on the structural level of the analogical system of correspondences. Just as the sign (bread and wine) in the Eucharist stands for the thing it signifies, so here the part stands for the whole it represents. In the same way that the Body of Christ, the Church, is mystically joined as parts of one whole, so the language of the poet using synecdoche (and here one must not forget the subtitle of Herbert's volume) can be seen to emulate or participate in the Church. Its use as a structure particularly facilitating the incorporation of each part into the whole, and thereby causing a loss of the individual, is demonstrated by Augustine in Confessions, IV. x. When talking about "things of beauty", he says,

> They rise and set: in their rising they begin to be, and they grow towards perfection, and once come to perfection they grow old, and they die: ... That is their law. You have given them to be parts of a whole: they are not all existent at once, but in their departures and successions constitute the whole of which they are parts. Our own speech,

> which we utter by making sounds signifying meanings, follows the same principles. For there never could be a whole sentence unless one word ceased to be when its syllables had sounded and another took its place. (Sheed, Ed., 1945:53)

The whole is made up of "departures and successions", so that loss of the individual becomes essential to completion of the whole. Hopkins was later to define this form of imagination as "Inscape", and Blake as the notion that "without contraries there is no progression".[9] As far as poetry is concerned, then, it may be said that words themselves have a synecdochical function, as do symbols and metaphors, pointing to realities greater than and beyond themselves. The images in Herbert's poems which reveal a philosophical use of synecdoche, do so often because they are placed in a structure that functions on the basis of a part/whole dichotomy. The metaphors that make up the poem "Prayer (I)" (p. 51), are all parts of the whole at the same time that each in itself represents the whole. Each is incomplete without the others, but each nevertheless stands on its own.

Hieroglyphic poems are particularly important in this regard, because each part in the visual structure is essential to a maintenance of the whole. The poem "Jesu" (p. 112) is an example of this form of synecdoche. Here Herbert "spells" the syncretism of part with whole by having shape represent meaning, as well as, because of the final pun, suggesting that sound does as well. Whole and part are inextricably linked in the broken letters of "JESU", which together form a unified "frame" (l. 3), which then becomes both Jesu and the poem itself, suggesting the analogical correspondence that unites

---

9 For the Hopkins, see
The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges, ed. Claude Collier Abbott, (Clarendon: Oxford U P, 1935) 66. For the Blake, see "The Argument", The Marriage of Heaven and Hell.

Christ with poet and with the poem, and makes the poem a sacramental reality bearing the divine.

The poem "Longing" (p. 148) reveals how Herbert is able to link part with whole by having words lose their ordinary connotations.

> From thee all pitie flows.
> Mothers are kinde, because thou art,
> And dost dispose
> To them a part:
> Their infants, them; and they suck thee
> More free. (ll. 13-18)

The filial bond between mothers and children is understood as an analogue of that between God and people, members and Head of the Body. Herbert does not need to speak of milk, then, when referring to God. It becomes implicitly understood, so that even an idea not usually symbolic takes on, in the context of Herbert's analogical framework, a representative, symbolical function. "Milk", in the poem's context, joins God to man as it does mother to child - it therefore may be seen as a symbol, operative in its unifying function, and sacramental in the way it reveals the divine in the temporal. A similar relation is evident in line 41, where "crumme" becomes a synecdoche representing not only the whole person who is "a pile of dust", but because of the association with bread, the Eucharist as well. The fact that "each crumme/Sayes come?" (ll. 41-42), results in the linking of "crumme" to "tongue", and by implication tongue to language, so that these parts, by metaphorical allusion, are all joined into a sacramental whole in which language becomes operative in synchronising the objects or ideas as parts of a whole. "Crumme" is part of the loaf, "tongue" part of the body, "dust" part of creation, words part of the poem, and all part of the incarnate Word - a wholeness which is more intimate and confined than mere symbolism - it is synecdoche.

The second important trope, metonymy, is defined by Bredin (54ff.) as part of what he calls "extrinsic relations", those opposite to "structural" or "intrinsic" ones. Structural relations are those "within things", extrinsic are those "among things". Not only are metonymic relations extrinsic, but they are also "simple" as opposed to "dependent", in which the two related objects or ideas share a specific property. In "simple" relations the related objects do not share any specific property, but are loosely related to one another because of the transfer of names between objects. Hence, while synecdoche functions primarily as a representational quality within a structural or intrinsic set of relations, metonymy functions primarily as a relational quality between essentially different objects or ideas. Cause and effect may be regarded as an example, since neither is intrinsically related to the other, and neither necessarily shares properties held by the other. The representational and relational qualities in the respective tropes are not always exclusive though, because synecdoche tends to suggest, in its philosophical use if not in its strictly linguistic one, a relation between the parts and the whole. Both tropes, then, but particularly metonymy, imply a preference, over metaphorical exploration, for a more fixed relation between objects or ideas, which assumes a perspective the reader must accept. In this sense, they may be seen as reductive, prescriptive, and a form of the via negativa in their emphasis on the corporate over the individual, the prescriptive over the exploratory.

Furthermore, Bredin's definition of metonymy is strongly suggestive of sacramentalism because the relational quality evident between essentially different objects implies an analogical way of seeing reality - one in which one object can imply the other - be operative

in making the "presence" of the other immanent. In this sense, one object may then be said to represent the other, but in more than just a "significative" way, in a truly "exhibitive" way - to borrow the phrasing of Bishop Ussher on the Eucharist. Such a view is strongly supported by a Reformation understanding of sacramentalism in terms of metonymy. Calvin says of the sacraments;

> [Those who say that] the bread is the body ... truly prove themselves literalists. ... I say this expression is a metonymy, a figure of speech commonly used in Scripture when mysteries are under discussion. ... For though the symbol differs in essence from the thing signified ..., still, because it not only symbolizes the thing that it has been consecrated to represent a bare and empty token, but also truly exhibits it, why may its name not rightly belong to the thing? (Institutes, IV. xvii. 20-21).

William Perkins, in his The Arte of Prophecying, speaks of a "sacramentall Metonymie" as a figure "whereby the name of the adjunct, as also of the helping cause is put for the thing represented in the Sacrament" (Workes, 2:656, Lewalski, 1979:79).[10] As a trope defining the sacraments, then, metonymy has both a representational and a relational function. Its use in poetry dealing with the divine implies a

---

10 John Hooper, one of England's foremost Protestants also uses the term metonymy in his description of the Eucharistic doctrine held by his opponents. He begins by quoting the Scripture,

> "This is my body, that is broken for you". And whereas Christ sayes, "this is", they say "under this form". Here is a very plain trope and figurative locution. Men saith that they admit metonymian, and say, under the form of bread is the true body of Christ, though it be false as God is true that they say. A dumb thing without senses is no harbour nor dwelling-place for Christ's precious body, nor for the Spirit of God; but the penitent and sorrowful heart of the Christian ...
> Answer to Bishop of Winchester's Book (1546). Samuel Carr, ed. Early Writings of John Hooper, (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1843) 120-121.

movement from the individualistic, exploratory action of metaphor, to a reversion to the base of all metaphor (if one accepts Eco's notion that metonymy is the base of all metaphor), and thereby to a conventional or tradition sponsored language. Metonymy may therefore be seen as a sacramental way in which the poet's "word" is taken over and transformed by the convention of the worshipping community. Bredin, in attempting to make a clear distinction between metaphor and metonymy (57), makes a similar assertion. A metonymy, he says;

> ... neither states nor implies the connection between the objects involved in it. For this reason, it relies wholly upon those relations between objects that are habitually and conventionally known and accepted. We must already know that the objects are related, if the metonymy is to be devised or understood. Thus, metaphor creates the relation between its objects, while metonymy presupposes that relation.

The metonymies Herbert uses most often depend for their effect on the fact that the reader is already familiar with the juxtaposition or conflation of the two ideas presented. "The Rose" (p. 177) for example, uses language so compact that it stretches beyond metaphor into metonymy, and the reader accepts, because of the rose's traditional association with aesthetic values, that the rose and language are one, a metonymy.

> But I will not much oppose
> Unto what you now advise:
> Only take this gentle rose,
> And therein my answer lies. (ll. 13-16)

The relation between rose and poem is so intimate that the one is able, as it were, to be "put for" the other in a truly exhibitive way. Not only does such a relation suggest an analogical correspondence between the poem and rose, but it also suggests a sacramental one, because the poem is the rose (as it is the flower in "The Flower") in

the same way that the Word is God. In this sense, the metonymy becomes thoroughly operative in being what it signifies. "Jordan (II)" (p. 102) has traditionally been seen by critics (Rickey, 173, Harman, 48, and Summers, 110ff.) as one of Herbert's poems concerned with the search for a "plain" style, free of self-adornment.

> As flames do work and winde, when they ascend,
> So did I weave myself into the sense.
> But while I bustled, I might heare a friend
> Whisper, How wide is all this long pretense!
> There is in love a sweetnesse readie penn'd:
> Copie out onely that, and save expense. (ll. 13-18)

Stanley Fish (1972:199) is undoubtedly correct when he suggests that the only answer to the problem of the poet's self-assertiveness in this poem, is to copy what is already available.

> The price of saving expense is very high, for the expense saved is the effort that would allow the self to justify its pretensions to independence and efficacy. ... By copying out what is already there one speaks in the words of another, and therefore, to the extent that speech is an assertion of self, does not speak.

However, there is more to the last three lines of the poem than the poet simply copying words spoken by a friend, presumably Christ. The vocal unity of the poet with Christ is born out of the kind of relation that Bredin calls metonymical. The two voices are not dependent on one another, and are not intrinsically related, but if Christ is seen as the Cause of the words' existence, then the poet's reaction of writing them must be seen as the effect; so that the relation between the voices may be seen as metonymical.[11] Furthermore, love, in the second last line, is not strictly described as being similar to

---

11 The same phenomenon is evident in other poems where the poet either quotes Scripture or puts words in the mouth of Christ. See "The Thanksgiving" (p. 35), "Deniall" (p. 79), and "Dialogue" (p. 114) among others.

sweetness, as it would be in a metaphorical expression, but rather the concepts of "sweetnesse" and it being "readie penn'd", are seen as constituents of love. They are extrinsically related because they are not parts of love, but in the context of the poem, they come to imply one another. As a result, the relation between "sweetnesse" and "love", between "love" and "readie penn'd", as well as between "readie penn'd" and "sweetnesse" can be seen as metonymical, and it is this kind of relationship Christ tells the poet to "Copie out ...".

The movement of the poem can therefore be seen as one from metaphorical expression, in which the poet is responsible for his own idiosyncratic language, to metonymical expression (and synecdochical, since the words represent part of the whole poem and the poet's voice part of the unified voice of Christ and poet), in which the method of expression used by the poet becomes inextricably linked to the words spoken by Christ. Metonymic language may therefore be seen as the language of copying rather than inventing, and it is a mode that a great many Herbert poems aspire to.

Even more important as far as sacramentalism is concerned, the metonymical language is the kind used by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, reported both in Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer; "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor. 11:26, RSV). Drinking the "cup" is a metonymy for drinking the wine, the blood, and sharing in the agony of Christ (Gethsemane's "let this cup pass from me", Matt. 26:29). Metonymy is therefore the type of language Christ himself used when instituting the one ceremony which most clearly links the Head with the Body, so that the synecdoche of part synchronised with whole is expressed and even achieved through metonymy. Two

further aspects of metonymy may be seen as important for Herbert's "sacrificial" aesthetic. These are the interchangeability of cause/effect relationships (already mentioned briefly) and the interchangeability of possessor/possessed relationships.[12] Until now these ideas have been used without being clearly defined. Kenneth Burke (1973:28) sees the interchange between cause and effect in literature as an aspect of synecdoche, a trope which he too regards as having an essentially representative quality. He quotes Coleridge's The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, and says of the Albatross; "In being placed there as a 'motivation' of the Mariner's guilt, its function as something-to-be-murdered is synonymous with its function as incitement-to-murder" (28). Because the Albatross is put there to be killed, it could be said to participate in the crime, in a sense, as both the cause and effect of the crime) and therefore, as far as Burke is concerned, attain a representative function. This means, however, (and Burke points this out himself (78) later in the book) that he sees synecdoche as a trope uniting objects and ideas which are essentially different from one another. His definition of synecdoche is therefore very similar to what Bredin (48 & 55) defines as metonymy, especially with regard to the interchanging of cause and effect. Indeed, Bredin's definition seems more reasonable and more easily comprehensible, since the placing of part/whole distinctions on the relation between cause and effect clouds the issue in a way that definition as

---

12 Although Bredin (48) cites a number of similar relationships as metonymies, these seem to be the most broad and most pertinent to Herbert's poetry. An exception is perhaps the sign/signified relationship, which, to some extent, can be seen as a possessor/possesed one. The sign acts, in the Eucharist at any rate, as both a possessor of eternal reality, as well as something possessed by it.

metonymy does not. Both Bredin's and Burke's readings nevertheless suggest that cause and effect can be interchangeable, so that as metonymy, the effect resulting from a cause can itself become a cause, a completely circular motion which is endless.

Poems such as "Submission" (p. 95) and "Conscience" (p. 105) which, as already shown at the beginning of this chapter, are concerned with the loss of the independent poetic self and consequently the loss of an independent language, may be seen to use the interchange of cause and effect as a means of abdicating from personal speech. For example, "designe" in line 4 of "Submission" refers both to God (the Cause) as well as the poet's words and life (the effect), at the same time that it refers to its own words as a cause, uniting the poem's design with God's.

Perhaps most marked in this regard, however, are poems that deal particularly with Eucharistic symbolism. "The Invitation" (p. 179) and "The Banquet" (p. 181) are two important examples. In both cases the metonymic unity evident between words and between concepts can be seen as dependent on the abandonment of strictly metaphorical relations (which tend to maintain the individual's distinctiveness from God), as well as the loss of the distinction between temporal and eternal, life and death. The opening lines of "The Invitation" read,

> Come ye hither All, whose taste
> Is your waste;
> Save your cost, and mend your fare.
> God is here prepar'd and drest,
> And the feast,
> God, in whom all dainties are.

As in "An Offering" (p. 147) the "All" may be seen to refer not only to the many worshippers and those being healed, but to God (because of the capitalised word) and even to the words of the poem, because

"here" in line 4 suggests that the poet is not only referring to the feast, but to the poem as well. The pun is essential to the meaning of the poem, and, as Umberto Eco (1984:72) has shown, the pun is an important example of metonymy because it suggests a forced contiguity between two or more words. As a result, metaphorical language is transformed because "vehicles coexist with tenors - " (73).

In this poem, the metonymic unity created by "taste" being synonymous with "waste", becomes what one may call an operative way of linking divine and human because the pun on "All" implies that "taste" and "waste" are experienced by both God and man. For God to be "tasted" in the Eucharist is for him to be "wasted", and for any to taste him is for them (their independent realities separate from him) to be wasted. The interchanging of cause/effect as well as possessor/possessed relationships is therefore evident in the metonymy, since those who "taste" God (and therefore, in a sense, possess him) are "wasted" by what they taste (and are therefore, in a sense, possessed by him). At the same time, to eat God (and here one is reminded of Augustine's words concerning the Eucharist; "you are what you eat", Sermon 227) is to eat oneself. To taste God, (the Cause) is therefore to find waste (the effect), with the result that true tasting becomes the effect of the willingness to be wasted, which is in turn a cause. Since this entire interrelationship is made clear by the poem, the implicit suggestion is that the poem is a means to making the "tasting" and "wasting" possible - a "word" which presents the "All" ("Thy word is all if we could spell" - "The Flower") as one immediately present (both literally and figuratively) to the reader. The poem may be seen as the feast, just as the words may be seen as the "Word" which is "All" (both the believers and Christ).

This sacramental relation is furthered in the second stanza.

> Come ye hither All, whom wine
> Doth define,
> Naming you not to your good:
> Weep what ye have drunk amisse,
> And drink this,
> Which before ye drink is bloud.

God, worshippers, poet, readers and poem may be seen as the "All" which is defined by wine. The link between wine, blood and words becomes metonymic in the last two lines. "This" refers to wine, blood and poem, the one "named" (l. 9) or "put for", in the metonymical term, the other. To be "defined" by "wine" (ll.7-8), is therefore not only to change one's allegiance from drinking (or "saying" in the phrase of "The Flower") "amisse", to being defined by the Eucharist, but also to accept a definition that, because of its nature as sacramental metonymy, is opposed to an independent or individualistic predication of God. Such a relation suggests a complete acceptance of the Logos as a creative force in the poem, because wine, blood and poem may not only be seen as referring to Christ, but actually as being metonymies for him. The poem is a metonymy for wine, which is a metonymy for blood, which is a metonymy for the Logos, which is the "All"-creating Word.

The seventh stanza of "The Banquet" uses metonymy in a similar way, so that language itself may be seen to become a sacramental means by which the poet is united with God.

> Having rais'd me to look up,
> In a cup
> Sweetly he doth meet my taste.
> But I still being low and short,
> Farre from court,
> Wine becomes a wing at last. (ll. 37-42)

Wine comes equivocally and metonymically to be the same as wing. It

is the cause of the poet's sense of transcendence,[13] as it is the result, because to participate in the Eucharist is to experience transcendence, and the experience of transcendence leads once again to a further participation in the Eucharist. The Eucharistic experience annuls the distinction between cause and effect in its uniting man with God, and the things of earth (wine, blood, words) with the things of heaven (wing).

One cannot conclude this discussion on synecdoche and metonymy, however, without at least a brief examination of "The Odour" (p. 174) and "Love (III)" (p. 188). Terry Sherwood (1982:330) sees "The Odour" as "... an earthly equivalent to the heavenly dialogue shared with a loving God 'sweetly questioning' in 'Love III'". The one poem shows of earth what the other does of heaven. Synecdoche is inextricably related to equivocation in "The Odour", because the parts (words) represent the whole only by their ability to contain in themselves more than one meaning. Moreover, not only are words not limited to single meanings, they are also not limited to particular sense impressions, nor, in some cases, to a single grammatical function within a sentence.

> How sweetly doth My Master sound! My Master!
> As Amber-greese leaves a rich sent
> Unto the taster:
> So do these words a sweet content,
> An orientall fragrancie, My Master. (ll. 1-5)

Taste, sound, colour, touch and smell are all drawn together in the first three lines, in a description of "My Master", so that all the fleshly attributes of man and Christ are united in that participation which is peculiarly Christian. It suggests an analogical frame of

---

13 For a reading of this poem as an example of ascension from earthly to heavenly, see Jean Clayton Hunter (1982:62ff.).

mind which sees all these aspects of creation as pointing both to each other, and the Creator - the "Master".

Not only do the two words "My Master" contain in their meaning all the senses, but in their grammatical context they refer both to themselves and to Christ. They may therefore be seen to unite Christ and the words of the poem, and in doing so become operative means by which the divine is made present in the temporal. Christ may be seen to cause the words, and the words may be seen, as it were, to cause Christ to be present - the relation is both metonymical and sacramental. The poet may be seen to give over his language to a greater Reality, but in doing so allow it to be given a quality of making present what it signifies, it would otherwise not have.

If "The Odour" represents an earthly union with the divine, then "Love (III)", at the close of "The Church" foreshadows the heavenly union. In language which is perhaps the most compressed of any used in The Temple, Herbert holds together with delicately balanced poise the self-offerings of both the Host (a word inclusive of its Eucharistic meanings) and the guest.

> Love bade me welcome: yet my soul drew back,
> Guiltie of dust and sinne.
> But quick-ey'd Love, observing me grow slack
> From my first entrance in,
> Drew nearer to me, sweetly questioning,
> If I lack'd any thing. (ll. 1-6)

For the poet (as the guest) to speak (write) the words of the Host is for him to participate in the Host's own Nature, and for the Host to allow the guest to speak for him, is to give himself up in offering to another. Moreover, for the guest to accept the invitation, not only to share in the Host's Body, but to share in his words as well, is to give up the individuality sustained by the awareness of human imper-

fection. When the speaker sits and eats (l. 18), he stops the complaint that keeps him separate from God. Furthermore, eating the "meat" of the Word made flesh (John 1:14) becomes the cause of speaking the words of the poem, and the effect is that speaking the words of the poem (Christ's words) becomes analogous to sharing in the Eucharistic feast and what it represents - a sharing in the corporate Body of Christ. The sacramental, metonymic unity is thus complete, and the individual speaker's language is included in a much deeper sense of corporate experience shared by all participating in the Eucharist. This supports the sense of synecdochic unity of part with whole that is evident, since word and meat represent (equivocally) not only the words of the poem and the Eucharist, but also, in both cases, the living Body of Christ, on earth and in heaven. Part comes to represent whole in a unity that can justly be called metonymic.

The poet's use in many poems of the language of corporate experience, leads to the second aspect of the loss of poetic individualism with which this chapter is concerned - the interrelationship between poet, speaker and reader, and the evidence in many Herbert poems of the speaker and reader having to give up their particular points of view in favour of a greater and "truer" one. "Love (III)", the poem just examined, is a case in point, because the individual speaker must, in the end, give up his own point of view in favour of Christ's in order both for him to share in the Body of Christ, and for the poem to work. In many ways, this may be seen to be achieved by the use in the poem of the symbolism of corporate worship - particularly the sacrament of the Eucharist - so that one may say that the use of specifically tradition sponsored language such as the corporate symbolism and imagery of the Church's worship, of Scripture, or of metonymy and

synecdoche, is a way in which the conflicts in the poem are resolved. This suggests not only that the text is often given meaning by its relation to conventional Christian experience, but also that the speaker and reader often adhere to the conventional in order for conflicts to be resolved, or for the poem to be fully understood.

The use of convention means that the reader is not always uncertain whether he is responding to a text in the way he is intended to by the author, or that, as Eco (7ff.) says, he is dealing interpretatively with expressions in the same way the author deals generatively with them. The common knowledge lessens the uncertainty. In many ways Herbert is in the position that Eco attributes to the Mediaevals, with their four-fold method of interpretation. The strictures of Biblical exegetical modes, suggests Eco, prevented the pre-Baroque reader (and hence writer) from moving outside "rigidly preestablished and ordained interpretative solutions" (51). The use of allegory and the hieroglyph may be seen as particular examples in Herbert. To the extent that he shares a baroque sensitivity for the reader's role in a text, he may be seen to allow an important role to the reader's response, but even that is inevitably controlled by the careful definition placed on meaning and the action of the self in the poems by corporate or tradition sponsored language. The speaker's concern in many poems with his own provisional responses, and the reader's participation in a similar feeling, are often the result of an awareness of being outside the corporate experience to which the poem aspires.

Of necessity, such a view suggests a careful distinction in many of the poems between poet and speaker, and such a separation is often achieved by the use of Biblical imagery and the allusion to specifically corporate Christian ideas. The complaint by the speaker of

"Affliction (II)" (p. 62) that his sufferings are to be measured by "each houre of Methusalems stay" (l. 5), is evidence to the informed reader that the speaker exists in the realm of the Old Testament and has not yet been fully initiated into the morality of the New. In this poem the reader is in the position of the poet or, in Barbara Harman's terms, the "regenerate speaker",[14] because he is able to see what the "unregenerate speaker" cannot.[15] In others he is not able to see as clearly, so that he takes up a position beside the unregenerate speaker, and is "catechized", to use Fish's term (1978), into becoming a full participant in the poem's process of worship - and in doing so gives up his own individualistic existence and interpretative framework in favour of the communal one.

The poem "Love-joy" (p. 116) according to Fish (1978:27-28) is an example of this. The reader, he suggests, is somewhat surprised when the speaker of the poem answers his questioner that the letters J and C refer only to "Joy" and "Charitie". One expects to hear him affirm that they mean Jesus Christ. The surprise is even more pronounced, however, when the questioner affirms the correctness of the speaker's interpretation, with the result that the reader's perspectives are broadened as much as the speaker's are later. The reader discovers that Christ represents Joy and Charity, and the speaker discovers that Joy and Charity are found in Christ. What Fish does not point out, however, is that the reader's "catechizing" is the result of his read-

---

14 Harman (1982:73) makes a clear and useful distinction between a narrating self (the "regenerate speaker") and an experiencing self (the "unregenerate speaker"). She equates the former largely with the poet himself as someone who has overcome the conflicts experienced by the unregenerate speaker.

15 Some other poems of this kind are "Deniall" (p. 79), "The Temper (I)" (p. 55) and "Affliction (I)" (p. 46).

ing with an eye to conventional and well-nigh universally understood meaning ("J C" almost immediately suggest "Jesus Christ" to the Christian reader). Without this approach, the poet would not be able to play the trick he does. Both speaker and reader are therefore catechised into an acceptance of the value of tradition sponsored language and symbolism, and therefore become part of the "Bodie" themselves.[16] They may be seen, then, to lose their individuality by being incorporated into a "Bodie" which is not only Christ's body, but the poem also ("the bodie and the letters both"), a feat which makes the poem not only an exhibiter of the divine, but also an operative means by which the divine is participated in by the speaker and reader.

This leads to a consideration of a further problem concerning the speaker and reader in Herbert's poems. Harman's assertion (see n. 14) that the "regenerate speaker" or "catechizer" in Fish's terms, stands largely above the conflict pictured in any poem is a problematic one. It makes sense of the presence in the poems of simultaneous order and conflict, as Fish suggests, and it equally makes sense of the way in which the poet is able to overturn his speaker's interpretations. Even so, that the poet should no longer identify with the speaker's conflict (Harman, 74) suggests that he stands aloof from the poem as a whole and sees past spiritual conflicts as fought once and for all. However, it seems difficult to read almost any Herbert poem without feeling some sense of the author's instinctive concern not to be too dismissive in his judgements against the speaker because the lessons

---

16 Other poems which cause a similar infusion of the reader and even the speaker into corporate experience, are particularly reductive (in the terms of the discussion in chapter two) hieroglyphic poems such as "The Altar" (p. 26) and "Easter-wings" (p. 43), where the form of the poem actually as it were "overcomes" the reader's reality.

learned by the speaker are ones that must be learned again and again.

In a poem such as "The Collar" (p. 153) for instance, the reader and poet are able to see the sacramental meanings in words (the "sub-text" as it were) while the speaker cannot, not because the reader and poet are above the conflict, but because they relive it. The conflict between poet/reader and speaker causes the former two to be inevitably involved in the poem's conflict once again, because their criticism of the speaker forces them to reassess their own position. This is particularly true of the closing lines of the poem, in which Christ's voice takes over, because the need for him to take over the "writing" as it were, is an indication to both poet and reader that they are as close to a presumptuous neglect of their position as Christ's subordinates as the speaker is himself. Not by chance, then, are the final lines something akin to a catechism. They may be seen as the means by which the reader and poet learn once again what is perhaps the poem's most important lesson; to assume a superior knowledge can lead to a dangerous complacency, and that it is only in giving up what seems even a just knowledge, in favour of Christ's voice, that the individual achieves true union with him. In the words of this chapter's epigraph, "To give away yourself keeps yourself still".

The result of such a self-giving is worshipful silence, and, like "Love (III)", may be seen as a fitting example of the via negativa. The words of Christ, "My Child", become the equivalent in the poem of what Kant called an a priori intuition leading poet, speaker and reader to abandon their own independent interpretative frameworks. Faith in the Incarnation makes it possible to accept the symbolic force of the words as an ontologically valid reality, lifting the action of the poem onto a plane where divine ontology overcomes the

human - the ultimate expression of the via negativa.

A detailed analysis of a single poem will be useful as a way of showing how the interaction between reader, speaker and poet is governed by the use of a communal symbol, in a way that eventually leads to a form of silence. "The Crosse" (p. 164) is an apt poem for this purpose.

> What is this strange and uncouth thing?
> To make me sigh, and seek, and faint, and die,
> Untill I had some place, where I might sing,
> And serve thee; and not onely I,
> But all my wealth and familie might combine
> To set thy honour up, as our designe. (ll. 1-6)

The opening line introduces the poem's theme by the way in which it completely puts the reader off balance. He does not expect the speaker to respond so warily to the almost universal symbol of worship, sacrifice and reconciliation. A certain judgemental distance is therefore created between reader and speaker, so that the reader's curiosity about the speaker's unusual point of view verges on his having an air of superior knowledge. His judgement, however, is soon undercut by the poet who, in the next line, reveals the speaker to be someone who "sigh[s]", "seek[s]", "faint[s]" and "die[s]", in his attempt to find some "place" to worship properly. By the third line, then, speaker, reader (whose judgement against the speaker has turned into a judgement against himself), and the poet creating these intricacies, are all searching for the proper "place" where they might "sing".

However, the speaker's assertion in the final line of the stanza, that he and his family would (somewhat presumptuously) set up God's honour "as our designe" (suggesting "crest" as well as worshipping and poetic form), reveals him to be self-centred despite his sincere seek-

ing, and as separate from the cross as if it truly were a strange and uncouth thing. At this point in the poem, then, the cross is a symbol for confusion, rather than reconciliation, and the implication is that the true place of worship cannot be found as long as each is concerned to worship in his own "designe". The question remains, though, as to what the proper "designe" is.

> And then when after much delay,
> Much wrastling, many a combate, this deare end,
> So much desir'd, is giv'n, to take away
> My power to serve thee; to unbend
> All my abilities, my desires confound,
> And lay my threatnings bleeding on the ground. (11.7-12)

The confounding of the speaker's own designs is the very answer to the problem. The proper design is, in fact, the confounding of the individual's design, a confounding which results eventually in speaker, reader and poet all being able to see, from their vantage point as members of the corporate worshipping Body, the sacramental meanings hidden in words such as "unbend" (suggesting crucifixion) and "bleeding".

It is tempting to suggest that this is the ultimate point of self-sacrifice the poet reaches, a complete disappearance of the self in favour of infusion into the corporate Body symbolised by the cross. This is a view that Fish (1972:185-186) eloquently endorses.

> His [the poet's] will may be turned in the right direction (studying thy renown), but he cannot even take credit for the turning. This is the woe that is the fee of all his other woes, the reason why he is cast down by being taken up, why his hopes when they are sped become griefs - because they are sped not by him, but by the figure on the cross - why the strength which now fills him "doth sting" - because it is borrowed and therefore diminishes him.

According to Fish, then, nothing the poet does towards self-sacrifice can be of his own accord, and this is a view with which it is diffi-

cult to disagree. It suggests, however, a total annihilation of the self, and as this chapter has been suggesting, Herbert's self-sacrifice leads not so much to annihilation as transformation - transformation from a position outside the corporate Body to a position within it. Furthermore, Fish's analysis begs the question (a very difficult one) about the existence of the poem itself. If the poet's concern is to sacrifice self, then one inevitably asks why he does it in such an elaborate and self-assertive way. An answer, it would seem, lies in the closing lines of the poem.

> And yet since these thy contradictions
> Are properly a crosse felt by thy Sonne,
> With but foure words, my words, Thy will be done.

The paradox of asserting that Christ's words "Thy will be done" are one's own words, is the paradox that resolves the dilemma, because it both asserts an individual self ("my words") at the same time that it reveals an individuality measured only by its relationship to Christ.

The final words resolve not only the theme of personal struggle by quoting the words of Christ in Gethsemane (Luke 22:42), but the syntax equally suggests a resolution of argument because the poet has left out any connective that would suggest mere similarity between his words and Christ's. Instead, his words are Christ's, and vice-versa. The poet speaking for Christ and Christ speaking, as it were, for the poet, at first glance suggests a complete fusion of the two, and since this would not be entirely theologically acceptable, a complete loss of the poetic self. However, the assertion of individual selfhood is essential, because without it there could not be a sacrifice of the self. Herbert, then, can write "Thy will be done" as if Christ were writing it without the least sense of contradiction, because the self he asserts as a poet is necessarily both self-centred and self-

sacrificed. Without one there cannot be the other, and "my words" become as much Herbert's words (and the speaker's and reader's who are both brought to the same realisation the poet has reached) as they do Christ's.

This is nothing less than a complete acceptance of the Logos as the instrument of poetic creation - the perfect Word sacrificed ("my"/ "Thy" become interchangeable but retain their own identities), but in its own sacrifice transformed into something that co-exists with the eternal. The sacrifices of "The Crosse" then, are multiple, and they are exemplary of most of Herbert's poems on self-sacrifice.[17] By the end of the poem, the relationship of poet, speaker and reader both to each other and to the central symbol of the poem, the cross, has changed from its initial one. The uncertainty surrounding their various interpretative frameworks is resolved by their acceptance of the symbol and of Christ's words as something having an a priori, even an ontological, value outside their own immediate perspectives. It subsumes those perspectives into its own reality, even though it does not entirely annihilate the individual. Speaker, reader and poet are all assessed by their response to the words spoken by Christ and to the symbol of the cross. The result is that the speaker gives up his concern for his own method of self-sacrifice, the poet assesses his own language against that of the divine, and purposely chooses the "silence" of quoting the latter, and the reader forfeits the comfort of his own position as an uninvolved onlooker. He becomes aware that the only reason he understands the poem at all, is because he has

---

17 For example see, among others, "The Reprisall" (p. 36), "The Temper (I)" (p. 55), "The Temper (II)" (p. 56), "Mattens" (p. 62), "Submission" (p. 95) and "The Flower" (p. 165).

necessarily become part of a corporate experience (another member of the Body and an extension of the "Temple"), which is the poem's chief instrument of resolution.

This chapter has attempted to show some of the ways in which Herbert's poetry may be said to emulate aspects of the via negativa. From the perspective of sacramentalism, his acceptance of Christ writing on his behalf, his use of poetic structures and symbolism which suggest a corporate rather than an individualistic origin, and the context of the "Temple" from within which he writes, may all be seen to suggest a form of "sacrifice" on the part of the poet. The "sacrifice" of individualistic language and interpretative perspectives may be seen as inherently sacramental, not only because they are an emulation of Christ's sacrifice, but also because they are a way in which Herbert shares the life of the corporate community which makes up the Body of Christ, the Church - a community whose very life depends on its participation in the sacrificial offering of Christ.

CHAPTER V

THE WORD TRANSCENDENT

"Only through time time is conquered."

T.S. Eliot. The Four Quartets

The concern in previous chapters with the action of symbolic language as a temporal entity revealing the divine has, in many ways, begged the question about Herbert's understanding of time, both specific historical time, and time as a general philosophical concept. The present discussion will endeavour to address the issue because, for the Christian, historical time may be seen as the raw material God uses in his dealings with man, so that for the Christian poet using symbolism to express that relationship, a particular understanding of time's function may be seen to become a prerequisite for the creation of an intelligible symbolic language. The suggestion in the opening chapter that Herbert's understanding of symbolism may be seen to be similar to the "Realist-Symbolism" Augustine applied to the Eucharist, implies as much a particular understanding of the function of time in the poems as it does of symbolism. The "Symbolist" part of the definition, by suggesting an unlimiting multivalency, may also be said to imply the search for the transcendence of temporal limitations. The "Realist" part, on the other hand, just as it may be said to suggest a fixed spatial entity (the "thing" or sign used as a symbol), may also be said to suggest temporal fixity, because the sign used is generally a temporal thing. "The Rose" (p. 177) is suggestive of this. The

rose itself may be seen as both the literal rose and the poem, "Onely take this gentle rose" (l. 15). As such it is both temporally and spatially bound. Its symbolic nuances, however, suggest that even though it has for the poet a "strict, yet welcome size" (l. 4), it nevertheless is a size whose limits are difficult to measure, and therefore it in a sense transcends them. The rose is more than just a rose - it is mystery that will not allow itself to be limited by unequivocal definition.

Such a reading suggests that in symbolism of this kind there is a tension between the temporal and the transcendent, between the fixed realism of the sign and the exploratory extension of its symbolic nuances. A poet using symbolism in such a way, may then be said to be living in tension between present and future, since the symbol may be said to exist in the present, but point to a future fullness of meaning possible when the distinction between temporal and transcendent is broken. In this sense he may be seen to offer the symbol as both its own immediate (but only partial) resolution of the tension, and as the embodiment of a hope in a complete resolution in the future. In doing so, he seeks to allow a measure of the eternal to vitalise his own present. "It is in so far as they are figurative that poems most defeat time ...", says Rosemond Tuve (1952:111).

Herbert suggests such a tension when he says in "Artillerie" (p. 139) "I am but finite, yet thine infinitely.", and he is explicit at the end of "The H. Communion" (p. 52) when he says of the Eucharist, "Thou hast restor'd us to this ease [\"to heav'n from Paradise go"]/By this thy heav'nly bloud;/Which I can go to, when I please,/And leave th' earth to their food." These lines suggest that Herbert sees in the Eucharist an important symbolic means by which the tension between

temporal and transcendent is resolved. The appropriation of the Eucharistic symbolism by the poem further suggests that the words of the poem (as the words sharing in the Logos made present at the Eucharist) may be seen to share the function of bridging temporal and transcendent. In other words it is possible to see the poet's language as performing a sacramental function, and if this is so, the poems can be seen as existing in time, but as symbols revealing the divine, can also be seen as, in some ways, transcending time. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to explore some of the ways in which this may be seen to be the case in Herbert's poems.

In order to do so, however, a brief consideration of the relation between the Eucharist and time is necessary. The Eucharist may be said to uphold God's presence in time because that presence is represented in the time-bound elements themselves. However, in doing so it points both backwards and forwards in time. It is a remembrance of a past event (Christ's Passion) at the same time that it may be seen to point to a future fulfilment of the presence it represents outside time because the Judeo-Christian view of history insists (unlike its Grecian counterpart which saw history as essentially circular) on a linear perspective, with temporal events reaching a fixed conclusion at an eschaton. In this way, eschatology becomes a fundamental aspect of the Eucharist's relation to time. The prayer of consecration in the Book of Common Prayer makes it clear that participation in the Eucharist involves both a remembrance of Christ's historical Passion,

and a looking forward to his coming in Glory.[1] The consecrated elements therefore become means by which the communicant shares both in Christ's Passion and in the eschatological fulfilment of his divine work begun on earth. C.H. Dodd, when discussing the New Testament understanding of the Eucharist (Micklem, Ed., 1936: 78), makes this two-pronged relation clear.

> It was, indeed, natural that a common meal which both expressed the Church's expectation of the Lord's Advent and celebrated the present blessings of His reign among His people, should also carry with it the remembrance of His finished work, through which those blessings had been won, and upon which the Advent hope rested. So the Sacrament provided anchorage for the historical element in the Christian faith, along with the more mystical sense of the Lord's abiding presence, and with the hope of glory. Past and future were brought together in a present and recurrent experience.

The emphasis here is on what one may call the "sacramental present", similar to that found in the prayer of consecration in the Book of Common Prayer. Such an emphasis is equally evident in the Gospels, particularly St. John's, "the hour comes and now is" (4:23; 5:25), which at least one commentator sees as the writer's "persistent attempt to do justice to the proper dialectical nature of the escha-tological question" (Charity, 1966:86). By this he means the dialec-tic, ever-present in Christian thought, and particularly about the

---

1 The prayer in the 1548 order reads,

> O God heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesu Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee; Parker Society, Cambridge U P, (Cambridge:1844) 88.

Eucharist, between the sense of time as recurrent (a notion common to most religious festivals), and as linear, moving towards a specific end.

While the Reformation tended to be divided on what the temporal focus of the Eucharist should be, with Calvin emphasising the aspect of eschatological promise,[2] and more high-Church English Protestants such as Thomas Cranmer and Richard Hooker emphasising the Incarnation and Passion as the focus,[3] both groups nevertheless unflinchingly proclaimed that in the Eucharist God's eternal time meets with man's present. Calvin's commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:4 stresses the work of the Holy Spirit in enabling even the Jews in the desert during the Exodus to partake of Christ's body in their eating of manna, thus destroying (by using typology) the distinctions of time (as St. Paul does) between the faithful before the Incarnation and those after it.[4]

---

2 Article X of the Consensus Tiguranus, signed with Zwingli's successor Heinrich Bullinger in 1549 begins by emphasising the importance of Promise in the Eucharist. "It is proper to look not to the bare signs but rather to the promise annexed thereto."

3 See Hooker's Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity, V.li.3., where the Incarnation is the focus, though this does not preclude him from referring to the sacraments as "heavenly ceremonies" (V. lvii.3.). Cranmer, in his writings on the Lord's Supper emphasises Christ's death as the object of remembrance; "... it is the Lord's death that shall be signified, represented, and preached in these holy mysteries, until his coming again." Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, relative to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (1580). Parker Society, Cambridge U P, (Cambridge: 1844) 17.

4 See the Corpus Reformatorum, G. Baum et al, eds., 59 vols, Braunschweig, 1893-1900, 49:455. (Cited by McDonnell, 1967:267). Referring to Calvin's eschatology, McDonnell (291) says;

> There are two moments in this eschatological imperative: the vertical and upward, which is the sursum corda, and the horizontal and forward, which is the parousial expectancy proper. These two moments are related to each other not as static, independent instants in a given history, but rather

Cranmer's commentary on the same text follows Calvin's line, so that he too suggests that in the Eucharist past, present and future meet.[5] "Sacramentes are the powerfull instrumentes of God to eternall life.", says Hooker (Lawes, V. L. 3), joining the eternal with the temporal, and suggesting with the two previous commentators that the celebration of the Eucharist makes past and future into a present reality by recalling past and anticipating the future.

This kind of thinking, that concerns itself with a "sacramental present", is evident in Herbert's poems. P.G. Stanwood (1982:21) has pointed to the circular motion of time suggested by the repetition of the liturgical year as a form evident in the structure of The Temple as a whole,[6] and (23-24) to individual poems such as "A Wreath" (p. 185) and "Sinnes round" (p. 122) as structures which show a circular

---

4 (continues)

> as living events in the movements of history: the first, the sursum corda, as an enduring elan which carries the motion of time up and is drawn forward to the second moment, the Parousia, where it finds its fulfillment and meaning. The eschatological imperative destroys the spatial imperative.

5 See Cranmer's Disputations, (1844:75).

> And although in the manner of signifying there be great diference between their [Israel's] sacraments and ours, yet, as St. Augustine saith, both we and they receive one thing in the diversity of sacraments. And our sacraments contain presently the very things signified, no more than theirs did, For in their sacraments they were by Christ presently regenerated and fed, as we be in ours; although their sacraments were figures of the death of Christ to come, and ours be figures of his death now past.

6 A host of other scholars have shown the value of the liturgy as a means of interpreting the structure of The Temple. Among them are Louis Martz (1954:288ff.), Gregory Ziegelmaier (1967), John Booty (1979), Brewster Ford (1984), and more recently, John Bienz (1986).

form based on the kind of regularity evident in liturgical worship. In these poems time may be seen as insistently brought into the present by the circularity (and consequent repetitiveness) of their structures, so that neither poet, speaker nor reader is able to avoid the demand for a regular re-evaluation of their present spiritual state.

Even so, it is not only in this kind of formally circular poem that the present is emphasised. "Love (III)" (p.188), the closing poem of "The Church", is a prominent example both of an individual poem which emphasises the present holding in tension past and future, and as one which is important for the same idea being applied to the structure of "The Church" as a whole. Here the dialectic between present and future is made particularly sharp by the allusion to the Eucharistic liturgy, pointing as it does to a future heavenly "banquet" partially experienced in the present. Not only does the poem round off the liturgical structure of "The Church" (see Martz, 1954: 288ff.), ending a sequence concerned both with the Eucharist and the last things (eg "The Invitation", "The Banquet", "Death", "Doomsday", "Judgement" and "Heaven"), but its own language is reminiscent of the Eucharistic liturgy. The intermingling of past, present and future tenses, just in the last stanza of the poem, coupled with the implicit suggestion that the event being recorded is the combination of an ordinary Eucharist, the entry of the soul into heaven, and the heavenly marriage feast at the eschaton (Rev. 19:7), all ensure that temporal and spatial differences are collapsed into a single limited but limitless present.

Truth Lord, but I have marr'd them: let my shame
Go where it doth deserve.
And know you not, sayes Love, who bore the blame?
My deare, then I will serve.
You must sit down, sayes Love, and taste my meat:
So I did sit and eat. (ll. 13-18)

The poet seeks, in Eliot's words, "to apprehend/The point of intersection of the timeless/With time," ("The Dry Salvages", ll. 200-202). The eschaton is not only anticipated, but in fact apprehended in the present. The poem may be seen to become, then, an expression of what C.H. Dodd has called "realised eschatology" (1950:85) because its own structure emphasises the future made present, at the same time that, as Stanwood (21) points out, as the closing poem of "The Church" it points back in a circular motion to the opening poem of the series "The Altar" (p. 26). The Old Testament sacrifice on the altar, prefiguring the New Testament Eucharist, is fulfilled, so that "Love (III)" joins past and future in a present that, because of its liturgical repetition, is constant.

Herbert's concern to realise the past and future in the present is evident in other thinkers important to the renaissance, just as it is in sacramental theology. In a sense, Donne emphasises the future in the present when he says "Creatures of an inferiour nature are possest with the present; Man is a future Creature" (Simpson & Potter Ed., 1959, 8:75). Sir Thomas Browne is unequivocal in his emphasis on the present as the essence of God's time.

> Saint Peter speakes modestly, when he saith, a thousand yeares to God are but as one day: 2 Pet. 3:8 for to speake like a Philosopher, those continued instances of time which flow into thousand yeares, make not to him one moment; what to us is to come, to his Eternitie is present, his whole duration being but one permanent point without succession, parts, flux, or division. (Religio Medici, I. xi. Patrides, Ed., 1977:73)

This is virtually an echo of St. Augustine;

> Your years abide all in one act of abiding: for they abide and the years that go are not thrust out by those that come, for none pass: ... Your years are as a single day; and Your day comes not daily but is today, a today which does not yield place to any tomorrow or follow upon any yesterday. In you today is eternity: (Confessions, XI. xiii., Sheed, Ed., 1945:217)

In all of these ideas eternity is regarded not as something separate from man's present, but as something to be found in the present.[7] This is matched by Herbert in poems like "The Sacrifice" (pp. 26ff.) and "The Agonie" (p. 37) which seek to make present both to himself and the reader Christ's suffering. In these poems the use of the present tense and the liturgical references reinforce the sense of a present spiritual re-enactment (which is not to suggest Christ is re-crucified) of the past. The moment of Incarnation and Passion is continually re-presented liturgically so that it remains a constant present, and man comes to share in the eternal present which is divine time. One is able, therefore, to speak of a "sacramental present" in Herbert's poetry because both in his imagery and his structures, of The Temple as a whole and of individual poems, he reveals an awareness of his language as something sharing in the salvation events of the past and the future. By having his symbols participate in the divine (see chapters one and two), by having his language share in Biblical forms of expression (see chapter three), and by offering his words as a means of self-sacrifice (see chapter four), Herbert may be seen to give his poetry a sacramental force which makes it share in the divine

---

7 See also Confessions, XI. xx., XI. xviii., and Dei Civitate Dei, XI. vi. On Platonic and Neo-Platonic ideas of time similar to those of Augustine, Browne and the reformers, see the Timaeus, 38b., and the Enneads, III. vii. 12.

timelessness in the same way that the sacraments themselves do.

The suggestion that there may be a strong parallel in Herbert's poetry between his understanding of time and the way contemporary theologians interpreted the Eucharist, may be seen to be supported by Herbert's use of two symbolic modes. St. Paul's interpretation in 1 Corinthians 10:4 of the manna used as food in the desert as a typological figure for the Eucharist, is copied not only by Calvin, but by the English churchmen as well. It suggests a typological way of interpreting Salvation History, one in which the Eucharist may be seen as a focal point, making the present an important focus of all time, for as long as the Eucharist is celebrated. Herbert's extensive use of typology encourages one to see his typological poems in relation to this understanding. Closely related to such a use of typology is the liturgy, and particularly the Eucharistic liturgy which may be seen to support an understanding of time similar to that of typology. Here too, Herbert's extensive use of the imagery of liturgy invites further consideration. These two forms of thought, then, are to be examined as ways in which Herbert may be seen to deal with time - particularly time as he and many of his contemporaries would have seen it interpreted through the Eucharist.

As far as the Middle Ages and the renaissance were concerned, typology was a mode of Biblical interpretation by means of which the New Testament was seen as the fulfilment of "promises" made in the Old, or New Testament figures, particularly Christ, seen as the Anti-type of Old Testament types such as Moses, Adam or David. The precedent is set by the New Testament writers themselves, who interpret Christian experience in the light of the Old Testament events. As already mentioned, St. Paul does so in 1 Cor 10:4, the passage so

carefully expounded by Calvin and other reformers. Also, the writer to the Hebrews (5:8ff.; 6:13ff.; 7:1ff.) uses typology when he interprets Christ's role in relation to that of a priest of the Old Testament order of Melchizedek.

The importance of Christian typology is that it has very specific ramifications for the Christian interpretation of history. All history is interpreted as leading to and from the Christ event, and whatever has taken place prior to this event is both used as a means of interpreting it and of being interpreted by it. Northrop Frye's definition (1982:80-81) reveals this interplay.

> Typology is a figure of speech that moves in time: the type exists in the past and the antitype in the present, or the type exists in the present and the antitype in the future. What typology really is as a mode of thought, what it both assumes and leads to, is a theory of history, or more accurately of historical process: an assumption that there is some meaning and point to history, and that sooner or later some event or events will occur which will indicate what that meaning or point is, and so become an antitype of what has happened previously.

Herbert's use of the mode largely supports this understanding. His interpretation in "The Sacrifice" (pp. 26ff. ll. 161ff.) and "The Bunch of Grapes" (p. 128) of Christ's Passion as something prefigured in the grapes found in the Promised Land (Num. 13:23), suggests that he reads history typologically. He sees it as a series of events given meaning by its focus on Christ's Incarnation as the central event controlling past and future. "God's works are wide, and let in future times;" he says in "The Bunch of Grapes", suggesting that the present can often be understood only in relation to the future, in the same way that the past can often be understood only in relation to the present. A series of events in the past is given full meaning only

insofar as it makes sense of the present, so that, for example, the full significance of the grapes in the Old Testament is revealed only in Christ's Passion and the Eucharistic wine which is used to celebrate it. By implication, Christ is seen as the Antitype of the Old Testament figures seeking a Promised Land.

Herbert does not only use typology as a form of imagery, however. A closer look at some of his poems shows that his use of the mode may be seen as a sacramental one in which the poem using typology is able to become a means by which the link between type and antitype is achieved. The poem may then be seen as an event in the course of typological history, bringing about the fulfilment of history's meaning in a way similar to the sacraments which give the history and life of the Church its meaning. Such a poem is "Aaron" (p. 174), whose last stanza reads,

> So holy in my head,
> Perfect and light in my deare breast,
> My doctrine tun'd by Christ, (who is not dead,
> But lives in me while I do rest)
> Come people; Aaron's drest.

His "doctrine tun'd by Christ" may be seen to be as much the actual poetry as it is the poet's awareness that because of Christ's typological fulfilment of Aaron's priestly role, and because as a Christian he participates in Christ's Body, (celebrated at the Eucharist) he too shares Aaron's priesthood. The speaker is "drest" as a priest only when the poem is complete, and the poem is complete only when the speaker is properly "drest", so that the implicit assertion is that to be "drest" as a priest is to be "drest" as a poet. This suggests that the "Harmonious bells" on Aaron's gown, and Christ as "My onely musick," imply the search for poetic harmony. For his poetry to become perfected by participating in Christ is therefore for the poet to

become himself a fulfilment of the Aaronic type - the true priest. The "word" (and here one cannot help thinking of it as the Logos who is the creator of all words, and the fulfilment of all types of Christ) of the poem and the fulfilment of the historical "event" prefigured in Aaron are therefore not clearly separable, and the poem may be seen as a "word" partially fulfilling the typological imperative that demands an antitype for the Aaronic type. This is much of what A.C. Charity (1966:199) means when he illuminatingly defines typology as a mode of thought linking events in such a way that one always implies another.

> One thing does not mean another in typology: it involves it, or has inferences for it, or suggests it, and it does all these things for no other reason than that there is a real, existential parallel, as well as a certain historical dependency and continuity between the events which typology relates.

Typology need not be seen as a way of interpreting events, its use can be seen as a way of sharing in the events themselves, so that the typological symbolism, like sacramentalism, may be seen as "operative" in making existentially present what it points to.

Herbert's typology, then, may be seen as largely accepting a role as an expression of the realisation in the present of what was hoped for in the past. His focus on the present gives credence to Erich Auerbach's (1953:64) interpretation of typology. Auerbach suggests that type and antitype, figure and fulfilment are to be seen as aspects of the same event in which time is not read as one event succeeding another on a horizontal plane, but is related in a more complex way.

> ... the here and now is no longer a mere link in an earthly chain of events, it is simultaneously something which has always been, and which will be fulfilled in the future;

From this perspective, typological action is best presented as a triangular whole in which Providence, as the peak of the triangle, is both controller and focal point of the other two ends which represent type and fulfilment, event and meaning. In the mind of God, not limited to human perspectives of time, there is little or no distinction between the type and the fulfilment, so that the present is, in a sense, able to "contain" in itself the past, and by implication, the future as well. While it would be idle to speculate here just how this is possible, suffice it to suggest that one of the ways the present can become the focus of reality in typology is by the fact that the past is understood with reasonable clarity only from the perspective of the present, and the future is in some ways already known because of the positive expectation (a foreknowledge) placed on it by typology. In a sense, Eliot's "the still point of the turning world" is reached, because the present becomes the centre of a circular movement of events, in which the past will take on full meaning in the future, the future will be fulfilled only because of its relation to the past, and the present holds both of these in tension.

This view obviously has important bearings on one's understanding of eschatology, because it suggests that the present in some way fulfils (if only partially) the future - or in a typological relationship, the type partially fulfils the antitype. In many ways, then, the use of typology may be seen as an indication of a concern with eschatology - with a fulfilment of the types in the future. The typological poem that emphasises the present, therefore, like the end of

"Aaron", may be understood to be a way of "realising" the eschatological future (in this case the perfection of the Aaronic type in the speaker) in the present. To some extent, this is what Charity (160) means by the idea of a "subfulfilment", a partial fulfilment of past type and eschatological future through the individual's present "self-conforming with the act of God." Such an idea is given credence by an important understanding of the nature of eschatology, presented by J.A.T. Robinson (1950:54). Robinson's assertion is that what is at issue in defining eschatology is not temporal but moral significance.

> It is to reverse the eschatological equation to say that the final in time is the ultimate in significance, rather than that the ultimate in significance is the final in time.

In Biblical eschatology, it is not so much the end of the temporal chain of events which is the focus of history, but rather the ultimately significant event which determines the course of history. This event is, of course, the Incarnation, and it is only from this perspective that one can make sense of many of the eschatological sayings of Jesus in which he affirms that "the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Matt. 12:28). The individual's conforming to this "eschatological imperative" may, then, be seen to result in the future being partially "realised" in the present.[8]

Herbert's poems (even those not using typological symbolism) show a similar understanding of eschatology. The eschatological impera-

---

8 This is to a large extent the import of Jesus's parables about the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. The parables are not only a warning to hearers of the imminent approach of the eschatological Kingdom, but also a demand that hearers conform to the imperative inherent in the parable, and in so doing, in fact participate in the inauguration of the Kingdom. See Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, S C M Press, (London:1972) 115-288. First impression, 1954.

tives of the poems at the end of "The Church" which deal with the future inauguration of God's Kingdom, tend to stress the importance of the individual's conforming to the demand in the present. "The Invitation" (p. 179) demands a self-abnegation of the individual's life in the face of Christ's death which is represented not only in the blood and wine of the Eucharist, but also in the way it "exalts you [the speaker, reader, worshipper] to the skie;". Similar eschatological language is evident in "The Banquet" (p. 181), where the speaker finds in the wine tasted on earth a foretaste of the heavenly banquet at the eschaton; "For with it alone I flie/To the skie:". In "Dooms-day" (p. 186) a vision of apocalyptic disorder is shown to be realised in the present, "Man is out of order hurl'd", and must be dealt with in the present, even though it is a present that implies a future; "Lord, thy broken consort raise,/And the musick shall be praise". "Consort" implies, of course, not only the musick of worship, but also that of poetry (see "Employment (I)" p. 57), at the same time that it suggests a betrothal between the speaker and God, one brought about in the present, but consummated at the final marriage between Christ and the Church, the Bridegroom and the Bride (Rev. 21 and 22). The marriage is itself foreshadowed in "Love (III)" (p. 188), and here too the allusion to the Eucharist suggests a realisation of the future banquet in the present.

What this means ultimately, is that if the speaker's conforming to the eschatological imperative results in a "subfulfilment" of a future fullness, then it seems reasonable to suggest that his language itself participates in the realisation of the "subfulfilment". If this is the case, then one may see the language itself as "operative" in a way similar to the sacraments, in bringing about in the present,

what it points to as the future. In other words, it may be seen as both symbolist and realist. The importance in eschatology of an imperative that demands a response in the present, may be seen to make the language that participates in the attempt by the individual poet to live up to that imperative, an event in itself actually participating in the realisation of eschatological fulfilment. In the language of typology, the figure as the typical "event" shares in the antitypical "event" in such a way that both, in Auerbach's words (64) "involve and fulfill" each other, or, as Murray Krieger would say, each is both a mirror and a window, reflecting itself and shadowing the other through its reflection (1964:175).

A particular language mechanism is often responsible, in Herbert, for typological language being able to achieve the function of "involving and fulfilling" what it represents. That mechanism is metonymy, and its use in typology can be regarded as equally sacramental as it is in Herbert's poetry generally. Holly Wallace Boucher (Bloomfield, Ed., 1981:129ff.) suggests that metonymy is a trope fundamental to the working of typology, and she uses Dante's typology as an example. What she terms metonymy, however, is what Hugh Bredin (see chapter four above) would be more inclined to refer to as synecdoche. Boucher (136) says in distinguishing metaphor from metonymy in typology,

> If metaphor, which consists of one thing represented or signified by another distinct thing, serves to figure Platonic truths, then metonymy, which represents a whole by a part which belongs to it, or the part by the whole which contains it, or one thing by another integrally connected to it, is the appropriate figure for Christian typology.

The reason Boucher gives for this view is that the typological understanding of history holds that "God makes each event a partial revela-

tion of his whole purpose and a term relative to the absolute fulfillment in Christ" (133). This is really the same as Auerbach's suggestion that type and antitype "involve and fulfill" each other. Boucher's definition, though, would be seen by Bredin as referring both to metonymy and synecdoche. If one accepts Bredin's definition of metonymy as "extrinsic" relations "among things", and synecdoche as "structural" or "intrinsic" relations "within things" (1984:53), then the first part of Boucher's definition must be read as referring to synecdoche, and the second to metonymy.

Both these tropes are evident in the typology at work in "Aaron" (p. 174). The type (speaker as Aaron) comes to be seen as a partial fulfilment of the whole it represents (Christ as Aaron), and a synecdochical relationship is instituted between part and whole, type and antitype, creating what Charity calls an "applied typology" (159), one in which the individual's (in this case the speaker's) conforming to the typological pattern makes him a "subfulfilment" of the antitype. Of necessity, the typology is "applied" in the present, so that the poem may be a means by which the "subfulfilment" is achieved. This action is possible, however, only because of a more intricate relation between type and antitype that Bredin calls metonymy. It is one that invites the suggestion that the word of the poem is itself an event in the metonymic relation between type and antitype.

> Christ is my onely head,
> My alone onely heart and breast,
> My onely musick, striking me ev'n dead;
> That to the old man I may rest,
> And be in him new drest. (ll. 16-20)

Christ as the speaker's "head" suggests the organic relationship between each member of the mystical Body of Christ and the whole, implying synecdoche. However, the fact that the speaker is able to say

Christ is his "onely" head, heart and breast, suggests a relationship where one is "put for" the other, a metonymy. Furthermore, Christ's role as the poet's "onely musick" is a strong indication that the poem's "musick" and Christ are metonymically related. This suggests that the "word" ("musick") of the poem is an event in the typological relationship between speaker and Christ, because, in the true character of the Logos, Christ as antitype not only fulfils the word of the poem, but is the word, breaking the distinction between the poem as a type (speaker as type also) and himself as antitype. As with all proper metonymy, the distinction between cause and effect is blurred, as is that between possessor and possessed. The poem itself takes on the immanent presence of the divine.[9]

The close relation between metonymy and typology is, in some ways, evident in the clothing imagery prevalent in some of Herbert's typological poems, and particularly in "Aaron". By saying "Come people, Aaron's drest", the speaker associates dressing not only with the fulfilment of his role as an Aaronic type, but also with his participation in the antitype - Christ. The primary way in which he puts on Aaron's priestly dress is by "putting on" Christ. Christ's body

---

9 This reading encourages one to disagree with Lewalski's view that Herbert, as a particularly Reformist poet, is concerned more with the eschaton than the Incarnation, and hence sees his language as no more than a sign of future perfection (1979:125). It also encourages disagreement with the view held by M.M. Ross (1969:96+100), reached from the Roman Catholic perspective rather than Lewalski's Protestant one, that the Anglican poets of the period do not see time as in any way contained by Christ's sacramental presence in the temporal. By implication, this argument suggests that Herbert's typology is also only a sign of distant events in the past and future, and one that does not participate in those events. It would seem more reasonable to say with Tuve (1952:117) that Herbert "reads history and biblical story as one great web of metaphor", and seeks in the metaphor an earnest of his redemption.

and Aaron's robes become, in the typological context of the poem, metonymies, each implying the other. The idea of putting on Christ as if he were a garment is Biblical (Rom. 13:14; Gal. 3:27), as is the notion that Christ is the antitype of Aaron (Heb. 5). Furthermore, the importance of clothing imagery in typology has been emphasised by Heather Asals (1981:39), who suggests that clothing in the typological poems becomes a symbol of Christ's voice uniting with the poet's in the creation of the poem (to "dress" oneself is to "address" Christ, to "wear" him is to "copy" him). The garment Christ puts on is flesh (at the Incarnation), and the one the poet puts on is Christ (see "The Sacrifice", p. 26, ll. 241-244 and "Josephs coat", p. 159). This suggests that the poem is itself a means to the fulfilment of the antitype, and therefore a way of "realising" the eschatological future in the present. This is supported by some of the important Biblical references to garments, and Herbert's use of them in "The Sacrifice" where Christ's garments are "the type of love" (l. 242). This closely relates to the clothing imagery that is particularly suggestive of the inauguration of the eschatological New Age in some of Christ's parables.

As Joachim Jeremias (1972) has shown, the imagery of garments, often closely related to that of the wedding and of wine in the parables, is usually a reference to the inauguration of the New Age, Christ's eschatological kingdom. Mark 2:21 contrasts new cloth with old, as it does new and old wine skins. The new cloth and new wine become symbols of the New Age (Jeremias, 117-118). What is more illuminating as far as the poems "Aaron" and "Josephs coat" are concerned, however, is Jeremias's analysis (128-130) of the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32). The robe given by the father to his

returning son represents the beginning of a new age. Jeremias suggests that this action is partially prefigured in Genesis 41:42, where Pharaoh gives Joseph a new robe, honouring him as a deserving official and thus ushering in a new age. If "Aaron" and "Josephs coat" are read with this in mind, the sense in which they represent an awareness of the immanence of the eschaton in the present, is considerably heightened. The new robe the speaker in each of these poems dons, symbolises his awareness of his role not only as the present fulfilment of the past type (Aaron and Joseph respectively), but also as the present realisation of the future antitype - Christ. The typology engenders a "realised eschatology" and the metonymy insisting on the speaker's "putting on" Christ as the "ultimate garment" becomes a means of making the typology "applied" in the poem itself.

Perhaps the basis of this relation is that as an "applied typology", the poems may be seen as means of rendering the divine present in the speaker, because their words may be seen as a way in which the writer dons the eternal Word made flesh. Each poem, by being a "donning" of Christ, is a participation in the Word. It is also a sharing in Christ's priesthood (particularly in "Aaron"), so that the priest using words to share in the Word may be seen to make his poem a sacramental means by which that sharing takes place.

Similar connections between typology, metonymy and "realised eschatology" are to be found in the conventional symbolism of "The Bunch of Grapes" (p. 128), especially the last stanza of the poem.

> But can he want the grape, who hath the wine?
> I have their fruit and more.
> Blessed be God, who prosper'd Noahs vine,
> And made it bring forth grapes good store.
> But much more him I must adore,
> Who of the Laws sowre juice sweet wine did make,
> Ev'n God himself being pressed for my sake.

Throughout the poem the speaker's present state of being is emphasised as the focal point. On the one hand Salvation History makes sense of his own spiritual life, but on the other hand, his life gives Salvation History its meaning because, in the typological framework of the poem, he represents part of history's culmination. The speaker's spiritual experience is a type of Israel's, and a type of Christ's, who is the fulfilment of both. In a sense, then, he imitates both Christ and Israel.[10] This imitation may be seen to be founded particularly on the combined use of metonymy and typology. The conventional nature of the images in the stanza quoted gives the typology a fixedness of reference which leads to a metonymic relation between the speaker and Christ, and between grapes, Christ and speaker. Even though "fruit" has varied connotations in its context (referring to grape, wine, the Church as the offspring both physically and spiritually of Israel, and Christ as the "fruit" of the Old Testament covenant with Noah), these are all nevertheless conventional, so that their meaning is focussed in a specific typological relationship.

The relation becomes stipulatory rather than exploratory (the way a metonymy does) and the individual speaker (as a representative of the whole Christian community) is defined by the definite connotations suggested by the general acceptance of the symbol's meaning. He is

---

10 This is in contradiction to the argument offered by Richard Strier (1983:50) that Herbert, like Luther, is against any notion of man being able to imitate Christ. Strier reads "The Thanksgiving" from this perspective, but associates the poet's apparent repudiation of imitation with the speaker's obviously misguided idea to "build a spittle" (l. 33) in response to Christ's grace. While the poet is adamant that he can never fully give thanks, and therefore never properly imitate Christ, the typology evident in "The Bunch of Grapes", which makes Christ the speaker's "head", does suggest that he is able to imitate Christ by being, in the Pauline phrase, "in" him.

defined as a member of a society whose life not only gives meaning to the symbol, but which is its meaning. In this sense the relation becomes metonymic (just as God being pressed (wine=blood) is metonymic) because the typology does not merely equate grape with wine, or the Old Testament covenant with the New (or in Eucharistic terms, wine with the blood of Christ), it identifies the one in the other, so that each (in Auerbach's terms) "involves and fulfills" the other. The pun on "pressed" extends the metonymy by suggesting not only the winepress but also the printing press, so that the printed poem figures the "pressing" of God in such a way that the poem and God's experience become synomymous, or mutually "identified" in each other - as in a metonymy. This identification becomes a primary means by which the individual speaker, the believing community and the poet himself, are able to realise the typological imperative to live, in the present, eschatological existence.

The eschatological range of this poem (and most other Eucharistic poems in The Temple for that matter) is supported by the New Testament references to wine, particularly those made by Jesus himself. Jeremias points out (118) that the miracle of turning water to wine at Cana (John 2:11) is to be seen as a sign by Christ that the New Age has dawned. This would have been understood by Jesus's contemporaries, he suggests, because of similar Old Testament references to wine, such as the vine planted by Noah in the restored earth after the Flood (Gen. 9:20) and the bunch of grapes brought from the Promised Land (Num. 13:23). These references contrast the old dispensation with the new, and this is precisely what Herbert's typology does in the poem when he chooses the same images to show the distinction between the spiritual experience which imitates Israel, and that which imitates

Christ. The latter is able to realise its own future fulfilment by participating in the metonymy which makes Christ himself (and by implication the mystical Body of Christ, the Church, as well) "pressed".

The consideration of the conventional symbolism of "The Bunch of grapes" is a useful introduction to Herbert's use of liturgical symbolism, the second major aspect of Herbert's understanding of time which is of interest to this particular argument. The specific aspect of liturgy concerned with here is its relation to the structure of time in many of the poems, rather than as a body of conventional imagery the poet uses as a basis for some of his ideas. Examples of the latter are numerous (eg "The Altar" (p. 26), "The Agonie" (p. 37), "Good Friday" (p. 38), "Easter" (p. 41) and "Lent" (p. 86) to name but a few), and have been examined extensively by a number of scholars (see n. 6.). As P.G. Stanwood (1982:19) has pointed out, liturgy makes use of time because all human actions take place in time, and it is the similarity between the functions of liturgical time and the time structures of many of Herbert's poems that seems, to the present writer at least, to be a facet of Herbert's poetry not fully explored by scholarship.

Liturgy may be seen as the formalisation of the Church's worship during its state of existence between the advent of Christ at the Incarnation, and his expected advent at the eschaton. As such it holds (particularly the Eucharistic liturgy) the past and future in tension. Its use in poetry means that poems having either liturgical structures, or even simply using liturgical imagery, tend to share in the function of focussing all time in the present, while nevertheless continuing to look towards a future fulfilment. In Stanwood's words (19), "... the end of liturgy is to fix time in an everlasting

present, to rescue time from mutability, to redeem the present moment by conquering the threat of loss and triumphing over decay - even the dissolution of mortality itself."

The way liturgy fixes time in the present, suggests Stanwood, is evident in its habit of recalling events that are past (the Passion, the Resurrection, etc.) so that the sense inspired in the worshipper is of a "continuing and instantaneous" (19) experience. Furthermore, by pointing to a future consummation of past events, liturgy may be said to share in a transcendence of time. This two-pronged movement is nowhere more evident than in the words of consecration of the Eucharistic elements known as the anamnesis or "remembrance". These words are generally taken from Christ's words of consecration at the Last Supper, and are reported earliest by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:23-26. "This is my body which is [given] for you. Do this in remembrance of me, ... This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me" (RSV: see also Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:17-19). Karl Rahner (1963:86) has shown the importance of these liturgical words for the Church.

> The anamnesis, the words of commemoration are the very central words of the Church because in the most real and intensive way they make present for our salvation what they signify. For that reason all other words in the Church are ultimately only preparation, exposition and defence of these words alone, in which the incarnate Word of God comes into our space and time as our salvation.

The words of remembrance proclaim the value of the past, but in doing so point to the future because they are only to be used "until he [Christ] comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). They function as a means, symbolic of all liturgy, of making past and future a present reality. This is particularly revealed in the fact that St. Paul's words in the

original Greek for "this do" (touto poiete) are in the present continuous tense. The action of remembrance is an ongoing, forward-looking one.

Northrop Frye (1982:81) has pointed out how the "backward movement" of typology (he defines this as the causal thinker having to read events from their effects back to their causes - thereby reversing the normal temporal order) is reminiscent of Plato's understanding of anamnesis, recognising the new as something identifiable in the old. In Plato anamnesis refers to a particular faculty that enables the soul to remember those things it had seen when residing in the realm of eternal forms or Ideas. It is the "recollection of things formerly seen by our soul when it traveled in the divine company" (Phaedrus, 249b). The Christian version, while not necessarily derived from Plato, is not that different, so that not only typological symbolism, but also liturgical structures used in poetry can be seen in similar terms.

The Eucharistic anamnesis remembers and makes present at the same time that it implicitly anticipates a future fulfilment. In recollection it creates and anticipates. This is supported by St. Paul who sees in the anamnesis a form of worship in which "the great acts of God's deliverance are always present, and ritual remembering of them involves the worshippers in them so that they become participants" (Suggit, 1987:16). This form of thinking is openly espoused by Thomas Traherne, who says in "The Improvement", "'Tis more to recollect, then make. The one/Is but an Accident without the other". In Herbert, a liturgical poem like "The Sacrifice" (p. 26) strongly suggests a way of thinking similar to anamnesis, because the setting recalls the original sacrifice, but the tone of urgency and the broad reference to

"all ye, who passe by", suggest (see Elsky, 1984:319) both the poet's and the reader's present re-enactment or "remembrance" of the event. The same may be seen to apply to other liturgically based poems such as "Easter" (p. 41), where the poet both remembers the actual historical event, but also uses the poem not only as a means of realising the past event in his own life, but also as one of realising a future perfection already anticipated in the resurrection: "O let thy blessed Spirit bear a part,/And make up our defects with his sweet art."

This suggests an important eschatological strand that is essential to anamnesis. As Suggit (16) says, "the eucharist is the way in which the church celebrates in the present its origin and its destiny." Poetry that shares this liturgical mode necessarily holds the two times in tension. Buckley (1968:47) has described such poetry as the kind which treats "process as manifesting the state to which it aspires;" thereby "establishing a sense of the sacred which, without such a use of language, would not be established at all". The poem as a process anticipating a future state of "completion" (and here one cannot help thinking of the many open-ended "closures" in Herbert's poems, such as the closing lines of "The Altar" or "The Thanksgiving") may contain in its own workings the beginnings of that future state. The recollection or remembrance of the past, and the expectation of a future are both held in tension by the present process of the poem, in the same way that they are in anamnesis.

An obvious example is "The Temper (II)" (p. 56), which begins with the remembrance of past experience evident in such phrases as "It cannot be. Where is that mighty joy,/Which just now took up all my heart?", and ends with a request for the past to be realised in the future, "Though elements change, and heaven move,/Let not thy higher

Court remove,/But keep a standing majestie in me." The entire poem, though, may be seen as a process recalling past and anticipating future in its own present structure, and therefore actually, in a sense, fulfilling its own demand for "completion" by bearing the presence of God. The third stanza suggests this when the poet implies that proper reverence on his part will result in divinely ordered verse. The fact, then, that his verse is not "unruly" (l. 12), suggests that it already bears the divine and is the beginning of the sense of fulfilment the poet seeks. This is sacramental in the sense that the poem becomes an entity participating in and revealing what it points towards.

It becomes liturgical in structure because every reading of the poem is a re-enactment of the past and a new anticipation of the future. In this way the poem holds together (as all anamnesis does) circular and linear time patterns, by continually recollecting the past but also looking forward to a specific future completion. It shares then, in the peculiar paradox central to most Christian eschatology, that the future fulfilment is both present and to come, a paradox perfectly summed up by St. Paul's insistence (Rom. 8:24) that the Christian is saved by hope (see Suggit, 12).

The question remains as to just how Herbert's poetic structures reveal the use of anamnesis in the sense described. While there are undoubtedly numerous techniques one may point to as evidence of Herbert's use of the idea, space limits the examination to two specific ways in which the individual structures of some poems can be said to reveal its use. The first is the technique of meditation, which a number of scholars, particularly Louis Martz (1954) and Barbara Lewalski (1979), have already shown is important both to the

seventeenth-century in general and Herbert in particular. The second is a way in which the narrative structures of many Herbert poems may be said to be governed by an "achronistic" use of time.

As Martz (1954) has shown, the idea of "recollection" is an important one in the structure of meditations during the seventeenth-century. It is a term used to describe the action of making vividly present to one's mind a specific object, or even theological or Biblical idea, upon which to meditate. In this sense it is an imaginative exercise which contemplates some external object or some event of the past with sufficiently single-minded vigour that the comtemplator feels as close a relation to the object or event as possible. The renaissance mystic, St. Francois de Sales, whom Martz has suggested strongly influenced Herbert, describes contemplation in the following terms.

> Meditation considereth by peecemeale the obiectes proper to move us; but contemplation beholdes the obiect it loves, in one simple and recollected looke, and the consideration so united, causeth a more lively and strong motion (Martz, 17).

The word "recollect" here means, as Evelyn Underhill points out when discussing its use in mysticism generally (1960:314), not simply to remember something from the past, but also to "gather together" thought, to "re-collect" as it were, what has before been disjoint and incoherent. It is not just an act of remembrance or memorial, but also one of imaginative focus on the object of contemplation in such a way that the self begins to be purified of extraneous thoughts and desires - it is the first stage of meditation leading to the attainment of the mystical Unitive Way. Martz (1954:18) describes the concept of "recollection" as

> ... the term which the Spanish mystics, notably St. Theresa, use to describe the withdrawal from the world of sense-perceptions that marks the road to the heights of mystical contemplation.

Because it is but the first step of a meditation, and is only an entry into more mystical forms described by Underhill (310ff.) as Quiet and Contemplation, "recollection" ensures that "the surface-mind still holds, so to speak, the leading strings:" (Underhill, 311). The conscious individual will is still very much in play at this stage, even though there is the beginning of a breakdown of the distinction between the worlds of Appearance and Reality. In this sense, "recollection" becomes the form of meditation perhaps most suited to the poet, who is still in conscious control of his material. The fact that it fixes the imagination upon a specific object or idea (whether it be a symbolic object of worship as was often the case with Catholic or high-Church Anglicans, or the actual words of Scripture, the more Protestant way (see Lewalski, 1979:148), is of mutual relevance here) often focusses the mind on sensuous detail, so that its presentation tends to be dramatically immediate. Martz (1954:29ff.) has shown how this dramatic immediacy is evident in the beginnings of many Donne and Herbert poems, implying their familiarity with the tradition of meditation. What is of importance here, however, is the effect dramatic immediacy and the structure of meditative "recollection" in general have on the presentation of time of Herbert's poems.

Dramatic immediacy implies not only vivid recollection of detail and a consequent emphasis on the present, but is also, in the form of recollective meditation described by Francois de Sales, very similar to anamnesis. He suggests (see Martz, 1954:30) that there are three different ways of approaching the meditation, or even three different

steps in its process. The first is to imagine oneself at the spot where the event occurred. Such an event would be the Nativity or the Passion. The second is to imagine the event as occurring before one's very eyes. And the third is to imagine that every one of the things meditated on passes within one's own heart. This is an imaginative making present both of past and future (when the object of meditation is a future spiritual state), and of the sensuous detail that goes to make up both. As such it is akin to anamnesis because it does just what Rahner (1963:86) says of the words of remembrance at the Eucharist, it makes "present for our salvation what [it] signif[ies]". In this way there is a link between the process of meditation and the sacramental anamnesis practised in many of Herbert's poems.

It is not difficult to find in Herbert numerous examples where there is a combination of dramatic immediacy and the imaginative recreation of the past. The liturgical sequence from "Good Friday" (p. 38) to "Easter-wings" (p. 43) consists of poems which all present a recreation of the events of Holy Week in such a way that they are made vividly present. The poems themselves function in very much the way the sacramental anamnesis does, by rendering a dramatically immediate presentation of the Passion and the Resurrection. They do so, however, in such a way that the actual words of each poem perform the sacramental function of both making the events present and, in the form of recollective meditation, assisting the reader and poet to have the events "pass within his heart". In "Good Friday" the dramatic immediacy of anamnesis is suggested by the opening lines which are a vivid remembering of the Passion.

O my chief good,
How shall I measure out thy bloud?
How shall I count what thee befell,
And each grief tell? (ll.1-4)

Both the anaphoric repetition and words like "measure", "count" and "tell" suggest a liturgically ritualistic attempt to "measure" with the actual words of the poem, the meaning of Christ's Passion. This vivid recalling is made more than merely imaginative when the poet seeks to have its meaning "pass within his heart" by uniting his own blood with Christ's in the chirograph of the poem itself.

Since blood is fittest, Lord, to write
Thy sorrows in, and bloudie fight;
My heart hath store, write there, where in
One box doth lie both ink and sinne: (ll. 21-24)

In similar fashion, the sonnet "Redemption" (p. 40) is a dramatic re-enactment of the Passion, which has the characteristic sense of immediacy at the end of the poem, rather than the beginning, because of the way it consistently undercuts both the speaker's and reader's expectations of Christ's commitment to men. The speaker's (and reader's) symbolic journey is not only a remembrance of the redemption event, but a vivid recreation of the search for redemption and the surprise with which it is discovered. The surprise created by the poem's unexpected closure may therefore be as much a reality as the surprise experienced in redemption.

The dramatic opening of "Sepulchre" (p. 40) draws past and present together in the speaker's address made to Christ's dead body - which is long since resurrected. The act is an imaginative recreation of the past.

O Blessed bodie! Whither art thou thrown?
No lodging for thee, but a cold hard stone?
So many hearts on earth, and yet not one
Receive thee? (ll. 1-4)

A further drawing together of past and present is suggested in the second line, where "lodging" implies both the search for lodging at the Inn in Bethlehem during the Nativity and the lodging of God in the believer's heart. Similarly, "stone" is suggestive both of the stone tablets of the Mosaic covenant, and the stony hearts of present believers. The liturgical poem "Easter" (p. 41) is a re-enactment, in the heart of the speaker, of the resurrection event, and the hieroglyphic poem "Easter-wings" (p. 43) actually figures in its shape (always present so long as the poem is read) the experience of Easter. It becomes a dramatically visual embodiment of the past resurrection, at the same time that it looks forward ("if I imp my wing on thine,") to a future ascension. The hieroglyph captures the past and future in the present.

The similarity between the function of meditation and the Eucharistic anamnesis is one that was accepted in the seventeenth-century not only by Catholics, but also by Protestants. Barbara Lewalski's description of Protestant interpretations of the relation between meditation and the sacrament of the Eucharist is suggestive of this. She says (1979:157)

> Since Protestants generally viewed the sacrament as a representation of Christ's Passion, they licensed imaginative recreation of the Passion scenes in sensory detail, in order to stir up repentance and promote proper affective responses.

The Protestant Richard Sibbes describes the Eucharistic memorial in a way reminiscent not only of anamnesis, but also of meditative recollection, so that the structure of the worship makes Christ's Passion present to the worshipper at the same time that it joins the future to a sacramental present.

> In the Sacrament, our thoughts must especially have recourse, in the first place, to Christs Body broken, and his blood shed, as the Bread is broken, and the Wine poured out; that we have benefit by Christs abasement and suffering, by satisfying his Fathers wrath, and reconciling us to God. Then thinke of Christ in Heaven, appearing there for us, keeping that happinesse that he hath purchased ... and applying the benefit of his death to our soules by his Spirit.
> (The Fountaine Opened: Or, The Mysterie of Godlinesse, in Light From Heaven, (London:1638) 197-198; see Lewalski 1979:158)

The strong sense of dramatic presentation offered in the first part is complemented by the application of the "picture" to a spiritualising of the "soul". Inner and outer realities combine, just as physical and spiritual, subjective and objective do - the same way that past, present and future are joined. Physical and spiritual become integrated and time becomes circular. In the words of John Donne,

> Fixe upon God any where, and you shall finde him a Circle; He is with you now, when you fix upon him; He was with you before, for he brought you to this fixation; and he will be with you hereafter, for He is yesterday, and to day and the same for ever. (Sermons, Simpson and Potter Eds., VII, 52)

A second way in which Herbert's poems reveal an understanding of time similar to anamnesis is in some of their narrative structures. Gerard Genette, in a discussion about time in (mainly fictional) narrative (see Hillis-Miller Ed., 1971:93ff.), has made a distinction between time, mode and voice in narrative technique. Time (the only one of the three of real concern here) he defines as the relationship between the story and the actual events. An important aspect of time in narrative, is what he calls "order" - the relation between the temporal order of events being told and the pseudo-temporal order of narrative. He suggests that the writer re-orders the temporal structure of events by means of such techniques as "retrospection" and "antici-

pation" (looking back at events past and forward at those to come respectively), and by means of anachronisms (the distinction between story and reality) such as "completive" events which fill in past narrative gaps, and "repetitions" which return to, repeat and explain moments already covered in the narrative. An important function of "repetition" is the "recall", which is a part of the narrative giving meaning to an event whose meaning when it was first narrated was unclear. Lastly, "achronisms" are structures cut loose from any chronological movement, so that they stand on their own in the narrative, well-nigh transcending time.

The choice made here of Genette's various categories has been specifically limited to those which have relevance to what has been defined as the work of anamnesis in Herbert's poetry. On the basis of what has been said so far, it is not difficult to see the importance in the poems of ideas such as retrospection and anticipation. A poem like "The Collar" (p. 153) is both a retrospective examination of a past spiritual struggle and an anticipation (because both the anguished tone and disordered structure of the poem suggest the struggle is ever-present, even though the end offers a short-term resolution) of a permanent resolution in the future. As has been shown, the technique is often apparent in Herbert, and the point need not be laboured further. The "repetition" Genette speaks of is perhaps most evident in Herbert's poems where a "friend" guides and interprets the narrative in a way the speaker is unable to. Such poems are "Jordan (II)" (p. 102), "Love-joy" (p. 116) and "Love unknown" (p. 129), all of which introduce a second person who reinterprets, and therefore in a sense repeats, although in a new way, past action. By reinterpreting, the "friend" retells the "story" from a different and a more "true"

perspective. The sense of dramatic interaction this engenders is a particularly important way in which the past is realised in the present. As with anamnesis, the dramatic immediacy renders past action present, and the fact that these poems offer lessons which must be learned again and again by speaker, poet and reader merely endorses the sense created of an ever-present action taking place.

This technique is, in fact, very similar to Genette's "completive events", which explain the past by filling in gaps in the narrative in order to make it more intelligible. Many of the surprise endings frequent in Herbert poems may be seen to function in this way. They often both reveal unnoticed (sometimes only by the speaker, but often by both speaker and reader) narrative or interpretative "gaps" and fill them at the same time. Such endings reinterpret the narrative in such a way that the surprise generated by the reinterpretation creates a sense of the need for a continual re-enactment of the "lesson" learned by the speaker and reader. Often the surprise endings and the consequent "lesson" have a strongly liturgical flavour and are suggestive of anamnesis. In "Redemption" (p. 40) it is the vivid proclamation (for the words seem hortatory) "Your suit is granted,", in "Jordan (I)" (p. 56) it is the submissive and worshipful conclusion "My God, My King". In "The Collar" (p. 153) it is the simple and eternally new act of submission marked by the words "My Lord", - both closing the narrative and giving meaning to the spiritual battle it represents, and in "Love (III)" (p. 188) it is the quietly assertive, yet awe-filled "So I did sit and eat". In each of these poems the closure places what seems a surprising, but which is nevertheless a fulfilling conclusion on the narrative, and in each the conclusion renders the action of the poem not only dramatically present as in a liturgy, but

also transcendent of its own immediate temporal limitations, by suggesting a resolution ordered by God and not the poet.

Of even greater importance for the similarity between Herbert's handling of time and anamnesis, however, are narrative techniques Genette dubs "recalls" and "achronisms". Both are prevalent in Herbert and both function to align the poetic narrative with the historical event it recounts, and by so doing not only memorialise the past or even re-enact it, but also, in a sense, fulfill it by having the narrative itself become a symbolic representation of a future fulfilment. These functions of narrative are most evident in the more overtly sacramental and liturgical poems, but they pervade The Temple as a whole. Herbert's use of these techniques is perhaps best demonstrated by a number of close readings of relevant poems.

In the two "H. Baptisme" poems (pp. 43-44), recalling of what seem past events, and their dramatisation in the present, occur simultaneously. The first of the two poems uses narrative to re-enact history by correcting the narrator's and reader's assumptions in a way similar to baptism symbolising the correction of an individual's assumptions about God.

> As he that sees a dark and shadie grove,
> Stayes not, but looks beyond it on the skie;
> So when I view my sinnes, mine eyes remove
> More backward still, and to that water flie,
> Which is above the heavens, ... (ll. 1-5)

Genette's understanding of "recall" as something that gives subsequent meaning to an event already reported, is valuable in understanding the way initial assumptions made by the reader are undercut. Baptism is associated implicitly in the first line with "grove", and the ambiguous "shadie" is generally a positive image until "Stayes not" in the second line precludes any positive response to the image. The lines

are given meaning first by an implicit assumption (shade equals baptism), then by an authorially correcting assumption (shade equals something to be avoided), and finally even this is corrected in the second part of line two which suggests that the only reason for avoiding the "shadie grove" is that transcendence (the dove symbolising the Holy Spirit at Christ's baptism is suggested) is more important. The continual reinterpretations depend on the recall of ideas not fully explained, but implicitly assumed by the narrative. In recalling the past baptism the narrative actually emulates the kind of rethinking the candidate for baptism (if an adult) does prior to the event itself.

In this sense, the poem's structure is what Fish (1978) would call "catechistical", in which the speaker and reader are both "catechized" by the reinterpretations placed on ideas during the narrative. The poem is also an example of what Vendler (1975) calls "reinvention" of narrative, the kind in which initial formulations by the speaker are consistently rethought throughout the narrative. Neither of these scholars, however, has laid much stress on the effect that reinterpretation of the past has on the future, an important facet of this poem and others. It uses the technique of recall to emphasise the narrator's concern with the future; "... whose spring and vent/Is in my deare Redeemer's pierced side." (ll. 5-6), recalls the Passion in the same way the Eucharistic anamnesis does, but at the same time suggests the transcendent ("spring and vent"). Both these ideas become joined by the emphasis on the present "Is", so that in fact the poem offers a conflation of all three times. This conflation is supported by two other important phrases in the poem. In line 7, "prevent" has the double meaning of both precluding an action

and coming before an action; it therefore holds in tension past baptism and the present sin which the baptism "prevents" from "growing thick and wide".

The past may be seen as determinative of both present and future, and this becomes the action of redemptive time, as suggested by the lines "In you Redemption measures all my time,/And spreads the plaister equall to the crime." The present tense recalls the past baptism as a redemptive event, but asserts that it is a continuing event, that all time, including narrative time in the present, and final redemption in the future, is prefigured and even contained in the baptismal event. Narrative reinterpretations make past redemption (which itself prefigures a future, completed one at the eschaton) a present experience, and this means that the poem itself actually ensures that narrative time participates in historical time. The narrative event shares in the order of salvation history, just as the anamnesis holds in tension God's past and future salvific acts.

Narrative performs a similar function in the second "H. Baptisme". The poem is itself a partial fulfilment of the historical event begun at baptism, the antedating of the speaker's faith.

> Since, Lord to thee
> A narrow way and little gate
> Is all the passage, on my infancie
> Thou didst lay hold, and antedate
> My faith in me. (ll. 1-5)

The fact that the narrative is itself a response of faith partially fulfilling the baptismal event, suggests that it participates in the complete fulfilment of the baptism, which will happen only in the future. The narrative "preserve[s]" (l. 13) past, and anticipates the future, "O let me still/Write thee great God, and me a childe:" (ll. 6-7), and in doing so encapsulates both in the present, as "still"

(used in the present continuous) suggests.

Like the use of "recalls", Herbert's use of "achronism" is most evident in the more overtly liturgical poems, especially those dealing with specific Church calendar events such as "Mattens" (p. 62) and "Even-song" (p. 63). The continued re-enactment of these events emphasises their existence in the present, remembers their value in the past and anticipates their importance in the future. In this sense they are not limited to any one time. The liturgy and Herbert's poem "The Sacrifice" (p. 26) both celebrate the action of Christ's sacrifice as something occuring both once and for all, but also eternally. The sense of the dramatic present in both the liturgy (particularly in the words of anamnesis) and the poem suggest a sharing in an eternal, achronistic event. Other poems of this nature are "The Altar" (p. 26), "Good Friday" (p. 38), "Prayer (I)" (p. 51) "Lent" (p. 86), "Prayer (II)" (p. 103) and "Love (III)" (p. 188). Space permits a brief examination of only some of these, and one or two others.

In "Mattens", ritual-like remembering of the kind similar to anamnesis is used to give the opening lines a dramatic immediacy that is suggestive of achronism. There is no distinction between historical time and narrative time, between past, present and future.

> I cannot ope mine eyes,
> But thou art ready there to catch
> My morning-soul and sacrifice:
> Then we must needs for that day make a match. (ll. 1-4)

The opening line expresses action of the present as if the speaker were still involved in opening his eyes (both from sleep and at prayer); and struggling in the process because to open one's eyes is to face God. The present tense suggests that there is no distinction here between the historical event and the narrative event. Even in

the next two lines, where the experience of the first is interpreted and the sense of immediacy is lost, the action remains essentially in the present. It is extended to a vision of a future eschatological fulfilment in the fourth line, but the phrase "make a match" suggests a move towards at least a partial fulfilment in the present, so that the narrative creates a symbolic union between the eschatological new day and the liturgical celebration of each new day in matins.

The poem does not offer the preservation of speech, or a retrospection to past events, but presents an achronistic enactment of worship that encompasses past, present and future. The breaking of these time barriers is emphasised in the closing lines; "Teach me thy love to know;/That this new light, which now I see,/May both the work and workman show:/Then by a sunne-beam I will climbe to thee." The lines anticipate the future ("teach)" in the present ("now"), at the same time that they assert its fulfilment ("I see"). The poem itself, then, may be seen as an event used by the poet to share in the liturgical anamnesis which joins all times in the present, but which also transcends the limitations of time.

Achronism is equally important in poems that have a liturgical base, but which are not strictly linked to the Church calendar. "Church-monuments" (p. 64) is an example. Here, however, achronism is closely associated with what the first chapter of this dissertation called a "Realist-Symbolist" interpretation of poetic language. The Church monuments are not only the icons on the tombs of the dead in the Church the speaker is in, but "Here" in line 2 suggests they are also the words of the poem itself. "Here I intombe my flesh, that it betimes/May take acquaintance of this heap of dust;" (ll. 2-3). The word "dust" refers as much to the speaker's words as it does to his

flesh or the tombs he is looking at. This is particularly supported in the second stanza where the speaker explains the reasons for his actions as the need for his body "To spell his elements, and finde his birth/Written in dustie heraldrie and lines;" (my emphasis). The implication of this is that the narrative performing a semi-liturgical meditation on tombs or the mutability of the physical body, is in fact also meditating on itself and its own future demise. In this sense the narrative time becomes achronistic, because as the subject of its own meditation it may be seen as a continuous present, meditating on itself. The poet's spiritual history and the narrative become inseparable, the one is apprehended through the other.

Many poems which have little or no liturgical base reveal a use of achronism which is not dependent for its effect on a sense of ritual repetition. In both "Deniall" (p. 79) and "The Collar" (p. 153) the disordered structures of the poems are suggestive of a spiritual struggle on the part of the speaker which is continually present. In "Deniall" the "broken" rhyme scheme ensures that what seems initially to be a past experience is kept real in the present. The pointed use of the present continuous in the third stanza implies achronism.

> As good go any where, they say,
> As to benumme
> Both knees and heart, in crying night and day,
> Come, come, my God, O come,
> But no hearing. (ll. 11-15)

There is a lack of any sense of a fixed time in this stanza, so that one feels the speaker's "crying" is continuous, extending even outside the immediate range of the (partially contrived) poem. Even if the poet controls the "anguish" and knows the end before he begins the poem (Harman, 1982:73), there is never any sense of the particular spiritual battle being fully completed. These poems are therefore not

entirely the "drama of contrived imaginative situations" as Buckley (31) suggests, but are rather "copies" (in the sense of "Jordan (II)") of the sacramental anamnesis, in which narrative re-enacts and thereby makes present, historical experience.

A further supremely achronistic poem is "Prayer (I)" (p. 51), with its collection of metaphors all describing prayer as an act that in various ways unites heaven and earth. None of the metaphors, however, limit the description to any particular time dimension, and in fact they seek to break the barrier of space and time that separates prayer from its object. Physical and metaphysical, temporal and eternal are both figured and made present in the metaphors, which act as symbols making the divine present just as the Eucharistic elements do. The final stanza of "The Temper (I)" (p. 55) performs in much the same way. Spatial limitations are broken, and this implies that temporal ones are as well.

> Whether I flie with angels, fall with dust,
> Thy hands made both, and I am there:
> Thy power and love, my love and trust
> Make one place ev'ry where. (ll. 25-28)

The second line's assertion that "I am there", whether in heaven or on earth, with its emphasis on the present "am", suggests that the poet's temporal existence shares that of God's eternal "I am" (John 8:12), and in doing so becomes, in a sense, achronistic.

In conclusion, one final poem deserves a brief discussion with relation to the sacramental present revealed in narrative structure. "Love (III)" (p. 188) contains many of the features that have been discussed concerning Herbert's emphasis on the present. The poem, as a commemoration of the Eucharist is perhaps one of the foremost examples of anamnesis. As an expression of liturgical action its recal-

ling of the past is not limited to the past or even the present, but suggests future re-enactment of the dramatic event it (and liturgical anamnesis generally) portrays. This does not detract from its emphasis on the present and the achronistic, however. While the use of the past tense suggests remembrance of past action, the dramatic immediacy with which it is remembered implies a present action. More than this, both the imagery suggesting the future heavenly banquet, and the sense that the poem is a type of liturgical movement that will be recreated again and again in the future, strongly suggest achronism. This is epitomised in the use of the present tense when Love's words are quoted; "And know you not, sayes Love, who bore the blame?" (my emphasis) places the action in the realm of an eternal present, in which the believer shares in his meeting with God. The narrative here, then, performs the sacramental function of revealing in the present, divine reality because it presents the action of the divine each time it is read. In doing so it acts as a sacramental symbol which realises the symbolised both in its own limited structure and in its own time dimension.

CONCLUSION

In many ways it is quite possible to understand the argument of this dissertation from an entirely different, yet complementary perspective. Much of what has been said about the sacramentalism of Herbert's language may be seen to involve and even depend on paradox. Even a superficial consideration reveals the inherently paradoxical nature of sacramentalism, because any earthly phenomenon that presumes it can bear transcendent reality at the same time that it insistently acknowledges its own limitations must, of necessity, exist in the realm of paradox.

Rosalie Colie (1966) has justifiably emphasised this way of thinking as central to renaissance epistemology, and particularly to the poetic frame of mind that sees its predication of the divine as both limited by the constraints of the phenomenal world and yet participating in the all-creating Logos. To invite the Word of God to participate in the creation of the poem is to accept participation in the foremost paradox of Christian thought - the paradox of the incarnation, in which God is both man and God at once. By implication, then, the poem that sees itself as participating in the Logos may also see itself as sharing in the incarnation, and therefore participating in divine revelation. It may be seen as both a human and a divine creation at the same time. In sacramental terminology, it has both a heavenly part and an earthly part - it is a visible sign of an invisible reality.

In this sense paradox is, as Colie suggests (398), essentially anti-monist, in that it will not allow itself to be an unequivocal ex-

pression of the truths it perceives. The user of paradox generally perceives truth as too complex to be dealt with in an unequivocal way. In many ways, this is the essence of "Prayer (I)" (p. 51), a poem which insistently establishes its definition of prayer as "something understood" in doubleness, equivocation and paradox.

> Prayer, the Churches banquet, Angels age,
> Gods breath in man returning to his birth,
> The soul in paraphrase, heart in pilgrimage,
> The Christian plummet sounding heav'n and earth;
> (ll. 1-4)

The paradoxes like "Angels age", "Gods breath in man returning to his birth", "Reversed thunder", "The six-daies world transposing in an houre," all suggest both a sure knowledge of the eternal in the temporal, and at the same time an inability to define the nature of that immanence. In this sense, the writing may be seen as paradoxically both "Realist" and "Symbolist" - in the terms used in this dissertation to describe the sacrament of the Eucharist. It is "Realist" in the sense that it assumes a sure knowledge of the divine, based on ordinary things like a banquet, age, breath, heart or thunder. But it is "Symbolist" in the sense that it sees its descriptions of prayer as approximations, not as unequivocal, monistic definitions. The poem is necessarily partly mystifying, in the same way that prayer is - but it is also necessarily ordinary, in the same way that prayer is. The mystical and the ordinary, everyday work together with the insistence common to most paradox.

Paradox need not always be seen as anti-monist, however. The acceptance by the poet of the Logos as the Writer of the poem suggests that while there is a sense of paradoxical dualism holding in tension the divine Creator and the human creator, that dualism is, in a way, overshadowed by what may be seen as a deus ex machina in which the di-

vine imposes itself upon the human. This is perhaps the primary paradox of the frame of mind that sees itself as "copying" a creation already given. The poet using this form of thinking and art maintains a degree of independence in that he chooses, paradoxically, to give up his independence - to have his word governed by the Word, and to accept (equally paradoxically) the monism of an unquestioned divine imperative to live and write in a way not original to himself. This is very much the meaning of the first stanza of "Providence" (p. 116).

> O Sacred Providence, who from end to end
> Strongly and sweetly movest, shall I write,
> And not of thee, through whom my fingers bend
> To hold my quill? Shall they not do thee right?

The question is well-nigh rhetorical, because the poet assumes the imposition of the divine on the human in such a way that God as writer can do nothing but "do thee right". On the one hand it is an understanding of poetic creation that is uncompromisingly presumptuous in claiming for itself a divine canon, and in this sense it is thoroughly monist. On the other hand, however, it recognises that the divine is still using the human ("quill") in his creation, so that the limitations inherent in human nature continue to apply.

The incarnation of the Word in human existence, in the form of the body of Christ, nature and Scripture, all suggest a monism. It is one which is, in Herbert's time, augmented by an analogical frame of mind that enables man to understand reality allegorically - to personify or "physicalise" the abstract as if it were an unquestionable reality. It means that the physical may be seen to become the visible sign of the invisible in a relation that accepts the physical and tangible as analogous to the invisible and intangible. It thereby institutes an "operative" sacramentalism that allows the physical to bear

the reality of the intangible. However, this paradoxically means that a full monism is not possible, because for one thing to represent another implies a dualism that is closer to a full-blown exploratory symbolism than the strict one-to-one relation evident in allegory and its related way of thinking, the hieroglyph. The paradox is that the exploratory symbolism and more designatory allegory consistently bear, in Herbert, a "both-and" relation to one another.

Herbert uses allegory, analogy and hieroglyph, and is able to see them as sacramental, as ways of making divine reality present in the temporal. He is also, however, able to stretch beyond the limitations of these modes into a more full-blown symbolism, and see in it the mysteriousness of the divine. In this sense, both the exploratory and designatory work together, complementing each other. The poet can presume to allow God to write for him, but he can also presume to explore in the farthest reaches of his imagination, the value of his own words. He exists, therefore, in the paradox of being both an inventor and a discoverer. He invents his own words - only to discover they are words already invented. He "alone" has the pen in his hand, but discovers that he is only a "Secretarie of thy praise" ("Providence", ll. 7-8), and that God is the giver, the dictator, as it were, even of the poet's praise.

The metonymy Herbert so often uses as a means whereby he gives over his natural sense of the exploratory in favour of a more communal or tradition sponsored form of expression, can be seen in these paradoxical terms. The use of metonymy assumes an analogical world-view in which one thing can be "put for" another, revealing its essence in the way a sacrament reveals part of the divine essence. At the same time, though, it does not assume an unequivocal equation between the

two related objects or ideas. The metonymy, then, acts paradoxically by being able to be "put for" something else, yet not being that thing. It too performs a "both-and" function, in the same way that the sacramental wine is both wine and blood, and in the same way that the Word is both Word and flesh.

Like metonymy, synecdoche may be seen to represent the essential paradox of the incarnation (and by implication the Church and the sacraments). It suggests that the parts all make up a whole, in the same way that the members of the Church all make up the Church, and yet each part and each member remains an individual - even though his individuality is paradoxically realised only because of his relation to the community. In this sense, the poet is an individual only insofar as he is a member of a community - the poems are individual only insofar as they are part of The Temple, and the words are individual only insofar as they go to make up whole poems. Synecdoche, therefore, becomes more than just a trope or figure of speech, it becomes a sacramental way of being, where something can attain individuality only by participating in a corporate reality, and thereby sacrifice itself, paradoxically, to gain new life.

Such a paradoxical existence can be maintained only in a realm where time is equally paradoxical, and the action of gaining new life through sacrifice may be seen as an essential part of the sacramental anamnesis that informs Herbert's understanding of time. The anamnesis both makes present past realities and future hopes, at the same time that it recognises the limitations of the present. Like typology, it points to a future fulfilment at the same time that it stresses its own value as a partial fulfilment in the present. The poetry sharing this mode, then, may see itself as apprehending the transcendent in

the present - holding divine reality in its own limited being.

All of these paradoxes may be seen as aspects of the all-consuming paradox that this dissertation has suggested is fundamental to Herbert's aesthetic - participation in the Logos and the consequent sacramentality of his verse. The Word immanent is paradoxical because any human language suggesting it bears divine reality must act paradoxically in order to deal with its own limitations. The Word copied is paradoxical because it is both an original of God's copied by the poet, at the same time that it is an original of the poet's imagination. The Word sacrificed is paradoxical because it is the poet's word that belongs to God - which is sacrificed by the poet in order to share in the sacrifice of God, so that both may share transcendence. The Word transcendent, then, is equally paradoxical, because it is both a present limited Word, sharing the Word made flesh (a chosen limitation on God's part), yet also bearing in itself the possibility of transcendence - because it bears the divine. In bearing the divine, it is sacramental, and in being sacramental, it engenders transcendence.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Hutchinson, F.E., ed. The Works of George Herbert. Clarendon: Oxford U P, 1945.

Patrides, C.A., ed. The English Poems of George Herbert. London: Dent, 1974.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abrams, M.H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971 ed.

Anderson, James F. St. Augustine and Being: A Metaphysical Essay. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965.

Asals, Heather, A.R. Equivocal Predication: George Herbert's Way to God. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1981.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1953.

Augustine, St. On Christian Doctrine. Trans. D.W. Robertson Jr. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1958.

_____. The Confessions of St. Augustine. Trans. F.J. Sheed. 2nd ed. London: Sheed & Ward, 1945.

Barkan, Leonard. Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World. 1975. New Haven: Yale U P, 1977.

Bethell, S. L. The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. 1951. London: Dennis Dobson, 1963.

Bevan, E. Symbolism and Belief. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938.

Bienz, John. "Images of Ceremonial in The Temple: Herbert's Solution to a Reformation Controversy." Studies in English Literature 26 (Winter 1986): 73-95.

Bloomfield, Morton W., ed. Allegory, Myth and Symbol. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1981.

Booty, John E., ed. The Divine Drama in History and Liturgy. Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1984.

_____. "George Herbert: The Temple and The Book of Common Prayer." Mosaic 12. 2 (1979): 75-90.

Bottrall, Margaret. George Herbert. London: John Murray, 1954.

Bredin, Hugh. "Metonymy". Poetics Today 5. 1 (1984): 45-58.

Browne, Sir Thomas. Sir Thomas Browne: The Major Works. Ed. C.A. Patrides. London: Penguin, 1977.

Boucher, Holly Wallace. "Metonymy in Typology and Allegory, with a consideration of Dante's Comedy." Morton W. Bloomfield, ed. (1981:129-145).

Buckley, Vincent. Poetry and the Sacred. London: Chatto & Windus, 1968.

Burckhardt, Sigurd. "The Poet as Fool and Priest". Elizabethan Literary History XXIII (1956): 279-298.

Burke, Kenneth. The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action. 1941. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.

Bush, Douglas. The Renaissance and English Humanism. 1939. Toronto: Toronto U P, 1958.

Cassirer, Ernst. The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Trans. Ralph Manheim. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale U P, 1955.

Charity, Alan C. Events and Their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1966.

Charles, Amy M. A Life of George Herbert. Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1977.

Colie, Rosalie L. Paradoxia Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U P, 1966.

Crystal, David. Linguistics, Language and Religion. London: Burns & Oates, 1965.

Cusanus, Nicolas. Of Learned Ignorance. Trans. Fr. Germain Heron. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954.

De Man, Paul. Blindness and Insight. New York: Oxford U P, 1971.

Dix, Dom Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. 1945. London: Dacre Press, Adam & Charles Black, 1964.

Dodd, Charles Harold. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. 1936. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950.

Dodd, Charles Harold. "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament". Micklem, ed. (1936:68-82).

Donne, John. Devotions Upon Emergent Occasi ons. Ed. Anthony Raspa. Montreal: McGill-Queen's U P, 1975.

_____. The Sermons of John Donne. Ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson. 10 vols. Berkeley: U of California P, 1955-1962.

Dugmore, C.W. The Mass and the English Reformers. London: Macmillan, 1958.

Eco, Umberto. The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semantics of Texts. 1979. Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1984.

Eliot, T.S. Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot. Ed. Frank Kermode. 2nd ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1980.

Elsky, Martin. "The Sacramental Frame of George Herbert's 'The Church' and the Shape of Spiritual Autobiography". Journal of English and Germanic Philology 83. 3 (July 1984): 313-329.

Empson, William. Seven Types of Ambiguity. 1930. London: Chatto & Windus, 1977.

_____. The Structure of Complex Words. London: Chatto & Windus, 1951.

Fish, Stanley E. Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1980.

_____. Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature. Berkeley: U of California P, 1972.

_____. The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.

Fletcher, Angus. Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode. Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1964.

Ford, Brewster S. "George Herbert and the Liturgies of Time and Space". South Atlantic Review 49. 4 (1984): 19-29.

Freeman, Rosemary. English Emblem Books. 1948. London: Chatto & Windus, 1967.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U P, 1957.

_____. The Great Code: The Bible and Literature. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

Funk, Robert W. Language, Hermeneutic and the Word of God. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Gardner, Helen. The Business of Criticism. 1959. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1963.

_____. Religion and Literature. 1971. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1983.

Genette, Gerard. "Time and Narrative in A la recherche du temps perdu". J. Hillis Miller, ed. (1971:93ff.).

Halewood, William H. The Poetry of Grace: Reformation Themes and Structures in English Seventeenth-Century Poetry. New Haven: Yale U P, 1970.

Harman, Barbara Leah. Costly Monuments: Representations of the Self in George Herbert's Poetry. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1982.

Holland, Norman N. The Dynamics of Literary Response. 1968. New York: W.W. Norton, 1975.

Hooker, Richard. The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker. 3 vols. Gen. ed. W. Speed Hill. Cambridge, Mass: 1977.

Hunter, Jeanne Clayton. "'With Wings of Faith': Herbert's Communion Poems". Journal of Religion 62. 1 (Jan. 1982): 57-71.

Huppe, Bernard F. Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry. New York: State Univ. of New York P, 1959.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Parables of Jesus. 1954. London: S C M Press, 1972.

Kirkham, Michael. "Metaphor and the Unitary World: Coleridge and Henry Vaughan". Essays in Criticism 37. 2 (1987): 121-134.

Klause, John L. "George Herbert, Kenosis and the Whole Truth". Morton W. Bloomfield, ed. (1981:209-225).

Krieger, Murray. "'A Waking Dream': The Symbolic Alternative to Allegory". Morton W. Bloomfield, ed. (1981:1-22)

_____. A Window to Criticism: Shakespeare's **Sonnets** and Modern Poetics. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U P, 1964.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U P, 1979.

Lynch, William F. Christ and Apollo: The Dimensions of the Literary Imagination. New York: New American Library, 1960.

MacLeish, Archibald. Poetry and Experience. London: The Bodley Head, 1960.

Martz, Louis L. The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth-Century. New Haven: Yale U P, 1954.

Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony. Renaissance and Seventeenth-Century Studies. New York: Columbia U P, 1964.

Merrill, Thomas F. Christian Criticism: A Study of Literary God-Talk. Amsterdam: Rodopi N. V., 1976.

Micklem, N, ed. Christian Worship: Studies in its History and Meaning. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1936.

Miller, J. Hillis, ed. Aspects of Narrative. New York: Columbia U P, 1971.

McAdoo, H.R. The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1949.

McDonnell, Kilian. John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U P, 1967.

Mclaughlin, Elizabeth, and Thomas, Gail. "Communion in The Temple". Studies in English Literature 15 (Winter 1975): 111-124.

Patrides, C.A., ed. Aspects of Time. Manchester and Toronto: Manchester U P, and Toronto U P, 1976.

_____ ., ed. George Herbert: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

_____ ., ed. Sir Thomas Browne: The Major Works. London: Penguin, 1977.

Perrin, Norman. Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation. London: S C M Press, 1976.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie. Ed. G.D. Willcock and A. Walker. 1936. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1970.

Quick, O.C. The Christian Sacraments. 1927. London: Nisbet & Co., 1955.

Rahner, Karl, ed. Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise **Sacramentum Mundi**. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

_____ . The Church and the Sacraments. London: Nelson, 1963.

Ramsey, Ian T., ed. Words About God: The Philosophy of Religion. London: S C M Press, 1971.

Ransom, John Crowe. "Poetry: A Note in Ontology". James Scully, ed. (1966:80-104).

Rickey, Mary Ellen. Utmost Art: Complexity in the Verse of George Herbert. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1966.

Robinson, John A.T. In the End, God ... A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things. London: James Clarke & Co., 1950.

Rogers, Robert. Metaphor: A Psychoanalytic View. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.

Ross, Malcolm Mackenzie. Poetry and Dogma: The Transformation of Eucharistic Symbols in Seventeenth Century English Poetry. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.

Rubey, Daniel. "The Poet and the Christian Community: Herbert's Affliction Poems and the Structure of The Temple". Studies in English Literature 20. 1 (1980): 105-123.

Samarin, William J., ed. Language in Religious Practice. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers, 1976.

Sandler, Florence. "'Solomon ubique regnet': Herbert's Use of the Images of the New Covenant". Papers on Language and Literature 8. 2 (1972): 147-158.

Scully, James, ed. Modern Poets on Modern Poetry. 1965. London: Collins, 1966.

Sherwood, Terry G. "Tasting and Telling Sweetness in George Herbert's Poetry". Elizabethan Literary Renaissance 12. 3 (1982): 319-340.

Soskice, Janet Martin. Metaphor and Religious Language. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Stanwood, Paul G. "Time and Liturgy in Donne, Crashaw, and T.S. Eliot". Mosaic 12. 2 (Winter 1979): 91-105.

_____. "Time and Liturgy in Herbert's Poetry". George Herbert Journal 5. 1-2 (Fall 1981-Spring 1982): 19-30.

Stein, Arnold. George Herbert's Lyrics. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1968.

Steiner, George. Language and Silence: Essays 1958-1966. 1967. London: Faber & Faber, 1985.

_____. "Real Presences". The Leslie Stephen Memorial Lecture. Cambridge, 1 November 1985. Cambridge U P, 1986.

Strier, Richard. Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Suggit, J.N. "The eucharist as eschatological proclamation, according to St. Paul." Neotestamentica 21 (1987): 11-24.

Summers, Joseph H. George Herbert: His Religion and Art. London: Chatto & Windus, 1954.

Taylor, Warren. Tudor Figures of Rhetoric. Whitewater, Wisconsin: The Language Press, 1972.

Tindall, William York. The Literary Symbol. Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1955.

Tuve, Rosemond. A Reading of George Herbert. London: Faber & Faber, 1952.

_____. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics. Chicago: Chicago U P, 1947.

_____. "George Herbert and **Caritas**". Journal of the Warbourg and Courtauld Institute 22 (1959):303-331.

Underhill, Evelyn. Mysticism: A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness. 1911. London: Methuen, 1960.

Vendler, Helen. The Poetry of George Herbert. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1975.

Walton, Izaak. "The Life of Mr George Herbert", Lives. 1670. George Saintsbury, ed. 1927. Oxford U P, 1950.

Wellek, Rene, and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature. 1942. London: Penguin, 1980.

Wheelwright, Philip. Metaphor and Reality. Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1967.

White, Helen C. The Metaphysical Poets: A Study in Religious Experience. 1936. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Willey, Basil. The Seventeenth Century Background: Studies in the Thought of the Age in Relation to Poetry and Religion. 1934. London: Chatto & Windus, 1950.

Wimsatt, W. K. The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry. 1954. New York: The Noonday Press, 1962.

Ziegelmaier, Gregory. "Liturgical Symbol and Reality in the Poetry of George Herbert". American Benedictine Review 18 (1967): 344-353.