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Restlessness occupied a significant spot in the literature of many prominent writers during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries including George Herbert, Christopher Marlowe, and John Milton. Herbert’s perspective alone differs from the others.

George Herbert’s perspective is framed in “The Pulley.” His view that restlessness is a divine treasure is unique to him and is manifested in various avenues. First, restlessness as a virtue is manifested in his own writing. Writing poetry was a mental form of restlessness that allowed Herbert to praise God, putting him in a position to be received into God’s rest. Second is the concept of practical theology. Practical use of his faith was essential to Herbert’s life as a priest and also to his life as a priest within his poetry. The speaker in The Temple is a man who longs to find God and to be found by God through an equal balance of grace and works. When combined, mental and physical restlessness form a powerful and essential part of George Herbert’s poetry, a part that cannot be underestimated for its value to a serious study of The Temple.
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"We must enjoy the poetry before we attempt to penetrate the poet's mind; we must enjoy it before we understand it, if the attempt to understand it is to be worth the trouble."

--T.S. Eliot on George Herbert
CHAPTER 1

RESTLESSNESS: GEORGE HERBERT
AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Restlessness occupied a significant spot in the literature of many prominent writers during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries including George Herbert, Christopher Marlowe, and John Milton. This restlessness may have been a product of various different elements that gained popularity in this time period. A continuing astronomical battle was being waged regarding a human's place in the universe in a geocentric or heliocentric universe, and the biological sciences were also beginning to disprove older ideas of physical health and temperament. Both sciences probably played a significant role in the restless feeling reflected by those literary giants who tackled these issues and expanded the argument in their literature.

The clash between the old and the new may have led many to question an individual's place in the new modern world. A few lines from David Lee's poem "Rhapsody for the Good Night" seems to adequately describe the seventeenth century's place in linear time: "Here's to the new year/and here's to the old one/and here's to the place in between . . ." (29). This "in between" status may account for at least some of the prevalent restlessness that characterized much seventeenth century literature. While restlessness was a common theme for Herbert, Marlowe, and Milton, the attitude toward it differed tremendously. Whether restlessness provides a way to reach God and achieve spiritual fulfillment, or
whether it impedes divine progress and leads to spiritual estrangement forms the
foundation for the differing attitudes. Before turning to the various sides of Herbert’s
restlessness, a close study of Herbert’s contemporaries, John Milton and Christopher
Marlowe, is invaluable because it makes Herbert and his religious paradigm original.

Herbert’s view of restlessness as a virtue was not the same as that of other sixteenth-
and seventeenth-century writers, one of the most prominent of whom is Christopher
Marlowe. Marlowe’s Tragedy of Dr. Faustus is fundamentally opposed to Herbert’s
devotional poetry, at least touching the subject of restlessness. Faustus is certainly
restless, but it is his restless state that leads him away from the ability to wonder in a
biblical sense that will help him contemplate the glory of God described in the Book of
Job when God told Job to “consider the wondrous works of God” (Job 37:14). Faustus’
soliloquy in the first scene of the play is revealing because it establishes his unrest from
the very beginning. Even though his “common talk [is] found aphorisms” and his “bills
[are] hung up as monuments” (lines 19-20), he wants more knowledge. When he decides
to trade his soul to Lucifer and his companion Mephistophilis, Faustus embarks on a
journey of restless ambition.

Not content with being a great physician, Faustus trades his soul for knowledge, an
act that begins with his request in scene five to “have a book wherein I might behold all
spells and incantations, that I might raise up spirits when I please” (lines 162-164). But is
Faustus content with this knowledge? Quite the contrary. He next requests a “book
where I might see all characters and planets of the heavens, that I might know their
motions and dispositions” (lines 166-168). After gaining knowledge about spirituality
and astronomy, Faustus requests other scientific knowledge. He proceeds in a continual
restless quest for more and more until finally in his despair he achieves “his hellish fall” (Epilogue, line 4).

As a notable difference from Herbert’s speakers in The Temple, Faustus does not seek correct principles in his restlessness. In Scene V, Marlowe reveals to the audience a key reason for Faustus’ fall and disquietude. In a moment of quick remorse, Faustus cries, “Ah Christ my Savior! Seek to save/Distressed Faustus’ soul” (Lines 253-254). Faustus is not willing to seek his God as Herbert does. Rather he expects that God will seek him. Marlowe nullifies the entire concept of activity leading to God. Faustus’ activity in his restlessness is not leading to God because he does not seek Him.

So the question becomes, what differentiates Marlowe’s restlessness from Herbert’s? The answer is quite simple. The difference depends on the end result and the faith of the poet or speaker in the final outcome. Herbert has faith that in his struggle to locate his Lord, his “weariness” will be rewarded by the grace of Christ, with the ultimate rest being achieved through death. Herbert sees the way to this end as fraught with a restlessness that allows the seeker to find God of his own will and accord. He must actively approach God with the humility necessary to “sit and eat” at Love’s table (“Love III”). Though restlessness is the reason for Faustus’ fall, it is not the restlessness of George Herbert. Faustus continually yearns and strives for more knowledge. But for what purpose does he seek? He does not do so with the intent to come unto God. He has no wonder, a faculty that “embraces contemplation” in addition to knowledge and philosophy (Behunin iii) and therefore no active desire to seek the contemplative life as is apparent by the Epilogue of Dr. Faustus, “Regard his hellish fall/Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise/Only to wonder at unlawful things;/Whose deepness doth entice such
forward wits. / To practice more than heavenly power permits” (Epilogue, lines 4-8). Faustus’ lack of wonder helps explain the chasm between Herbert and Marlowe’s very different views of restlessness because of what wonder will lead an individual to, contemplation of the divine.

Moreover, John Milton also presented a unique view of restlessness in Paradise Lost. After Satan and his evil companions have been literally thrust out of heaven, Satan surveys them as they flounder on the lake of fire, and he comes to an understanding of what heaven is comprised. Not only is wonder a source of godliness, as Satan himself indicates in Book Four, but rest is also an essential characteristic of heaven. Since the “heart of Hell” (line 151) is the opposite of heaven, those attributes that characterize each place are also necessarily opposite. Satan recognizes his frightful condition in lines 183-191:

Thither let us tend
From off the tossing of these fiery waves;
There rest, if any rest can harbor there;
And reassembling our afflicted power,
Consult how we may henceforth most offend
Our enemy, our own loss how repair,
How overcome this dire calamity,
What reinforcement we may gain from hope,
If not, what resolution from despair.

Satan knows that no rest or hope of rest can attend his position, thereby forcing him to seek a place where he can at least mimic the rest only to be found in heaven. As such, he
strives to create his own imitation of his fallen glory since “the mind is its own place, and
in itself/Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven” (Book 1, lines 254-255).

Although Satan tries to duplicate Heaven’s majesty, he never refers to his Hell as a place
of rest. The restful state is reserved only for heaven. Book Two affirms that the loss of
rest results from the loss of heaven. The fallen angels can find no rest for their minds or
spirits:

Thence more at ease their minds and somewhat raised
By false presumptuous hope, the ranged powers
Disband; and wandering, each his several way
Pursues, as inclination or sad choice
Leads him perplexed where he may likeliest find
Truce to his restless thoughts ... (lines 520-525)

As the angels continue to wander, following their presumptuous leader, Satan, the “truce”
they seek is denied them since they are beyond the glory of heaven:

In confused march forlorn, th’ adventurous bands
With shuddering horror pale, and eyes aghast,
Viewed first their lamentable lot, and found
No rest. [italics added] (lines 615 - 618)

Line 618 is especially revealing. Milton adds emphasis to the restless state of the fallen
angels by putting a hard stop after “No rest,” one of the few times that Milton will use
such a definitive stop so close to the beginning of a line. The period after the phrase,
“No rest,” immediately draws the attention of even a casual reader. Milton did not want
to leave recognition of this point to chance. He signals the reader with the equivalent of a bright red flag - a hard-stopped period.

Milton’s particular view of rest would appear to be in line with what Herbert would say in *The Temple*. Rest can only be given through God, whose dwelling place is heaven. As such the fallen angels must dwell in perpetual restlessness, but unlike Herbert’s restlessness, Milton’s restlessness is not a gift that leads to God. It is a consequence of the fallen angels’ rebellion, pride, and hate. Milton creates a paradox with one side being that of Herbert - God is the giver of rest (a concept that will be addressed in an upcoming chapter) - but the restlessness of the fallen angels is not to “toss them to [His] breast” ("The Pulley"). To continue such a paradox, Milton presents two views of restlessness through Adam and Eve.

In Book Nine, Milton’s restlessness is more in accord with Marlowe than Herbert. Milton depicts restlessness as a catalyst to the fall of humankind. In Book Nine, Adam chastises Eve for her “desire of wandering” (Line 1136) that took her away from his side and into the serpent’s power. Only eleven lines later, Eve refutes Adam’s assertion that it was Eve’s wandering that led to her partaking of the fruit. She states that the serpent might well have deceived Adam had he been with her. Her wandering did not cause the deception:

Imput’st though that to my default or will
Of wandering, as thou call’st it, which who knows
But might as ill have happened, though being by,
Or to thyself perhaps? Hadst thou been there,
Or here th’attempt, thou couldst not have discerned
Fraud in the serpent, speaking as he spake;
No ground of enmity between us know,
Why he should mean me ill, or seek to harm?
Was I to have never parted from thy side? (lines 1145-1153)

So which view does Milton espouse, Eve’s or Adam’s? Is restlessness what caused the fall? To answer this question, it would be helpful to look at the specific phrases Milton uses in the text. Since Milton is one of the brightest and most conscientious of all writers, his sentence structure, phrases, and word choice carry tremendous meaning and should be carefully scrutinized.

The phrase “Hadst thou been there” is markedly similar to the Biblical passage in John chapter eleven about Lazarus. When Jesus returns to Bethany, he discovers that his friend Lazarus is dead and his sister, Martha, says to him, “Lord if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died” (11:21). Following her statement, Martha proves her faith in the Lord Jesus Christ by stating, “I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee” (11:22), to which Jesus responds, “Thy brother shall rise again” (11:23). Martha and Jesus’ exchange may be an important parallel to Milton’s exchange between Eve and Adam, although in a reversed pattern. Essentially Eve’s statement is designed to indicate to Adam as well as the audience the inevitability of the deception and the Fall. Even if Adam had been present, the Fall would still have happened if he would have chosen it. Her restless wandering did not cause the Fall.

Similarly, in the exchange between Martha and Jesus, Jesus neither refutes Martha’s accusation, nor explains why he was not present or even if he would have prevented the event, indicating the inevitability of Lazarus’ death. It matters not so much that it
happened since some things are unpreventable. The result of the event is what matters. In Eve’s case, this means the knowledge that she and Adam gain. Jesus, through his raising of Lazarus from the dead, achieves a greater purpose; he seals his death on earth and dispels any doubt that his power is greater than that of the Pharisees and Sadducees who dominated the Jewish religion.

With the biblical parallel in mind, it would appear that Milton stands on the side of Herbert, an idea that will be further explored in the coming pages. Restlessness does not mean a hellish Faustian fall; rather it can be used to achieve a greater purpose such as the coming of the Son of God. Scholars often debate who the hero of *Paradise Lost* really is, and each perspective can be validated by various passages and arguments, but the one argument that holds with the previous discussion is that Jesus Christ is the intended hero to come in *Paradise Regained*. If the felix culpa view of Milton’s hero is accepted, his position on rest, the purpose of restlessness and the paradox that he created between Eve’s restlessness and that of the fallen angels is even more fully solidified. Restlessness is only a virtue if it achieves a divine purpose, to “justify the ways of God to men” (Book 1, line 26).

Regardless of whether or not Milton and Marlowe concluded anything definite about the question of restlessness or the purpose of it, they each plausibly explained an answer. Herbert’s restlessness, as will be demonstrated, that leads to redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ has little to do with the restlessness of Milton’s fallen angels and even less to do with Faustus’ restless quest for knowledge. What is evident is that Milton took the view embraced by Herbert and the view embraced by Marlowe and molded it
into a stunning paradox that solidified his purpose for *Paradise Lost* and the climactic coming of the Son in *Paradise Regained*.

Although Milton, Marlowe, and Herbert treated restlessness differently in their works, the theme was a prevailing feature of sixteenth and seventeenth-century literature, a theme that reflected the tumultuous changes in science, politics, and religion that marked the time period as a "place in between" - in between the old medieval world and the new modern world, thereby making it a crucial time period and a time period that deserves close attention. Particularly the study of George Herbert is vital because he differed from his contemporaries in respect to restlessness and the purpose of it.
The key text for George Herbert's restlessness is "The Pulley." Because Herbert's concept of restlessness is framed within "The Pulley," a general overview and explication of the poem is invaluable to a thorough study of Herbert and his restlessness, including critical perspectives of the poem, its particular diction, its dependence on the Pandora Box myth, and the origin of the restlessness that it offers:

When God at first made man,

Having a glass of blessings standing by;

Let us (said he) pour on him all we can;

Let the world's riches, which dispersed lie,

   Contract into a span.

   So strength first made a way;

Then beauty flowed, then wisdom, honour, pleasure:

When almost all was out, God made a stay,

Perceiving that alone of all his treasure

   Rest in the bottom lay.

   For if I should (said he)

Bestow this jewel also on my creature,

He would adore my gifts instead of me,
And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature:
So both should losers be.
Yet let him keep the rest,
But keep them with repining restlessness:
Let him be rich and weary, that at least,
If goodness lead him not, yet weariness
May toss him to my breast. ("The Pulley")

Although "The Pulley" is one of the most frequently anthologized of Herbert's poems, it has received surprisingly little critical attention (Routh 44). Michael Routh suggests that this is unfortunate because the poem is "more subtle than [the] lack of critical attention would suggest" (44). Routh might be correct in his claim that the poem is extraordinarily subtle and has occasioned only "brief consideration" (44) in many of the critical texts on Herbert's poetry. Yet the critical attention that has been given to "The Pulley" is worth noting for its many differences and many varied readings. The major critical camps for examining "The Pulley" have, historically, fallen into two categories: those that place emphasis on the conceit itself and those that focus on the playful and serious use of "rest," both in its origin and in its various functions in the poem itself. On these two points, the conceit and rest, does the subtle meaning of Herbert's poetry depend.

Obviously, since Herbert has been labeled a metaphysical, in the same camp as Vaughan, Donne, and Traherne, the pulley conceit is, rightly, crucial to the overall theme of the poem, even though the mechanical device is never once mentioned in the poem itself. Mickey Wadia has written an article entitled "Brief Analysis of Herbert's Conceit
of The Pulley” that points to the conceit as the principle point of the poem. The pulley is the tool by which God does the impossible, lifts mankind back to Him, using restlessness as the leverage. Chauncey Wood in “An Augustinian Reading of George Herbert’s ‘The Pulley’” also devotes time to the conceit but in a different way. Wood sees the conceit as being a different form of a pulley than many critics have considered for the poem. Wood suggests that Herbert’s pulley is based on the more common use of a pulley in the seventeenth century, as a two-bucket well pulley. According to Wood’s analysis, the two-bucket emblem found in Thomas Tenner’s The Soules Solace (1631) is the sourcebook for the meaning behind Herbert’s pulley, a two-bucket pulley with sin on one side and grace on the other. Wood changes Tenner’s emblem to more closely resemble Herbert’s poem with goodness and weariness on opposite but co-existing ends. Regardless of the differences in their two arguments, Wadia with her emphasis on leverage and Wood’s emphasis on the dualism of the pulley itself, the conceit is the focal point of “The Pulley,” although Wood also gives equal critical time to the concept of rest, which will be discussed shortly.

Robert Waddington is the one critic whose view of the mechanical conceit is much different than the others. Most critics have been prone to see “The Pulley” as a positive relationship between God and humanity. Even though some differ on the specifics of the conceit, most seem to agree that one of the focal points of the poem is God’s mercy in doing the impossible, allowing fallen humanity to again regain His presence. Waddington, however, cites another use of the pulley in the seventeenth century, in contrast with Wood’s explanation of the two-bucket well. Waddington sees the pulley as
a device for torture, leaving the speaker of the poem in bitterness and torment in trying to attain rest in His god.

Besides the obvious necessity of studying the conceit itself, Herbert’s play on “rest” has formed the second crucial area of critical attention. First and foremost, critics have devoted a considerable amount of energy to determining where the basis for Herbert’s use of rest originated, primarily. Just as critics differ in their opinions of the metaphysical conceit, they also differ on the origin of Herbert’s rest. Chauncey Wood and Wilfred Guerin both adamantly posit that Herbert’s use of rest stems from St. Augustine and his famous opening section of the *Confessions*. When compared directly to “The Pulley” Guerin and Wood seem to be right on track with their Augustinian connections. But St. Augustine is not the only probably source for Herbert’s rest. C. Stuart Hunter and Janet Grayson also give plausible alternative origins for Herbert’s rest, the Psalms and Bernard of Clairvaux. Another non-Augustinian reading of “The Pulley” comes from Michael Routh, who does not focus so much on the origin of the term rest but on its varied uses within the poem and what they indicate about the “upward/downward movement of the poem’s God-man pulley” and the paradox that the word play creates (44-45).

To gain a more comprehensive view of “The Pulley” and the rest that Herbert’s speaker so desperately wants to achieve, an explicit examination of the text itself, in addition to critical commentary, is invaluable. In so doing, possibly one of the first points to consider is the difference between the speaker in the first few lines and the speaker in the middle of the poem to the end. Herbert is, of course, very much aware of the distinction between the Old Testament and the New Testament; indeed he takes the opportunity to place his first two poems of “The Church” in a singular order that
manifests his deliberate understanding of the fine thread that connects the two Testaments. The first poem, "The Altar is a clear reference to the Old Testament altar that stood outside the Tabernacle. A sacrifice was first placed on the altar by an individual before s/he was permitted entrance to the Temple or Tabernacle, thereby demonstrating sacred devotion to God and the ordinances of salvation that took place inside the Tabernacle.

In Herbert’s own poem, the sacrifice is a broken heart and a contrite spirit. But what is even more interesting is the tie between the first poem, "The Altar," and the second poem, "The Sacrifice," a poem not about a sacrifice laid on the Altar of the Temple but rather about the ultimate sacrifice that is held up for all humanity, the voluntary sacrifice of Herbert’s Lord, the Savior Jesus Christ. Metaphorically, Herbert’s distinction between the sacrificial altar and the sacrificial Lamb of God is not a strong one. He recognizes the connection between the two and is anxious that the reader should know at the outset, before entering The Temple, that one, in this case the reader, must be willing to offer himself/herself as a metaphorical sacrifice, a surrendering of the will and the hardened heart, as well as recognizing the sacrifice of the Savior before being in a position to achieve the redemption and sanctification that is offered only in the Temple of God.

The Old Testament and the New Testament are definitively linked as one in the first two poems of “The Church.” Herbert will continue to use Old Testament themes throughout his poetry, but he never forgets that what the Old Testament prophesied and foretold was fulfilled, in his mind, by the coming of the Messiah and the New Testament, the Old Law fulfilled by the New Law, demonstrated by “The Altar’s” placement immediately preceding the Sacrifice—the physical reminder before the final fulfillment of
the Mosaic Law (sacrifices were a type for the Sacrificial Lamb). Joseph H. Summers in his article "The Poem as Hieroglyph" makes overwhelmingly clear Herbert's complex understanding of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments: "Herbert and his contemporaries cherished the conception of the altar and the sacrifice. The Mosaic sacrifices were considered types of the one true Sacrifice, in which Christ had shed blood for the remission of sins once for all time" (266). Rosamond Tuve further explores such a concept in *A Reading of George Herbert* when she describes Christ as "the new Law" (146).

Herbert knew, as did the ancient Jews who converted to Christianity, the significance of the coming of the Messiah in fulfillment of the promise of the Hebrew prophet Isaiah, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace" (Isaiah 9:6). And it was through the new law, the law of the New Testament, with its roots ever present in the Old Testament, that the Rest in "The Pulley" could be achieved—a concept reiterated by Herbert in his poem "Aaron:"

Profaneness in my head,
Defect and darknesse in my breast,
A noise of passions ringing me for dead
Unto a place where is not rest.
Poore priest thus am I drest.
Onely another head
I have, another heart and breast,
Another musick, making live not dead,
Without whom I could have no rest:
In him I am well drest.

Herbert has an abiding knowledge of what the other “musick” represents, the Christ, his source of rest, but also the new law of whom the prophets of the Old Testament prophesied would come to redeem His people.

Tuve again conflates Christ with love and the new Law of sacrifice as demonstrated in Herbert’s “The Altar,” which makes use of two dominant conceits, one of which is applicable to Herbert’s understanding of Christ as the new law (New Testament) in fulfillment of the old law (Old Testament): “the heart of flesh that is the Table of Stone whereon the new Law, of love, is inscribed, thus again representing God’s tabernacle” (182-183). The biblical reference for such a conceit is, of course, found in Deuteronomy 27: 8, “And thou shalt write upon the stones [of the altar] all the words of this law very plainly.” According to Tuve, the conceit must be taken a step further in “The Altar” and given contextuality. The altar in Herbert’s poem can be seen as the heart of the hardened sinner, and the pleading of the speaker is for the Lord to mold his heart since “nothing but thy pow’r doth cut;” it is, however, not the law of Moses that the speaker needs to cut into his heart, but rather Love, and the “SACRIFICE” of his Lord. The individual’s entrance into The Temple and progression toward and understanding of the sacrifice is dependent upon the cutting of the heart to the satisfaction of the Lord. The New Law, the love that is personified in Christ must be present before entering the Temple, the place of sanctification in the Old Testament, in the form of the Tabernacle (see Exodus 25-26), as well as in the New Testament from which Jesus (himself Love personified), in an act of
righteous indignation, expelled the moneychangers in an attempt to restore the Temple's divinity (see John 2:14-16).

When attempting to understand "The Pulley" as a complex religious statement of an even more complex poet, the poem must also first be studied contextually from the very beginning, that is, from the moment of Old Testament Christian Creation. T.S. Eliot "claim[ed] a place for Herbert among those poets whose work every lover of English poetry should read and every student of English poetry should study, irrespective of religious belief or unbelief" (19). He saw Herbert's poetry as worthy of academic study because of Herbert's "exquisite craftsmanship, [...] extraordinary metrical virtuosity, [...] and verbal felicities" (19). He credits Herbert with a religious and poetic sophistication that places him in the privileged category of metaphysical poets like Vaughan, Crashaw, Traherne, and Donne. Anthony Low has noted that seventeenth-century religious poets were, as T.S. Eliot saw them, a powerful combination of feeling and intellect (226) and that "poets like Herbert, Vaughan, and Traherne [were] thoroughly learned and technically expert in their craft, but also widely read and deeply literate in theological, religious, and devotional matters" (227). Taking Low's statement as evidence of Herbert's strong technical awareness of his own poetry as well as a strong technical awareness of religious concerns, a close reading of any of Herbert's poetry must not be shackled too closely to only the purely overt. Account must be taken of Herbert's work as a whole and the themes that he often utilized through the canon of his work.

One of the themes that Herbert often drew upon was the connecting thread that runs from the Old Testament through to the New Testament—the Old Testament as types of the New Testament. A good example of Herbert using a type to explicate something
quite spiritually esoteric might be his poem "Joseph's Coat." The Old Testament reference is clear, even though Herbert never uses Joseph's name in the poem. Joseph H. Summers describes the poem in terms of how Herbert used it in a typically hieroglyphic fashion: "The title [Joseph's Coat], a reference to a traditional Christian type, gives Herbert's interpretation of the experience of contradictory joys and sorrows. Joseph’s 'coat of many colors' was the sign of his father's particular love," a concept that ends, according to Summers, with the ultimate vision of insight of the Christian in the "extraordinary mixture of joy and sorrow in the Christian's life...a particular sign of God's love" (258). Another example of Herbert's intense and complete development as a religious and secular thinker, two attributes that necessarily force a close reading of Herbert in all his particulars, not just those that are immediately apparent, is again "The Altar." This opening and illustrative poem should not be studied only in relation to its placement before "The Sacrifice," as noted above, but it should be studied for its own unique content.

A broken ALTAR, Lord, thy servant rears,

Made of a heart, and cemented with tears:

Whose parts are as thy hand did frame;

No workman's tool hath touched the same.

A HEART alone

Is such a stone,

As nothing but

Thy pow'r doth cut.

Wherefore each part
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Of my hard heart
Meets in this frame,
To praise thy name.
That, if I chance to hold my peace,
These stones to praise thee may not cease.
O let thy blessed SACRIFICE be mine,
And sanctify this ALTAR to be thine.

"The Altar" occupies a prominent position in The Temple, as noted above, and serves at least two purposes. First it serves as a call to all those who will read The Temple, to be willing to place their hearts on the altar as a sacrifice, the type of sacrifice in Psalms 51:17, "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise," on the altar of their god before entering into the Temple to receive the salvation only possible through the ultimate salvation of the Lord's sacrifice at Calvary. Second, and it is on this concept that the first must ultimately rest, is the poem's unique picture as a symbol of the Old Testament, not a modern concept derived from the New Testament or even of the seventeenth century. Summers is quite explicit in his description of Herbert's altar. The altar of Herbert is an altar of stone, an altar, in fact, much like those of the ancient Hebrews outside of the Tabernacle. The altar of the poem is, of course, to be distinguished from the altar of the Anglicans and the Church of England itself. Summers notes that the very word 'altar' was simply not "applied to the Communion Table in the Book of Common Prayer" (266). Even more importantly, the "canons of Herbert's time directed that the Table should be made of wood rather than stone" (266). Herbert's altar is not a contemporary or modern reference; rather it is a
direct reference to the altars of the Old Testament, specifically a reference to the ancient altar before the Tabernacle.

Herbert's mature religious development and attention to detail forbid a casual reading of any of his poetry; the poems that form the middle section of *The Temple* deserves a diverse and perhaps even deconstructive critical model, one that does not attempt to pigeonhole the poetry into one category when perplexities create possibilities for further analysis. Such a reading is necessary for "The Pulley" and has in fact already been utilized, given the scholarly rift between seeing the poem as an Augustinian poem or an inspired version of the Pandora's Box mythology. The poem is, then, problematic or filled with possibility, depending on the perspective of the reader, not just in its possible roots but also within the chosen diction of the poem itself. If Eliot's estimation of Herbert as an astute and conscientious writer, both religiously and intellectually, is even partially true, and one accepts Herbert's propensity for infusing his poetry with specifics of the Old Testament, even down to the use of a particular word, 'altar,' then a careful reader is obligated to consider the specific diction in "The Pulley," since why would Herbert be so careful about the diction of one poem, "The Altar" and not about another?

"The Pulley" is at heart a creation poem, one that carefully intertwines and inseparably connects the pre- and post-lapsarian worlds. The poem is also a poem that demonstrates Herbert's religious concepts and outlines his view of God. To fully appreciate Herbert's overall themes, a careful analysis of his language is crucial. One will remember that the beginning of Herbert's poem includes the plural pronoun 'us' and 'we': "Let us (said he) pour on him all we can." To set up the reason for such a use of the plural pronouns, a brief discussion of the Bible is indispensable.
In dealing with Christian creation, of course, one finds two separate and complementary aspects of God presented in the book of Genesis. The Bible is comprised of writings that originate not with just one document but four separate documents, each with different writers who emphasized different elements and points of doctrine. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, a “known and respected” German scholar in 1780 published his discovery of the discrepancies between the two apparently different texts and labeled them the E Document named for the use of Elohim, and the J Document so named because of its use of Yahweh (Friedman 52). Eichhorn’s bifurcated paradigm lasted only about eighteen years before scholars discovered that the Bible was comprised of not just two documents but four documents. What Eichhorn had labeled the E Document was actually “not one but two sources” (52). Embedded within the E Document was what has come to be known as the P Document due to its emphasis on priestly activities like “stories about priests, laws about priest, matters of ritual, sacrifice, incense-burning, and purity, and concern with dates, numbers, and measurements” (52-53). For the context of the present study, the “P” and “J” Documents are the most significant.

While Herbert died nearly 70 years before the first publication of the contradictions in Genesis in 1711 by Henning Bernhard Witter (Friedman 52), and he certainly should not be placed in a Hebraic context, as a religious and secular scholar, it is not unthinkable that Herbert may have recognized, as a strong believer in the Trinity, the two complementary aspects of God that are found in what have come to be known as the P and J Documents. He may have used the two different attributes of God to further unify “The Pulley” and provide further evidence of his belief in the Christian Trinity. The P Document comprises the first creation story of Genesis and continues through Genesis 2:2. In the
Hebrew Bible, "the third word [...] is Elohim, the name of God throughout the account of the creation of the cosmos" (Dyer and Merrill 6). According to the Old Testament Explorer, the title's [Elohim's] origin is a word denoting power (6). Eloh, from which Elohim is derived, (the English, of course, being translated simply as God) means creator or architect, who according to some, created something out of nothing. But in the J Document of Genesis, God is named only YHWH, a sacred abbreviation for the Hebrews who felt the name of God was too sacred to be pronounced. (The translation into English reflects the change in godship to be Lord God.) So, Genesis I entitles the creator God, and Genesis II entitles the creator, Lord God. What Herbert does with the diction in his poem might very well be an indication of his complex understanding of the Trinity and the different attributes of God that the Trinity represents. Indeed Herbert refers directly to the Trinity in "The Star" when he refers to the three powers that will help him take "flight/Unto the place where thou [the Lord]/ Before didst bow." Herbert states that it is with the "trinity of light./Motion, and heat" that the "flight" can be achieved (lines 17-20). Doubtless, Herbert affirms the concept of the Trinity in many ways, through the change of pronouns in "The Pulley," through his use of the Trinity to describe how one can "fly" to the Lord, and even through the structure of The Temple with its three separate sections.

As noted previously, Herbert infuses his poetry with a distinctive mark of Old Testament imagery to invite contemplation of more abstract New Testament, spiritual matters. Herbert is fond of utilizing the very physical to add enlightenment to the very spiritual as in the case of "The Altar" and "Easter Wings," the two poems for which he is most recognized. Summers in his article "The Poem as Hieroglyph" acknowledges Herbert's intentions to use the physical to manifest the spiritual. Both "The Altar" and
“Easter Wings” were a step for Herbert in a higher poetic plane of imagery (265). He used the visual elements of the poems to create a shape “which formed an immediately apparent image relevant both to context and structure” (265). George Herbert the intellectual fused with George Herbert the devout poet in the creation of The Temple. It is not unusual for Herbert to conceive of his poetry as a tool to exemplify New Testament principles in Old Testament imagery. After all, the Old Testament is a very physical book. The Hebrews frequently relied on physical signs from their prophets or from their God to remind them of spiritual matters, the altar and blood sacrifices are, of course, the definitive examples of such belief. The New Testament is indeed the New Gospel, not based as much on physical as on abstract concepts as exhibited in the parables, often esoteric and vague for those not ready to understand the spiritual concepts being taught. Such was George Herbert’s habit of exhorting spiritual truths; the physical Old Testament manifests and unites with the spiritual New Testament, and his interesting switch of pronouns in “The Pulley” further exemplifies his unique hieroglyphic style.

Herbert begins "The Pulley" with the following lines, “When God at first made man,’ Having a glass of blessings standing by;/Let us (said he) pour on him all we can;” John N. Wall, in his introduction to a 1981 printing of The Country Parson and The Temple, indicates that Herbert was overtly concerned with his use of Biblical language patterns: “[…] Herbert borrowed from the Bible not only subject matter but also style, form, genre, and language […] Always subordinating his own efforts with words to the claims of biblical language” (4). Given such a view of Herbert’s focus on diction, note must be taken of his unique use of pronouns in “The Pulley.”
Herbert changes the use of his pronouns at a crucial moment in “The Pulley,” not at the moment of creation, but at the moment where the poem switches to a focus on the way man can achieve salvation, through the Son, or through the Lord of the New Testament, Jesus Christ. “For if I should (said he)/Bestow this jewel also on my creature./He would adore my gifts instead of me./And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature:/So both should losers be.” And who is the God to whom the Christian Herbert comes to devote his life? The God with complementary attributes: God, the creator, The One on the cross, the Sacrifice, the Lord of the New Testament, Lord God. Just as the God of Genesis I is the priestly God who stands back from his creations and creates humankind last, so is the God at the beginning of “The Pulley” withdrawn from mankind, pouring blessings from heaven but with little personal contact. Genesis II, however, presents a much different and complementary attribute in Lord God. Here is a God who “does not stand in front of a potter’s wheel” but “instead, he picks up the moistened clay and molds it in his hands, rather like a solitary child making a mud pie or building clay houses near water” (Bloom 175). The God of Genesis II has a much closer relationship to his human creations and gives of himself to give them physical life, “Yahweh shaped an earthling from clay of this earth, blew into its nostrils the wind of life” (trans. Rosenberg 175). Like the creator of Genesis II, the God at the end of Herbert’s poem is the God who saves humanity, the God who again gives of himself, this time as a sacrifice, the sacrificial Christ of the New Testament. Michael Routh in “The Crux of ‘The Pulley’” outlines a similar concept, conceiving that a significant turn in the poem does take place after the first two stanzas, exactly at the moment the pronouns change. Routh believes that the change occurs and changes the focus of the poem “from the higher world of God
to the lower world of man” (44). Although he draws his conclusion not from the use of the pronouns but on the use of the term “rest” in its varied forms for his conclusion, the tone and end result is the same, the focus of the poem shifts from the world of God to that of fallen humanity, a world in need of a Savior to provide the rest that has been withheld, thereby requiring a “movement downward from the world of God to that of man” both poetically and spiritually (Routh 45). Undoubtedly Herbert shared a strong belief in the Trinity as outlined in the Nicene Creed and solidified by the early church fathers, including Clement of Alexandria (172) and St. Augustine. Herbert’s brilliant mind found a subtle way of reinforcing the Trinity within “The Pulley” while outlining the complementary attributes of God and His relationship to humankind both as a Creator and as a Messiah.

Another aspect of “The Pulley” that makes it so interesting is its relationship to the Pandora’s Box myth. Much has been made of the similarities between Herbert’s poem and the Pandora myth. Wilfred L. Guerin in his article “Herbert’s ‘The Pulley’” points out that in the past, scholars have been too quick to judge Herbert’s poem on the basis of the Pandora myth, a line of thinking that in his view has been far too overrated. He indicates that scholars are missing much more in the poem than has previously been thought, too prone to draw on the “exaggerated-and somewhat erroneous—references to Pandora” (par. 6). A brief discussion of the connections between the two is useful and will here be treated quickly since several scholars, including Louis L. Martz (533), have already written about the possible connection. The Pandora’s Box myth is a straightforward explanation of how vice came to be on the earth, causing misery for
humankind. The Pandora myth relies largely on two important concepts, first Epimethean thinking and second the jealous and anthropomorphic nature of the pagan gods.

The Pandora story is much different than "The Pulley" because Herbert subtly takes the well-known myth and flips it completely around in a dramatic and graceful twist away from the pagan images and toward a concept that more fully fits the Christian notion of God, a God infinitely good, incapable of jealous rage and spite. Epimethean thinking governs the Pandora myth completely but is absolutely lacking in "The Pulley."

Epimethean hindsight (Epimetheus comes from the Greek word for hindsight) is that which keeps Hope inside Pandora's wretched box, but it is Promethean foresight (Prometheus comes from the Greek word for foresight) in "The Pulley" that keeps Rest inside God's "glass of blessings." God foreordains mankind to be restless, keeping the equivalent of Hope, Rest, with Him.

Herbert, as a secularly educated man was, no doubt, well schooled in classical mythology, thereby likely acquainted with the myth. He may have used the basic structure of Hesiod's myth to construct the beginnings of his poem, but that is where the similarities end. Herbert took the pagan myth and gave it something that was much more inline with the Christian concept of creation. In the pagan myth, after the creation of humankind, Zeus in his anger at Prometheus for stealing fire, asked Hephaestus to create a beautiful mortal creature, a female. Zeus then asked Hermes to give her a "deceptive heart" and a "lying tongue" ("The Creation of Man"). Pandora was then given a jar that she was forbidden to open and sent to earth to Epimetheus. Pandora was sent to the earth with the gods' foreknowledge that she would ultimately not be able to restrain her curiosity and would open the box, thereby releasing misery into the world. Obviously,
Pandora did exactly what the gods expected her to do, and she opened the box. When she did so, to the chagrin of mankind, misery was released and could not be placed back in the box. However, Epimetheus with his wonderful gift of hindsight (Epimetheus comes from the Greek word for hindsight) tells Pandora to shut the box. But what happens is not what Epimetheus or Pandora wanted; Hope, alone of all the "gifts" of the gods, was shut back up in the chest.

The natural correlation here is to Herbert’s concept of Rest. “That of all his treasures, Rest in the bottom lay.” Certainly the parallel is a natural and perhaps a just one, but a couple of points deserve further thought. First, in the Pandora myth, what is it that the gods know will be released into the world? Misery. Each god places misery in the box as some form of vice, an interesting point in and of itself, which will be addressed later. Misery is released to the world, but with what intent? The gods give no specific reason for releasing misery, merely an explanation as to WHY it is on the earth. But in Herbert’s creation poem, as one would expect from a Christian God, misery is not released at all; in fact it is only rest, the greatest of all the treasures that is withheld, but with an odd stipulation. Why is Rest kept back?

In Herbert’s poem, a reason is bluntly given, unlike the Pandora myth. Rest is withheld with the sole purpose of pulling man back to God. “For if I should (said he)/ Bestow this jewel on my creature,/ He would adore my gifts instead of me./And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature:/ So both should losers be.” Rest is not given to the world because humankind will never achieve salvation with it on the earth. Another problem with the Pandora parallel is in the nature of the gods who are creating and releasing emotion and vice to the world. The gods of Pandora’s box are certainly divine and
immortal, but their natures are so different as to be almost incomparable to Herbert’s God. They are filled with human-type emotions and foibles. They are capable of great good, perhaps, but they are also capable of great evil. One famous example will suffice. In Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*, the story of “Venus and Adonis” is recounted as well as the ultimate transformation of Adonis’ blood into a fragrant flower, the very description of which is a combination of violence and grace:

One hour had yet to pass when, from that gore,
a bloodred flower sprang, the very color
of pomegranates when that fruit is ripe
and hides sweet seeds beneath its pliant rind.
And yet Adonis’ blossoms have brief life:
his flower is light and delicate; it clings
too loosely to the stem and thus is called
Anemone – ‘born of the wind’—because
winds shake its fragile petals, and they fall. (1182)

Adonis is, of course, gored by a boar, “[he] sinks his long tusks/into Adonis’ groin” (1181), because Venus had earlier angered two lovers by her own arrogance and jealous pride. After uniting the two great lovers, Hippomenes and Atalanta, she seeks revenge on them because they neglected to burn “sweet incense to honor” her. She admits to Adonis that her “wrath was spurred” and that she vowed to “serve them as an example” by “incit[ing]” herself “against the pair” (1180). She proceeds to “ignite” Hippomenes with “an indecent, sudden need/for Atalanta’s body” (1180) while the couple were resting in a sacred shrine, thereby desecrating the holy cave. In response to their lewdness, the
"Mother goddess, turret-crowned,/was set to plunge the obscene lovers down/ into the waves of Styx. But then that seemed too slight a penalty: instead, she wraps/their necks in tawny manes," soon transforming them into lions. Venus warns Adonis to “keep away from such beasts and, any sort of animal that will not turn its back/and flee from you” (lines 700-703). Venus, the goddess of love, whose machinations brought the two lovers together, erupted in spiteful vengeance when slighted by Hippomenes and Atalanta.

Venus’ behavior is typical of Mount Olympus gods, the givers of Pandora’s Box. Their complex natures allow them to bestow both virtue and vice on mankind. These are the gods of the Pandora myth. But Herbert’s God is much different. Comprehension of Herbert’s God is crucial to an objective and accurate reading of “The Pulley” and The Temple as a whole because The Temple is, in many respects, the answer to God’s bestowal of gifts in “The Pulley.”

Consider the following lines from Herbert’s poem and even more, consider the nature of the God in Herbert’s poem, a clear foil for the Olympians:

So strength first made a way;

Then beauty flowed, then wisdom, honour, pleasure;

When almost all was out, God made a stay,

Perceiving that alone of all his treasure

Rest in the bottom lay.

Herbert’s God is the God of the Old and New Testaments, the God found in Genesis, because after all Herbert’s poem is at root a creation poem. In Genesis, God’s creations do not include anything resembling the misery that is released in the Pandora myth. Misery is not part of creation and is not bestowed by God at all. The name of God is
mentioned thirty-five times between Genesis 1:1-2:2, followed after each creative day with the phrase, “And God saw that it was good.” Herbert’s God is one whose creations are good, in fact a God quite incapable, at least in relation to creation, of vice or evil. Tertullian, one of the early Church Fathers stated in his treatise “The Goodness of creation, and of the Law” that the creation itself was based on goodness and that “the world was made up of all kinds of good things, and gives sufficient indication of the great good in store for him for whom all this was provided” (106). Tertullian goes on to describe God as goodness personified and added that God continued to create “further delights for man” that he would enjoy God’s goodness in paradise (106). Such a virtuous perception of the Divine, not unexpectedly since Herbert, having been schooled at Cambridge in divinity, would have been acquainted with the Church Fathers, is offered in “The Pulley.” What does God bestow on His creatures? Strength, beauty, wisdom, honour, pleasure. Hardly surprising in a Christian context, particularly for a priest who would have been well acquainted with the New Testament Christ, a man whose parables teach how to find the virtues Herbert attributes to God’s creation of the world, at least those given in “The Pulley.” The nature of God is absolutely clear to Herbert. God releases only virtues on the world. He does not create misery or vice.

One of the most important aspects of Christianity is its insistence on a bipolar concept of good and evil. All goodness is contained in one image, God, and all evil is contained in another image, Satan. God is only capable of releasing virtue and good to humanity. Herbert is on strong ground with such a concept as it is found in the Gospel of Matthew 7:7-11:
Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If you then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

The Christian God’s gifts are innately good. He will neither give a “serpent” when a fish is requested nor a stone for bread. Herbert’s concept of God contains the bipolarity of good and evil embraced by the Christian church, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Christianity has maintained that the serpent in the Garden of Eden was indeed Satan, even though the Hebrews do not mention Lucifer or Satan at all until 1 Chronicles 21:1. God did not release misery into the world. For vice to have reign on the earth, it HAD to come from another source, a source that was outside of God himself. One of the most striking points of “The Pulley” is that God is the bestower of virtuous gifts, a perpendicular angle that intersects at only one point in the comparison to the Pandora myth in which the gods not only send Pandora to earth knowing that her curiosity will make her open the box, but they also provide the miserable vices that will be released.

But what about Rest itself and its relation to Hope? To fully appreciate the connection, the following problem demands an answer. If God is the bestower of virtue and goodness, then what about the gift he gives by omission, restlessness? George Herbert’s view of restlessness is essentially framed in “The Pulley.” Herbert clearly indicates that the restlessness pervading human existence is almost holy. Raymond B.
Waddington, in his article "The Title Image of Herbert’s ‘The Pulley’" insists on a negative reading of restlessness. He views the restlessness of Herbert as "spiritual torment" that is "self-inflicted" (52). The self-inflicted vision of torment in "The Pulley" is not, however, the best reading since the actions of the speaker have not yet even come to fruition. While the poem allows that in a post-lapsarian world, humanity will have the agency to effect a spiritual weariness, God is still completely in control in the poem. Never inside "The Pulley" does He relinquish control of humanity’s destiny. Even though the poem does shift from a God of creation to a God of saving, the speaker has not yet had the opportunity to actually put that saving into practice, choosing to utilize or not to utilize the “silken twist” that prominently ends “The Pearl.” Waddington’s concept of “The Pulley” is interesting, but it might better be applied to “The Pulley” in relation to other poems of The Temple, like “The Collar” where the speaker recognizes his self-inflicted torment that leads him away from God. Contrary to Waddington’s reading of “The Pulley” as a conceit of torture (50), the restlessness of Herbert comes from God and should, therefore, not be feared but rather embraced as a ladder, leading a diligent climber to perfection in God.

Especially revealing is Herbert’s list of various attributes and positive “blessings” that are in fact typically considered gifts from God: “So strength first made a way;/Then beauty flowed, then wisdom, honor, pleasure [...] Perceiving that, alone of all his treasure/Rest in the bottom lay” (1383). Rest, like the other attributes distributed to mankind by God, is a treasure. But because if rest were given to the earth mankind might “adore” God’s gifts instead of Him, rest is withheld. God clearly states that rest is his final treasure, obviously a virtue, yet in keeping rest he lets humankind be kept in
“repining restlessness.” Additionally, Herbert’s use of the word treasure to describe God’s gifts and also to describe the one treasured jewel that He keeps in his presence, a treasure stored in heaven, is significant. St. Augustine notes that his desire, like Herbert’s is “not of the earth, nor of gold and silver, and precious stones, nor gorgeous apparel, nor honors and powers, nor the pleasures of the flesh,” but is of the kingdom of God (qtd. in Wood 149). The treasure that he seeks is not earthbound; the treasure that he seeks is that which resides with God, the treasure that He has kept—rest. St. Augustine and Herbert both recognize that because God kept his most precious of jewels with Him, humanity would repine in restlessness, constantly seeking that one treasure in heaven, a fulfillment of Matthew 19-21:

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt,
and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in
heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break
through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

If the restless soul seeks the treasure in heaven, the heart will be in heaven also, for where the treasure is, with God, the heart can also be, achievement of St. Augustine’s famous statement.

Restlessness then comes as a direct result of God’s creation. And if God is the embodiment of good, which He is in Christianity, then all that results from his creation must necessarily also be good. Such a positive view of restlessness is the one that Herbert took and utilized in The Temple. Restlessness, according to Mickey Wadia in her article “Brief Analysis of Herbert's Conceit of The Pulley” is the “leverage” needed to pull man to God. To a Christian, being with God is to achieve final rest, as St. Augustine
noted in the opening section of his *Confessions*: “For Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee.” Whatever, then, brings humanity, or acts as God’s leverage, to the rest of God must be virtuous since it leads to a virtuous end, according to St. Paul:

> whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. Those things, which he have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you. (Philippians 4:8-9)

Restlessness is the opportunity to seek those “pure” and “lovely” experiences that prepare the individual for final rest in the bosom of God.

Wilfred Guerin has stated that “The Pulley” should be read with a more Augustine and less Pandora’s Box perspective, and he is correct. As just noted in a previous discussion, St. Augustine is felt throughout “The Pulley” in a multiplicity of ways, not just in the use of the term “rest.” Interestingly, the *Confessions* and “The Pulley” begin in the same place, the moment of creation. Chauncey Wood sees this fact as significant since it is because of creation that humanity is restless: “Created for God he [mankind] is restless away from Him” (149). At the very moment that humans are endowed with “certain mutable and therefore unsatisfactory goods” (Wood 150), they become restless, as noted above. However, God gave the promise of eternal rest, if only mankind would praise Him and not his creations, another tie to St. Augustine who warns in the *Confessions* against “that intoxication wherein the world so often forgets Thee, its
Creator, and falls in love with Thy creature instead of Thee” (qtd. in Wood 150).

Herbert, of course, follows the exact same concept in allowing that God keeps rest because “if I should (said he)/Bestow this jewel also on my creature,/He would adore my gifts instead of me,/And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature:/So both should losers be” (stanza 3). If God grants rest, they will never regain his presence. Humanity will never have a reason to “seek” His word, something that St. Augustine also considers to be tantamount to spiritual progression (Wood 149).

Herbert takes the same track as St. Augustine in the bulk of “The Pulley” by indicating that God allowed humankind the opportunity to be restless that they might become weary, allowing Him to make up the final difference and “toss” them to His “breast” after all the good works that they have done. In His infinite mercy and goodness, He opens his box of treasures, but also in his mercy, he releases restlessness in his foreknowledge of the post-lapsarian world, as opposed to the Epimethean hindsight that keeps Hope in Pandora’s Box, that will soon come. Restlessness is a product of foresight, not hindsight, a merciful act that offers humanity the chance to finally “repose” in His rest. In the words of John Milton in Book III of Paradise Lost, “past, present, future he beholds.” As such, even what He gives through omission is merciful because it provides the tools for humanity to regain what it lost in the Fall, a position that appears to have been very much informed by St. Augustine. The Augustinian view given by Wilfred Geurin is, therefore, a much better way of understanding “The Pulley,” not only because of the problems with the Pandora parallel but also because it illuminates Herbert’s view of restlessness as a virtue given by a merciful God to achieve an otherwise impossible task, to bring His fallen creations back to His presence.
CHAPTER 3

HERBERT’S INTERNAL SPIRITUAL RESTLESSNESS

If the various attributes of creation are viewed as divine treasures, is not the greatest
treasure of all God’s grace and salvation, as Herbert states in his poem “Redemption?”
That the ultimate gift is for one’s “suit [to be] granted” through the blood of Jesus Christ?
According to Herbert the answer is yes, and like the tenant in “Redemption,” one must
conscienciously seek the tenant lord, Jesus Christ, to obtain this gift - rest. To achieve
the rest in Jesus Christ that is offered in John 14:27, “My peace I leave with you, my
peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you,” Herbert recognizes the
need for an active life to reach a contemplative or restful state. A contemplative life, that
is, one of complete rest, is what Herbert seeks; it can, however, only be achieved through
action. Since salvation is Herbert’s spiritual goal, the pathway that God has provided for
this salvation must also be a “pearl of great price” (Matthew 13:46). In this way,
restlessness is in fact the greater treasure since it leads the humble and penitent to rest in
God or salvation.

Spiritual restlessness leading to contemplation is extended in the poem “Love III”
when Love invites the speaker to sit and eat. To sit down and eat is one form of rest that
in this case is the metaphor for grace and rest in Jesus Christ who is the embodiment of
love since “God is love” (1 John 4:8). Rest in Jesus Christ is also scripture based in
Matthew 11:28 when Jesus offers an invitation to “Come all ye that labour and are heavy
laden, and I will give you rest.” Only when Herbert acknowledges his inadequacy as in “Love III” and when he seeks after the Savior as in “Redemption” does he achieve rest through his own restlessness that translates into his embracing the active life that leads to the contemplative life. As such Herbert’s unrest is in fact part of that “strait gate” and “narrow way” (Matthew 7:14), the only “way” that leads to the giver of rest—God.

Herbert’s restless activity is exhibited through the constant movement of the speakers in his poems. It is very seldom that the speaker arrives at a state of rest without first searching and actively seeking Jesus Christ. This notion is probably based on the Biblical reference, “Ask and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you” (Matthew 7:7). Moreover, the diction found in “The Pulley” is illustrative of Herbert’s view of movement and its crucial relationship to attaining rest. The final lines of “The Pulley” represent God’s final judgment for humanity: “If goodness lead him not, then weariness may toss him to my breast.” Weariness. Upon this one word does humanity’s fate depend. Only by becoming weary can humankind again attain God’s presence. In addition to the biblical references to weariness, most notably in Isaiah 28:12, “To whom he said, This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest; and this is the refreshing: yet they would not hear,” the etymology of weariness reveals much about the word’s origin as it relates to the type of weariness in “The Pulley.” The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that one form of the modern English word “weary” is found in the Old Saxon “wórig,” which is used in the context of being “weary of a journey.” More important than the varied forms of the word is the shared root “wor,” which seems to be the same in both the Old English, “wórian” and in the Old Saxon, “wórig.” The root “wor” means to “wander” or “go astray.” Certainly Herbert is nothing if not a seeker, a
man wandering after true religion and faith. In the “Pilgrimage,” Herbert climbs to a high peak with the hope that his journey’s end will be God’s presence. Of course his journey is only a metaphor or even a metaphysical conceit for his journey through life. He overcomes one challenge and trial after another, only to discover that the spot he reaches is not for him. It is filled with “brackish waters on the ground.” He is at first “abashed, and struck with many a sting of swarming fears.” But after crying to his King he discovers that this hilltop was not for him; he needed to climb a “further” hill only to discover, after doing so, that final rest in death is not to be feared but something sought after. Even his concluding lines indicate a state of rest, “After so foul a journey, death is far, And but a chair.” Death as an absolute rest from earthly care is a unique characteristic Herbert utilizes in his poetry, in association with peace and rest.

For Herbert, death was not terrifying but peaceful. The last few lines of “Mortification” complete the circle of Herbert’s religion and demonstrate his understanding of what really connects life and death: “Yet Lord, instruct us so to die,/That all these dyings may be life in death.” What begins to happen in Herbert’s poetry, if looked at not individually but intertextually, is the true nature of Herbert’s understanding about his own mortality and by his own mortality the nature of his own religion, the essence of his God. Herbert is certainly not the only poet to recognize what Thomas Gray so profoundly stated in his “Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard” that “the paths of glory lead but to the grave” (Line 36). Indeed one of the great modern Western American poets of the 21st Century, Samuel Green, stated such a concept in his poem of the same title, “What are we all headed for except a cold grave?” (41). Both Thomas Gray and Samuel Green spoke of the same concept that humans have struggled
with for centuries, including George Herbert, and some have expressed it more elegantly than others. Herbert was well aware of his mortal, physical shell that was subject to decay, all the more poignant in Herbert's case as his body was being consumed by tuberculosis. The opening cry of "Mortification" is evidence of Herbert's all-too personal knowledge of physical decay. "How soon doth man decay!" If Herbert's body was consumed by disease at the end of his life, his mind and spirit were consumed with trying to conquer his worldly self and become a man who could truly say, at the end of his life, that he had achieved final rest, peace, a man who had earned the blessed words of his Lord recounted in Matthew 25:21, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of the lord." The true test for Herbert was not in the nature of his final goal and the hoped for final state of his spirit at death, but in the nature of life before that point.

Herbert does not fear death because it is the only path to pure rest and cessation of earthly cares. By the second stanza of his poem "Life," the speaker's foreboding "sad" thoughts or "suspicions" on death are "sugared." The progressive attitude and tonal change signifies Herbert's view of death as his poem "Death" even more clearly illustrates. Death allows every person to finally lay themselves in a "pillow of either down or dust," demonstrating, as does the "sugaring" of the speakers' thoughts in "Life," Herbert's positive view of death. It should not be feared but sought as an end, as the final line of "The Pilgrimage" specifies. Death becomes an end that is not only "much in request" but even "sought for as a good" since it brings complete and final rest in the Lord. "The Sacrifice," another of Herbert's devotional poems, further explores the nature of death. The speaker, Christ, while on the cross, begins a significant shift in the poem...
with the following idea—He has “stolen death” thereby robbing it of its historical and biblical “sting” (1 Corinthians 15:55). Herbert brings this concept to a full realization in “Death.” Abstract death is personified and given pleasant attributes of “blood into [its] face” through “our Savior’s death.” Death even becomes effeminate with its “fair”ness and “grace” and is almost given as a “Bride of Christ.” Death is certainly more “sugared” than detested since after the life of “ornament” has withered and passed from the flower, it enters a new phase of existence. It becomes “fit...for cures.”

Herbert’s rest through seeking and searching, if only to find peaceful death, is complete rest and is a product of his overall belief in the soul’s immortality. In his poem “Redemption,” Herbert characteristically seeks to know God and His ways. He ultimately finds his Savior among thieves and when the speaker asks the Lord for to “make a suit,” he is given an undeniably redemptive answer: “he straight your suit is granted, said, and died.” Herbert’s life-after-death view is guided by his willingness to accept Christ’s grace if not fully able to understand it as in “Thanksgiving:” “then for thy passion - I’ll do for that - Alas my God I know not what.”

Although Herbert viewed death as definitive peace, he did not advocate quiet submission or self-inflicted death as a way to reach God more quickly; rather Herbert was more interested, as was discussed earlier, in the seeking after God through pursuing an active life. The active life versus the contemplative life is tied directly to the various forms of restlessness in the seventeenth century. Herbert’s view of the active life was that it is the means to an end. Only through activity can true contemplation be reached, a state of mind that would encompass rest in God and would eventually end with death. Only then can the final state of rest be achieved. Herbert’s view of the active and
contemplative should be seen as two parts that achieve a particular end - worthiness of God’s love, a worthiness that leads to God’s grace and the rest spoken of in Matthew 11:28.

Herbert is not the only poet to have this end in mind. His contemporary Henry Vaughan, most notably in his poem “Regeneration,” addresses the same issue of constant searching to find peace and rest. His poem’s final lines show the speaker also seeking death as the key to forsaking his “restless eye”: “Lord then said I, on my one breath, And let me die before my death.” Vaughan understands that complete rest can only be achieved through his material self’s death, and the way to achieve his carnal nature’s demise is through seeking and finding, as the speaker of “Redemption” sought and found the “Lord of lords” (Revelation 17:14). Like Vaughan who focuses most of his poetry on the active life, including “Regeneration,” “The Retreat,” “The World,” and “I Walked the Other Day (To Spend My Hour), Herbert utilized action to reach final peace.

Another example of Herbert’s insistence on spiritual activity is his poem “The Pilgrimage.” In this poem the speaker actively seeks, in almost a Pilgrim’s Progress sort of way, salvation. At the end, the speaker realizes that he must continue on his journey, indicating that the active life is never truly complete, until death and final rest is accomplished as is evidenced by the closing lines of the poem. “Redemption” also approaches this same idea although it could also be seen as a contemplative act that leads to a metaphorical physical action. In either case, it is the speaker’s own physical movement that leads him to an almost meditative understanding of his relationship with his Lord. “Your suit is granted” is a complete fulfillment of Biblical rest. “Come ye who labour and that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” The very first verb of the verse
is exactly what Herbert is doing. It requires action on the seeker’s part. The seeker must “come” of his/her own accord to gain salvation.

Herbert’s “Vanity (I)” is probably the strongest argument for his emphasis on contemplation being an integral goal in the search for Godly rest. Herbert provides three examples of activity: an astronomer, a diver, and a “chemyc.” Although all three have been active seekers of knowledge and wisdom, they have not found God or, more importantly, life through God. They have succumbed to vain curiosity and lost the ability to engage in wonder, which spurs activity into the correct contemplative avenue and toward a “speculative life” (Quinn qtd. in Behunin 175), an idea further addressed in “The Pearl” when the speaker acknowledges nine lines of the active process of acquiring knowledge followed by the contemplative line “yet do I love thee.” This last line is very important in solidifying a direct tie to obtaining rest. When the speaker discovers that he loves God, he discovers something very important. God is love personified and as such when the speaker can finally acknowledge this love, he is as close as he can be to God and can be given rest based on his weary travels of actively seeking knowledge since if “goodness lead him not, then weariness may toss him to my [God’s] breast.”

Herbert was not the only poet to address the differences between activity and contemplation. Donne also is concerned with these ideas. In “The Good Morrow” Donne begins with the line, “I wonder, by my troth what we did until we loved.” Since according to Aristotle wonder is one of the first emotions, “it is owing to their wonder that men both now and at first began to philosophize” (qtd. in Behunin iii), it would seem to be an essential part of the contemplative tradition. Before the act of coming together can be achieved by the lovers in “The Ecstasy,” a state of wonder was first necessary. It
is not the physical movement that brings the lovers to an understanding of their love but rather a spiritual, contemplative experience that allows the process that “interanimates” their two souls. Only does necessity drive them back into a physical and therefore active communion - “the body is [Love’s] Book.”

Donne also utilizes the contemplative life in his poem “A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning.” It is the contemplative life that draws them together into one unified soul being “interassured of the mind.” Only the contemplation in the mind is able to overcome the physical separation of the two loves. George Herbert, of course, is not concerned with becoming one with a woman, but he is concerned about becoming one with his God, of subjecting his will to the will of God, something that can only be achieved through internal mental activity that culminates in contemplation.

Herbert’s restlessness, as just noted, takes many forms and is manifested in many ways throughout The Temple. Undeniably, Herbert’s poetry addresses the active spiritual wandering of a man consumed with conquering the carnal man in order to finally become as a little child and be able to respond contemplatively to His call, “My Lord” (“The Collar”). The agonized speaker in so many of Herbert’s poems, like “The Collar,” frequently moves from a state of forced humility to voluntary submission and it often happens through restless movement, as in “Redemption.” Herbert’s restlessness takes on yet another form when Herbert is placed in the context of seventeenth-century religious meditative thought. The Temple is not only a book of physical restlessness; it is also a book of mental restlessness, of active thinking with one goal in mind—to repose in the rest of God.
Herbert was a man of great care who paid close attention to detail, like most poets. *The Temple* manuscripts are evidence of Herbert's great care. *The Temple* manuscript, the manuscript upon which the first printed edition was based, was revised circa 1627 but was not published until 1633 after Herbert had died. During the course of Herbert's life, he wrote many poems, most of which comprise *The Temple*. The exact dates for each of the individual poems is uncertain (Stewart 3). Stanley Stewart, in his book *George Herbert*, indicates that Herbert probably wrote many of the poems that would “find their way into the revised *Temple*” around 1627 while he was visiting the earl of Danby, the brother of his mother's second husband, Sir John Danvers (2-3). Some scholars do not place such a specific date of conception for Herbert's poems. So although Herbert was early “destined” for a life of divinity and was on July 15, 1626 “installed as deacon and prebendary of Leighton Ecclesia” (Stewart 3) in the Diocese of Lincoln by “John, then Lord Bishop of that See” (Walton 278), scholars have had a difficult time ascertaining that all of his religious poetry was written during the time that he was the priest over the Bemerton Parish, a position he accepted on April 26, 1630 (Stewart 4).

George Herbert's early demise from tuberculosis is a generally well-known fact, and there is no telling what Herbert may have concluded about the ordering of his poems or their content had he not succumbed to consumption after only three years serving as rector of St. Andrew's Church (Wall 14) in the Bemerton Parish. What happened just days before Herbert died is not, perhaps, as generally well known. Amy M. Charles, in her introduction to the *Bodleian Manuscript of George Herbert*, noted that Herbert's family had a bad habit of waiting literally until their deathbeds to settle their legal affairs. Only days before Herbert died, a fellow curate visited him and, since these things were
often done in a rush, wrote on whatever paper was available, in this case that which was sitting on Herbert’s writing desk. Apparently, Herbert dictated his will to his “first curate” Nathanael Bostocke:

Herbert’s will, dictated to Bostocke on 25 February 1633, four days before his death, is written on a folio page that Bostocke apparently took from the writing table that Herbert had used as long as he had the strength to sit up to work. Although it is not now possible to decipher the blind impressions on this sheet, it is clearly a list, probably of titles. (xviii)

Charles posits the possibility that Herbert was revising at least the order of The Temple poems, the order in which they would appear in the final manuscript, almost at the moment of his death. Such a situation would indicate that Herbert was working very hard to arrange his poetry before the fatal sickness that he knew would overtake him finally did overtake his lungs. Charles’ point about the manuscript revisions and the list of titles, if that is what the impressed list really was, is crucial to establishing a time frame for revisions not only of the poems themselves but of the order in which they appear in the final 1633 printed edition of The Temple.

Herbert’s manuscript revisions form the foundation for one vital element of Herbert’s mental restlessness, thereby warranting a brief analysis. Before the printing of The Temple in 1633 Herbert’s poems circulated individually during his life in manuscript form. When he died, he sent the entire manuscript of The Temple to his friend Nicholas Ferrar with strict instructions to publish the poems only if they would help “any dejected poor soul” (qtd. in Knights 242). The book was very well received when it was first published in 1633 and had been printed thirteen times by 1680. To date, scholars have
determined that there are three versions of *The Temple* in existence: The Williams Manuscript (WM), The British/Bodleian Manuscript (BM), and the actual 1633 printed edition. The final manuscript was not in the hands of the copiers long before it was sent to the printers, a point validated by a letter dated London, October 10, 1633 from Joshua Mapletoft to his wife’s uncle, Nicholas Ferrar.

As scholars have studied and compared the two manuscripts, they have discovered that Herbert made significant changes in the poems themselves, as well as in the placement of the poems within the text. Many of Herbert’s poems underwent changes between the copying of the WM and the BM, in addition to the many poems that appear only in the BM, the one that most closely resembles the 1633 printed edition, and were not part of the WM at all. The following poems are significant to *The Temple* and are also significant because they underwent some kind of change between the two manuscripts: “The Church-porch,” “The Sacrifice,” “The Thanksgiving,” “The Passion,” “Easter,” “Affliction,” “Faith,” “Communion,” “Grace,” “Praise,” “Whitsunday,” “Church-musick,” “Church-lock and key,” “Sunday,” “Employment,” “The Pearl,” “Jordan,” “The Elixir.”

When the major revisions and order shifting took place is a matter that is not altogether clear. According to Cristina Malcolmson in her book *Heart-Work: George Herbert and the Protestant Ethic*, Herbert probably made these revisions sometime after 1627, an opinion shared by Stanley Stewart (3). If Malcolmson’s position is adopted, one is also forced to then note that perhaps not only his poetic voice changed within the poems but that his spiritual growth and understanding of Christian theology, both in doctrine and practice, may also be reflected in the revised placement of the poetry.
Because concrete evidence does not exist to verify when the significant changes and re-ordering of the poems took place, Malcolmson’s position is, of course, supposition, and Amy Charles, in the introduction to the Williams Manuscript, cites good evidence why it is impossible to determine the dates of revision—Herbert began writing serious poetry for his mother when he was only seventeen. Herbert, then, was writing poetry for most of his adult life, and any revisions that he made could have been made at any time after he started writing poetry. But, Charles does discuss the blind impressions on Herbert’s will and makes it clear that while those impressions may not have been a new order for the poems in The Temple, they very well could have been. Therefore, one might conclude, as Charles does, that Herbert specifically intended for the poems in The Temple to follow a set pattern or at the very least a set order. Quite possibly that order could revolve around “the traditions of spiritual meditation” (Stewart 84) with which Herbert would most certainly have been acquainted.

George Herbert knew, at least according to what is found in his poetry, that achieving God’s presence would require him to become weary with searching, weary from climbing the “silk twist” (“The Pearl”). Certainly physical activity, whether it was doing good works or writing poetry, both to be discussed in later sections, constitute a tremendous part of Herbert’s virtuous restlessness, but equally important was his mental searching, his restless search to put his mind in an acceptable state to allow God’s light to “shine within” (“The Windows”) him. Two of Herbert’s changes from the WM to the BM are significant indicators of Herbert’s virtuously restless mind. First, the concept of spiritual progression. Second, the change to reflect spiritual meditation.
Many scholars have tried to determine exactly what Herbert was doing with the ordering of his poems, some focusing on the artistic display of the poems in the manuscript and some on the internal connections within the poems. Stanley Stewart represents one reason for the poems' re-ordering by stating that "as a result of the changes imposed on the sequence after composition of the Williams Manuscript, the movement within this segment [the opening section of "The Church"] is never stiff or obvious" because "the revised sequence amplifies, rather than the narrative of Holy Week, the worshiper's responses to it [...] (90). Within the segment, the opening poems of "The Church," that Stewart addresses in his book, is a smaller internal cycle that reflects the mind of man who is passing through a "spiritual struggle," one that uses his poetry to manifest his mentally anguished search for redemption through Christ.\textsuperscript{12}

In the \textit{WM} the following is the order of poems dealing with Jesus Christ's crucifixion, or Holy Week: "The Passion I," "The Passion II," "Good Friday," and "The Sinner." The later \textit{BM} has the poems in the following order, including some additional noteworthy changes: "The Sinner," "Good Friday," which combined "Passion II" as the final two stanzas, and "Redemption," whose name was originally "Passion I". The order of the spiritual progression has been changed to reflect a truly step-by-step process, beginning now with the poem about a sinner pleading with God to again "write on stone" or change the his heart of stone to something more pliable, something more like the altar that can only be hewn by God, "a stone./As nothing but/Thy pow'r doth cut" ("The Altar"). The ordering of poems begins an internal series that in the \textit{BM} now naturally leads to the day of the Messiah's death, Good Friday, which is also the beginning of the Christian resurrection that ultimately provides "the sinner" with the opportunity for redemption,
exactly the progression that Herbert sets out in the *BM* through his placement of the poems. From "The Sinner," the narrator proceeds to "Good Friday," where he sees the wounds of his Savior and pleads for grace to encompass and fill his sin-wracked soul. The end of "Good Friday" leads the narrator to the natural conclusion of "Redemption," which was "Passion I" in the Williams Manuscript. "Redemption" narrates what has occurred in the previous three poems but ends with something new. The narrator finds the tenant lord that he seeks and even speaks with him. "Of theeves and murderers: there I him espied./Who straight, Your suit is granted, said, & died." So, he has progressed from recognition of his sin, through to a pleading for grace and an acknowledgement of his Savior, to his actual discovery of Jesus Christ. He has become aware, spiritually, of his dependency upon the Savior for his very life and ultimate salvation, and he does so by progressing through a spiritual awareness that only culminates with action at the end of the mental struggle and then salvation through his dying Lord.

The new progression of poems in the Bodleian Manuscript displays a mature and mentally active poet who takes the reader who has just entered *The Temple*, as well as himself, through each major stage of the Savior's death and the sinner's role in accepting the final atonement of the Christ. L.C. Knights in "George Herbert: Resolution and Conflict" eloquently illustrates the sinner's progression with a description of Herbert's poetry in general: "But it [Herbert's poetry] does not, unlike some religious poetry, simply express conflict; it is consciously and steadily directed towards resolution and integration" (243). The sinner's "integration" of his new-found spiritual dependence, only to be acquired by intense mental agony, an experience that will "restore [the Lord's]
image" to where it should be, as something "treasur'd in [his] memorie" ("The Sinner").
Guish prepares his mind to accept his Lord's sacrifice.

Furthermore, the change in the ordering of the poems reflects the mental restlessness
of traditional spiritual meditation. Both Anthony Low and Stanley Stewart have
discussed the effect of spiritual meditation on seventeenth-century poets. Stewart cites
Louis Martz's book *The Poetry of Meditation* when he admits the "importance of the
Psalms and the traditions of spiritual meditation to a proper understanding of *The Temple*
(84). John Donne used the meditative tradition in his poetry, according to Helen
Gardner, as did George Herbert who "when he wished to be was an accomplished
practitioner of the form" (Low 228). The cycle that contains "The Sinner," "Good
Friday," and "Redemption" (an order that was changed from the *WM* to the later *BM*) is
just one example of Herbert's reliance on the meditative process. Anthony Low has
outlined three different steps in the meditative process, as given by Louis Martz, and
Helen Gardner has also outlined the meditative process. Both outlines are useful and
follow essentially the same pattern. The pattern given here reflects the terminology of
Helen Gardner (see endnotes for further discussion by Anthony Low).

The meditative process begins with what is known as the Preparatory Prayer wherein
one asks God that all intentions bend toward the praise and service of Him. Following
the Preparatory Prayer is the First Prelude or the Eyes of the Imagination. During this
step, the meditator images a place or situation such as the Mount of Olives, Gethsemane,
or Golgotha. If it is a situation such as sin, The Prelude might be the imagining of the
soul as being imprisoned. After imagining a place or scene, the meditator should follow
with a Second Prelude, or petition according to subject matter, that allows the individual
the opportunity to gain fellowship with Christ through sorrow and tears. If the subject
matter is about sin, then the individual should petition for shame for that sin. The final
step is The Memory or The Will, which is an outpouring of devotion on the part of the
person meditating (Gardner 287). The Preparatory Prayer is manifested very strongly in
“The Sinner” as is the First Prelude. Herbert is very clear about the imprisonment of his
soul and the nature of his “hard heart” that is as stone, very reminiscent of his hieroglyph,
“The Altar.” He also appeals to the Lord by a recognition that his own “pil’d vanities”
and “shreds of holinesse” need to be replaced with His divine “image.” It is to this end
that Herbert asks the Lord to “heare [his] call.” Such an agonized petition fits very well
into the first two steps of the meditative process, The Preparatory Prayer and the First
Prelude. Herbert continues with the meditative steps by outlining the Second Prelude in
both of its unique aspects in the final moments of “The Passion.”

In the final two stanzas of “Good Friday,” a poem previously entitled “Passion I,”
Herbert demonstrates a strong understanding and wish to be one with Christ in his
sorrows:

That when sin spies so many foes,

They whips, thy nails, thy wounds, thy woes,

All come to lodge there, sin may say,

Nor room for me, and fly away.

Sin being gone, oh fill the place,

And keep possession with thy grace;

Lest sin take courage and return.
And all the writings blot and burn.

For Herbert, the events of the scriptures are not buried past events. He believed in the potency of the Bible as a “living language” (Wall 41). The Bible is not a “closed narrative, but an account of a story that is still going on” (40). Particularly, Christ is ever-present in the Christian’s life: “The Christ-event is not over, a past event, but a living event, still open to the speaker’s participation,” (Wall 42) a paradigm directly inline with spiritual meditation. Herbert graphically describes the agony of Jesus’ passion: “Thy whips, thy nails, thy wounds, thy foes . . .” Herbert not only becomes a fellow of this “man of sorrows,” but he also recognizes his part in Christ’s suffering and is duly impressed with his own shame and inability to “measure out [Christ’s] bloud” or “count what [He] befell.” The seventeenth-century Herbert lives through the Passion of his Savior. The Passion is very much alive in his restless mind.

“Redemption,” as the final poem in the meditative representation being discussed, is a very good example of the last step of the meditative process, the memory or the will. The speaker is very active and “seeks” his tenant lord, prompted only by his own desire to “cancell th’ old” suit and petition for a new one. He grants his tenant lord, Jesus Christ, his old life, his desire to continue the sinful prospects that characterized the first poem. The speaker has no rest until he has traveled to “heaven,” to “cities, theatres, gardens, parks, and courts” and finally to the place of “theeves and murderers.” The narrator bends his active will to a search for his Lord, in this case the “Lord of Lords” and “King of Kings.” He finds resolution for his spiritual conflict in the word the Savior speaks from the cross, exemplifying the last step of the meditative process.
The significant change in order between the poems in the earlier Williams Manuscript and the order of the later Bodleian Manuscript is subtle but is, nevertheless, crucial to appreciating the progression of Herbert's Christian mind. Herbert was a student of devotional meditation, and the poems of The Temple are indicative of a man who was not only restlessly versifying with the intention of praising God, but also of an active mind that was mentally climbing the "silken twist" to further his spiritual communion with his Lord and to voluntarily subjugate his will to that of his God's, a task often fraught with disappointment, "brackish waters" ("The Pilgrimage"), and the forced humility of a man "tortured in the space/Betwixt this world and that of grace" ("Affliction IV").
CHAPTER 4

GRIEF AND DELIGHT: RECONCILED THROUGH RESTLESS VERSING

One need not be confined to “The Pulley” for Herbert’s positive perspective of restlessness. Herbert provides another very clear example of the positive nature of restlessness and an individual’s need for a virtuous restlessness. God gave in creation, by retaining rest, restlessness to humankind, but it is actual restless activity by the individual that is necessary to lift one to the Divine—the equal balance of works and grace, both of which are quoted in the Book of Common Prayer as tools to reach God, with grace as the final necessary complement to works. As already mentioned, the method by which the individual achieves salvation through God, or more specifically through Christ as Herbert reveals in “Redemption,”

At length I heard a ragged noise and mirth

Of thieves and murderers: there I him espied,

Who straight Your suit is granted, said, and died

is not just given in the form of the metaphysical conceit of a pulley. Virtuous restlessness, a form of good works, also becomes, for Herbert, the act of writing poetry.

Terry G. Sherwood in his book Herbert’s Prayerful Art devotes an entire chapter to the twin baits that Herbert mentions in “Affliction V,”—delight and grief (101). Sherwood chooses to describe the struggle of George Herbert not in terms of the pulley
with restlessness being the leverage, but rather that the lines of the pulley are bipolar, including not only the anguished soul pleading to God for rest, but also the soul that in moments of great spiritual insight has moments of spiritual delight. Sherwood uses Herbert’s own words from stanza three of “Affliction V” to demonstrate the point of the twin baits:

There is but joy and grief;

If either will convert us, we are thine:

Some Angels us’d the first; if our relief

Take up the second, then thy double line

And sevr’al baits in either kind

Furnish thy table to thy mind. (Wall 216)

Undoubtedly, Sherwood’s point is well given and is logical. In fact, the footnote to this poem in the *Country Parson, The Temple* edited by John M. Wall validates Sherwood’s conception of Herbert’s view of how to reach God. Footnote 251 appears directly after the phrase “sevr’al baits” and gives the following definition of baits: “Lures, one of pleasure, the other of weariness” (216). The key term in the quoted phrase is “weariness.”

Weariness one will remember is exactly what Herbert notes in “The Pulley” is what will “toss” man to God. “If goodness lead him not, yet weariness/May toss him to my breast.” There is no question that Herbert believed that becoming weary of what Sherwood refers to as the “worldly motions” that “encumber” the soul, would eventually allow him to greet his Messiah, his Redeemer, his God. Indeed Herbert even saw his own consumptive suffering through the lenses of “The Pulley.” Herbert, at the close of his
life, wrote to his friend Nicholas Ferrar and told him about the “decaying condition” of his own body (qtd. Sherwood 120). Izaak Walton in The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert and Robert Sanderson quoted Herbert as writing of his deathly condition to Ferrar:

and tell him, that I do not repine but am pleas’d with my want of health; and tell him, my heart is fixed on that place where true joy is only to be found; and that I long to be there, and do wait for my appointed change with hope and patience.

(qtd. in Sherwood 120)

What immediately strikes one about such a statement from a suffering man like Herbert, a man of learning, a man of education, a man of worldly customs, and a man of faith is the resigned tone of acceptance. Yet, as discussed in a previous chapter, Herbert did not fear death. He viewed it as the only way to obtain complete cessation from life’s cares, both spiritual and physical. Indeed, “these impediments [earthly cares] can be totally removed only in the state of satisfied rest and leisure in heaven” (Sherwood 24). As much as one is prone to accept Herbert’s acceptance of his own fate and his own cessation of physical care, one has to also ask the question, how then if affliction is such a crucial part of spiritual progression, is the polar opposite, joy or delight, also part of progression since one would seem to cancel out the other, or at the very least be completely perpendicular to one another?

Sherwood spends a good amount of his chapter “The Baits of Delight and Grief” defining exactly what delight is and how it differs from worldly pleasure as well as trying to determine what the nature of Herbert’s paradoxical concepts really is. He finally reconciles the two by allowing an Augustinian reading of Herbert and an Augustinian
interpretation of Herbert himself. Few, if any, would doubt that Herbert was influenced by St. Augustine, as were, and still are, many Christians. William H. Pahlka in his book entitled *Saint Augustine's Meter and George Herbert's Will* states in the introduction that “it is hard to think of a major work by Augustine that has not been cited as relevant to Herbert’s poetry, or to seventeenth-century poetry in general, over the thirty years since Joseph Summers laid the groundwork for modern Herbert studies” (xiii). Pahlka then goes on to cite several scholars who have used St. Augustine to explore Herbert’s poetry: Rosemond Tuve, Mark Taylor, Heather Asals, Joseph Mazzeo, Arnold Stein, Stanley Fish, William Halewood, Patrick Grant, and Barbara Lewalski (xiii). Pahlka also notes that Herbert’s stint as the Public Orator at Cambridge is good evidence that Herbert intimately knew St. Augustine’s work since at Cambridge “Augustine was considered a principle model for rhetorical studies” (xiv).

Given the long and powerful history of work and scholars linking Augustine’s work to Herbert’s, it is hardly surprising that Sherwood utilizes the Augustine-Herbert connection to demonstrate how both grief and delight can be reconciled together, since delight is often associated with pleasure, often worldly pleasure that seems irreconcilable to a Christian philosophy. Sherwood notes that as a priest, Herbert fully comprehended that his parishioners would not necessarily embrace the concept of sheer affliction and grief to obtain salvation, “however wary about bodily pleasure” (102). So, instead of alienating any of his Christian audience, he takes St. Augustine’s stance that some pleasures were “legitimate” because they were “sensory experiences” and were necessary “for the soul’s perception,” a justifiable position since it is delight’s object, not delight itself, that “determines the virtue of the soul” (Sherwood 102). If one accepts
Sherwood's argument that the relationship between grief and delight is paradoxical, on the one hand forming a set of parallel lines, never touching each other and seemingly independent, in binary opposition, and on the other hand parabolic, each bait an arm extending on either side of the soul's axis, independent yet with a common set of points, one half unable to function without the other half (each line is required to form the complete parabola), the paradox is complete. (See figure below)

Sherwood is correct in noting the pair of baits, and his theory is a credible one. But what if there were another figure, in addition to the parabola and the parallel lines, that physically represents the concepts that prominently appear in Herbert's poetry, a figure closer to providing a complete reconciliation of grief and delight? Such a figure does exist, and it exists in "The Pulley" and in "The Pearl." Indisputably, grief and delight form a tremendous foundation for The Temple. Herbert himself said that the poems that make up The Temple are "a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have past betwixt God and my Soul" (qtd. in Low 224). Additionally, T.S. Eliot acknowledged that "these poems form a record of spiritual struggle" (19). Grief and delight are indeed given by God as the means to reach Him, and it is the reconciliation of the two that causes restlessness. Restlessness is, in fact, the reconciling factor. In "The Pulley" the very
metaphysical conceit is quite obvious. A pulley is attached to a rope that extends down to the object that is desired to be moved or lifted. The entire pulley is necessary to move the individual from a fallen state to one of complete exaltation, achieving the final rest that Augustine saw as the crucial goal of the Christian, rest in God, or rest in the presence of God as Herbert himself says in "Trinity Sunday:" “That I may run, rise, rest with thee.” The placement of the pulley itself is notable as a conceit since the actual mechanical part of the pulley is raised above the object to be removed. So in a sense, humankind, if taken in a physical context, really is being raised up to God, both figuratively and physically. Mickey Wadia in an article entitled “Brief Analysis of Herbert’s Conceit of The Pulley,” posits that the rest that God withholds from mankind is in fact "the leverage that will hoist or draw mankind towards God when other means would make that task difficult" (par. 3). While the leverage issue is absolutely applicable to the metaphysical concept of "The Pulley” and its mechanical underpinnings, it assumes far too much about the negative connotations of restlessness and weariness. Wadia also attributes to Herbert the notion that when mankind has become tired and “fatigued” by the material gifts that God has bestowed, only then will they turn to Him in sheer exhaustion (par. 3). What is missing in this interpretation, however, is what is most important to the reading of "The Pulley"--the positive nature of the restlessness bestowed by God. Wadia’s reading is far to simplistic and does not credit Herbert’s brilliant mind. Restlessness, as the reconciliation of grief and delight, is the rope of the pulley, not just twin lines of a double-lined pulley, which would be in line with the parallel line image, or merely the leverage that Wadia states that it is. Such a viewpoint is supported by Herbert’s closing lines of “The Pearl:”
I fly to thee, and fully understand
Both the main sale, and the commodities;
And at what rate and price I have thy love
With all the circumstances that may move:
Yet through these labyrinths, not my groveling wit,
But thy silk twist let down from heav’n to me,
Did both conduct and teach me, how by it
To climb to thee.

Restlessness, if it is to be what leads a fallen, post-lapsarian individual back to heaven, cannot simply be leverage, and it cannot simply be two parallel lines. It must be a combination of the two into one ultimate “silk twist;” and more importantly it must be something that does not disallow or otherwise destroy the necessary concept of works and free agency of humankind. The image of the rope or the “silk twist” implies the possibility, or is directly stated as in “The Pearl,” of activity on the part of the sinner. The “climbing” becomes possible only when God “conducts” and “teaches” the penitent and humble person how to climb the “twist,” how to use restlessness in a beneficial and spiritually satisfying manner, sometimes providing brief periods of spiritual delight and sometimes allowing grief and affliction. This is not to say that grief and delight are the same emotions. Undeniably they are polar opposites, which is exactly why they require reconciliation in one concept that provides the necessary path that leads directly to God—restlessness. Perhaps an even better way of viewing the two concepts and their relationship to restlessness and each other is found in the mathematical graph with its x
and y-axis, one horizontal line and one vertical line. (See figure below)
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When an asymptote appears on the graph and extends its arms upwards on the y-axis with its roots approaching from equal positive and negative points on the x-axis, the lines are clearly separate. They are separated by the vertical y-axis. However, the further they extend horizontally, the closer they come to touching and merging with the x-axis. But they never actually touch it or merge with it, although they become so close as to appear to be the same line, if taken far enough toward infinity. Such is the case with grief and delight as they relate to restlessness. Each is clearly separated and stands on either side of an emotional axis, yet they come so close to merging that they almost appear to be one, yet they are still able to maintain their distinctive characteristics, characteristics that Herbert so attentively delineates in his poetry.

“Affliction I” is probably the best example where Herbert takes the concepts of grief and delight and fuses them into one final concluding plea to his Lord, “Ah my dear God! Though I am clean forgot,/ Let me not love thee, if I love thee not.” The poem finds the speaker in a state of restless contemplation. The reader catches him, as it were, in a discussion with himself, trying to determine to what extent he belongs to God and to what extent he is orphaned from Him. He begins by outlining the “joys” that he received when he was first “enticed” to God’s “heart.” Herbert describes his blessings as “natural
delights.” An interesting and important parallel to draw here is to “The Pulley” since “pleasure” is given by the “God of nature” in both contexts of nature. After all, what could be more natural than a gift that God Himself gave at the moment of creation? As the speaker of “Affliction I” proceeds through his narrative, initially he is overcome with confidence in His God and in His good blessings, and then by the reversal of his situation from delight to grief:

What pleasures could I want, whose King I served,

Where joys my fellows were?

Thus argued into hopes, my thoughts reserved

no place for grief or fear.

As yet, the speaker has no concept of grief. To him, God is not capable of allowing individuals to suffer if they “seek [His] face.” The speaker even outlines the specific physical blessings that he attributes to God’s good will toward him. God has provided him with “milk and sweetmesses.” What follows the speaker’s confident declaration is perhaps what causes or allows his final reversal of situation. He claims for himself his own will and not the will of God. “I had my wish and way.” Within two lines of his autonomous declaration, he admits the onslaught of the second asymptote, grief:

But with my years sorrow did twist and grow,

And made a party unawares for woe.

My flesh began unto my soul in pain,

Sicknesses cleave my bones;

Consuming agues dwell in ev’ry vein

And turn my breath to groans.
Herbert has carefully juxtaposed the two concepts that finally bring him to one plea for God, but only after the two have been merged, yet still maintained their separate identities, as an asymptote must, can Herbert finally declare his loyalty to his God. The final lines are revealing because they do not only indicate the speaker's decision to embrace God's will, whether it be grief or delight, affliction or pleasure, but they reveal restlessness as the means for achieving such loyalty. Restlessness, by its very nature, involves movement toward or away from something. It requires mental or physical action, and Herbert's poetry is nothing if not active, as noted in a previous chapter.

The speaker in "Affliction I" is no different than the speaker in "Redemption." Both poems are about seeking and finding the true Master, the Lord. In "Redemption" the speaker actively seeks out his Lord, first in heaven, and then on earth: "In heaven at his manor I him sought: [...] and knowing his great birth,/Sought him accordingly in great resorts [...]" In "Affliction I" the speaker, in one final burst of agonized rebellion states that he will "change the service, and go seek/Some other master out." While the language is not as direct in this poem as in "Redemption," Herbert implies that the speaker has already sought out and found his current master, but being unhappy will search out another. To find the Master requires effort, a sign of restlessness, and in each instance, the Master is indeed found, but only through restless activity.

So if restlessness can be the reconciliation of grief and delight, thereby offering yet another reading of "The Pulley" and Herbert's poetry in general, where is the direct correlation between Herbert's body of work and the spiritual progression of the poet? Does Herbert achieve his own reconciliation that the speaker of "Affliction I" achieves? The answer to this question is to be found in another master seventeenth century writer,
Ben Jonson. Ben Jonson is known for many achievements, but among his greatest is the Court Masque.

Robert M. Adams has given an excellent informative introduction to the court masques in the second edition of the Norton Critical Edition of Ben Jonson’s Plays and Masques. The masque was an elaborate court piece that was designed to be not “literary forms so much as courtly entertainments” (xiii). The Masque generally centered around one important figure and served to illuminate the virtues of this one “central luminary of the occasion” (xiv). The Court Masque involved dancing, music, and the text, none of which took precedence over the other. Jonson developed the masque form that is the most relevant to the current study of George Herbert, the anti-masque.

Generally, the players of the Court Masque were extravagantly dressed members of the court who took pleasure in showing off their elegance. Many of the Court Masque characters were allegorically designed. What Jonson did was to off set these virtuous masquers with their opposites, the antithesis of the masque. Like all good rhetoric the thesis (masque) and antithesis (anti-masque) end with a resolution. The resolution in Jonson’s masques, as might be expected, is one in which virtue triumphs over vice: “The conflict is heraldic, not dramatic; good appears, declaring itself, and the figures of evil withdraw like the shades of night when the sun rises” (xv). That virtue triumphs over vice in the Court Masque is neither surprising nor shocking. It is, in fact, “inevitable” (xv). Yet the question of how it is resolved is the more important concern. Through the masque itself, the allegorical figures play themselves out. The concept of the antimasque, the masque, and the resolution of the two is given prominence in one particular masque for which Jonson is known, Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue. Within the few pages of this
masque, Jonson gives detailed directions about how the two opposites of his masque, vice and virtue, can finally be reconciled, and they are reconcilable, but only through the masque itself.

*Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* begins with the jolly and epicurean Comus—the figurehead for revelry, decadence, and pleasure. He is naturally countered by virtue’s ally, Hercules. What begins to happen during the course of the masque is a battle between the anti-masquers and the masquers, between pleasure and virtue. Toward the middle of the masque, lines 146-153, Mercury lays out the purpose of the masque, to reconcile pleasure with virtue, not that virtue should destroy pleasure, but that the two should be equal partners:

[...] But now

The time’s arrived that Atlas told thee of: how

By unaltered law, and working of the stars,

There should be a cessation of all jars

Twixt virtue and her noted opposite,

Pleasure; that both should meet here in the sight

Of Hesperus, the glory of the west [..]

On the heels of Mercury’s speech, Daedalus enters with his songs and with his dancing. As the masquers position themselves for the dance, Daedalus begins his first song, the first of four that he will sing through until the end of the masque. Daedalus, in Greek mythology, is the great builder of mazes and here in Jonson’s masque, he will weave, through his art, the dance and the song, a reconciliation for pleasure and virtue. The anti-masquers and the masquers will dance the reconciliation. The footnote to *Pleasure*
Reconciled to Virtue confirms Daedalus’ importance to this particular masque and to the nature of the reconciliation. Through what means can two opposites be reconciled together? Through art. Richard Harp’s note to line 217 illustrates the importance of art to the reconciliation: “Daedalus, the mythical Greek maker of mazes, acts here as master of the intricate steps of the dance which interweaves pleasure with virtue under the guidance of art” (339). Art is the great reconciler of opposites, powerfully demonstrated by a master of both artistic and intellectual endeavors, Ben Jonson.

Jonson, having died in 1637, following Herbert to the grave just four years after consumption overtook Herbert’s lungs, was a man of the seventeenth century just as Herbert was. Like Herbert, he saw the apparent need to use art as a means for something, allegorically at least, greater, a means to accomplish the impossible, reconciling those objects that are seemingly irreconcilable, polar opposites. With Jonson’s view of art Herbert accomplishes his greatest task; he reconciles the twin baits, grief and delight in one act of supreme restlessness that he hopes will help him also accomplish the impossible, to be reconciled in his own imperfections with his perfect God; Herbert’s reconciliation comes through versifying, through writing poetry. Only in poetry are delight and grief made as one.

Writing poetry must be seen not just as a contemplative act; rather writing poetry must be viewed as a restless activity, one that requires action and not just contemplation, perhaps action as a way to achieve contemplation, as discussed earlier in a previous chapter. Herbert’s poetry is certainly what Eliot described it as, “a spiritual struggle” of a spiritual man. Throughout The Temple, Herbert, through his poetry, directly addresses his own need to write poetry as a way to reconcile his grief and his delight into one “silken...
"twist" that he can climb to achieve salvation. Before addressing Herbert's verse about versification, it would be helpful to view those moments of grief and delight which require a resolution in his poetry. One of the best poems for addressing Herbert's battle with grief, besides "Affliction V" with its direct reference to grief and delight is, not surprisingly, "Affliction IV." The opening stanza is indicative of Herbert's grief throughout The Temple and is used here as the representative of many other instances that are well known in Herbert's verse:

Broken in pieces all asunder,

   Lord, hunt me not,

   A thing forgot,

Once a poor creature, now a wonder,

   A wonder tortured in the space

   Betwixt this world and that of grace.

The speaker's anguish and "torture" results because he has been torn with the grief of the post-lapsarian world, a world that is not capable of receiving God's grace; yet he is also a man who is on his way to finding that grace and is, therefore, "betwixt this world and that of grace." The concluding lines illustrate the speaker's hope for a fuller relationship with his God, a relationship born of grief, born of the "elements [that have been] let loose to fight,/ and while [the speaker] live[s], try out their right" ("Affliction IV"). Of consequence is a comparison of the "elements let loose" in "Affliction IV" and the "glass of blessings" in "The Pulley." Perhaps the significance to be drawn is again that God does not place those instruments of grief on the earth, but He allows them to torment the speaker of the poem, in an effort to make him restless, to give him a reason to begin
climbing the "silken twist," making him weary enough that he will be "tossed" to the bosom of God. Such a concept is revisited in the final stanza of "Affliction IV." God does not always cause grief, but He will allow it for a divine purpose:

Then shall those powers, which work for grief,

Enter thy pay,

And day by day

Labour thy praise, and my relief;

With care and courage building me,

Till I reach heav'n, and much more, thee.

The speaker recognizes the necessity of grief for what it gives him courage to do but always with the knowledge that he can only become weary in the effort until he is worthy to be "tossed to [God's] breast." Grief is an absolutely essential element of The Temple.

The second element that Sherwood addresses as a twin bait is delight. Joy is to be found from only one source, the Lord, and is most evident in a number of Herbert's poems. As with grief, however, one will serve as an example for many. "The Collar" is one of the more famous poems in The Temple, and it certainly deserves to be so. Such a naked struggle of an individual determined to do right but equally determined to be independent appeals to even the most unreligious of readers. T.S. Eliot described Herbert's honest poetic voice by saying that "the great danger, for the poet who would write religious verse, is that of setting down what he would like to feel rather than be faithful to the expression of what he really feels. Of such pious insincerity Herbert is never guilty" (24). The poem's foundation is based on one of the two types of restlessness addressed herein. The restlessness of "The Collar" is mental restlessness. The speaker
engages in a violent mental wrestling intending to convince his intellectual component of the necessity, and even the right, for freedom from what he at first sees as spiritual oppression.

I STRUCK the board, and cry'd, No more ;

I will abroad.

What? shall I ever sigh and pine?

My lines and life are free; free as the rode,

Loose as the winde, as large as store.

Shall I be still in suit?

Have I no harvest but a thorn

To let me bloud, and not restore

What I have lost with cordiall fruit?

Sure there was wine,

Before my sighs did drie it: there was corn

Before my tears did drown it.

Is the yeare onely lost to me?

Have I no bayes to crown it?

No flowers, no garlands gay? all blasted?

All wasted?

Not so, my heart: but there is fruit,

And thou hast hands.

Recover all thy sigh-blown age

On double pleasures: leave thy cold dispute
Of what is fit, and not forsake thy cage,

    Thy rope of sands,

Which pettie thoughts have made, and made to thee

    Good cable, to enforce and draw,

    And be thy law,

While thou didst wink and wouldst not see.

    Away; take heed:

    I will abroad.

Call in thy deaths head there: tie up thy fears.

    He that forbears

To suit and serve his need,

    Deserves his load.

But as I rav’d and grew more fierce and wilde,

    At every word,

Methought I heard one calling, Childe:

    And I reply’d, My Lord.

The beginning of the poem is extremely revealing because the speaker asserts his own authority in direct opposition to God’s. His “lines and life are free” to go whichever direction the “loose wind” will carry him, yet he is bound by his position, by his priestly collar, a yoke, not unlike the yoke of Matthew 11:29, “Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.” The speaker, probably Herbert, has chosen to take the yoke of Christ upon him, the collar of
priestly duties. Also notable is the juxtaposition between the words that the Savior uses to describe himself and the independent and proud attributes that describe the speaker of the poem. By the end of "The Collar" the final submission or turning of the active will of the speaker to the will of God occurs, the ultimate example of achieving spiritual delight. The truest joy is found only after having experienced sorrow, a theme aptly played out in "The Collar." After having struggled with his will, the speaker is allowed the greatest spiritual joy, a oneness with God. He is not just given absolution for his struggle, but he is called the dearest of all names, Child. The Lord has accepted the speaker as His own. The speaker is by this point firmly rooted in his faith and has the wherewithal to reply, "My Lord." He has completed the circle of struggle to final joy. Truly, grief and delight found ample place in The Temple and manifest themselves in Herbert’s restless pursuit to give voice to his struggle, to utilize each one to find the One who promised in Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Herbert wrote poetry to reveal the struggle that took place between his spiritual and intellectual self and between his God. But why poetry? And, which of his selves, the intellectual or the spiritual, triumphs in his verse? The first question is easily answered if we refer to T.S. Eliot’s summary judgment: "[...] in Donne thought seems in control of feeling, and in Herbert feeling seems in control of thought" (17). Never does Herbert lose the intellectual nature of himself in his spiritual verse. His placement among the metaphysicals assures any skeptic that his poetry will be infused with the secular knowledge of a worldly educated man, but as Eliot has stated, emotion holds the reigns over the
intellectualism. The second question is also easily answered, but will take a bit more
time and explanation.

Herbert also wrote effective religious prose such as “A Priest to the Temple, or the
Country Parson, His Character, and Rule of Holy Life,” and certainly as the public orator
of Cambridge, a position of “essentially public relations, of addressing noble visitors and
writing letters to present and potential benefactors of the university” (Wall 13), and a
member of the English Parliament, he had the skills to write effective rhetoric. So, why
did Herbert confine himself to the rhythms of poetry? Poetry is neither only words nor
only meter. Poetry is the delicate combination of both. William H. Pahlka in his book
Saint Augustine’s Meter and George Herbert’s Will clarifies, according to Augustine,
why a man might be apt to choose poetry as a means to achieve spiritual justification:

What is the meter for? In Augustine, meter is a divine sign. Unlike the sciences
of rhetoric and grammar [both primary aspects of prose], meter is divinely
ordained and therefore sacramental. And verse is an imitation of a sacrament,
an incarnation of divine signs in the corporeal sounds of language. Herbert may
write the words, but if they are accepted as a sacrifice on the altar and
transformed into divine signs, that is none of his doing. Poets are not able to
make divine signs. That is why Augustine said that poets have no idea what
they are doing when they use their ears to produce verse forms. By listening to
the Word, by making Christ the object of their imitation, and by remaining
faithful to the rhythms of personal experience, they produce material signs
through which God can speak by divine sign. (200)
Herbert’s poetry is certainly nothing if not a record of his “rhythms of personal experience.” Poetry becomes the conduit for the divine to touch the material and for the material to touch the divine. However, such a conduit is not built without struggle, both intellectual and spiritual. For Herbert, the act of writing poetry itself must first be cleansed of all worldliness and carnality. Many scholars, like Pahlka, have noted the ways in which St. Augustine seems to have informed Herbert’s poetry, in a variety of ways, from the use of the word rest, to concepts of creation, to the use of meter, and finally in the use of poetry as a way to actually praise God.

St. Augustine’s famous statement, “For Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee” did not appear alone in the Confessions. Rather the statement on rest is preceded by several lines that describe not only that humans were made for God, but also why they were made—to praise Him and to praise Him not by force but by desire:

Great art Thou, O Lord, and greatly to be praised; great is Thy power, and of Thy wisdom there is no end. And man, being a part of Thy creation, desires to praise Thee—man, who bears about with him his mortality, the witness of his sin . . . yet man, this part of Thy creation, desires to praise Thee. Thou movest us to delight in praising Thee: for Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee. (qtd. in Wood 148)

As already noted, Herbert was surely acquainted with Augustine since he specifically mentions his works of Augustine in his will. If Herbert used St. Augustine as a basis for “The Pulley,” which some scholars certainly believe he did, Augustine’s influence may well have extended beyond just one poem. “The Pulley” defines why humans are restless
and outlines exactly how one can achieve that so great of all treasures, rest, just as
Augustine outlines in the opening lines of the Confessions exactly how to achieve rest.
One needs to praise God in an attempt to find rest in Him since it is God that “movest”
the individual with a sense of “delight” when actively praising God. St. Augustine then
follows directly with his famous statement on rest. *The Temple* is, above all, a book of
praises from the humble and sometimes forced penitent author, George Herbert, a record
of his own personal struggles to find God and implement God’s will into his own life.
One way that Herbert incorporates his praise of God is through his poetry. Herbert’s
versing or praising is one attempt to lead his restless heart to repose in his Lord. Herbert
is quite clear on this point in “Jordan (II)” in the closing lines. Why does Herbert strive
to write acceptable, praising poetry? Because “there is in love a sweetness ready
penned: Copy out only that, and save expense.” He knows, as St. Augustine knew, that
praising God would lead the individual down a path that leads to the Messiah and the rest
offered by Him, “Your suit is granted, [Jesus] said, and died” (“Redemption”).

Of course, just being a poet does not guarantee that one’s poetry will automatically
fall into the category that St. Augustine describes as being one of true praising. Herbert
was acutely aware of the dilemmas of writing poetry and writing poetry that captures that
“sweetness ready penned.” “Jordan (II)” is the best example of Herbert’s movement
between simply being a poet and being the type of poet that Henry Vaughan, and St.
Augustine, felt was the truly devotional poet, a title Vaughan adoringly bestowed on
George Herbert in his “Preface to ‘Silex Scintillans’” in 1655:

> It is true indeed, that to give up our thoughts to pious Themes and Contemplations
> (if it be done for pieties sake) is a great step towards perfection; because it will
refine, and dispose to devotion and sanctity. And further, it will procure for us (so easily communicable is that loving spirit) some small prelibation of those heavenly refreshments, which descend but seldom, and then very sparingly, upon men of an ordinary or indifferent holyness; but he that desires to excel in this kinde of Hagiography, or holy writing, must strive (by all means) for perfection and true holyness, that a door may be opened to him in heaven, Rev. 4.1 and then he will be able to write (with Hierotheus and holy Herbert) A true Hymn. (85)

Vaughan’s words sound hauntingly familiar. His faith in a door that opens to allow the holy and perfection seeking poet to write a religious hymn seems not unlike the epic muse of Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton. Herbert, like Vaughan, came to realize that if his poetry was to be a true conduit for divine signs, he needed to strive for sanctification. Sanctification would come in two ways. First, through Herbert’s restless act of versifying and second through God’s grace in perfecting the verses.

Herbert creates in “Jordan II” the perfect act of turning from verse of a worldly source to verse of a divine source. He opens the poem by stating what he feels to be a natural source of his verse: “When first my lines of heav’nly joys made mention” (42). The speaker views his poetry as completely legitimate; it is, after all, recounting the greatest of all subjects, “heav’nly joys.” What the poet, at this point, does not realize is that although his topic is worthy, he has made no effort to include the source of that joy as also the source of the poetry. He describes his lyrics as having a “luster” that makes them “excel.” The “quaint words, and trim invention” start to take shape as the poet “curls” his work with “metaphors,” gently “weav[ing]” his words, since “nothing could seem too rich to clothe the sun” (43). Certainly, most Christians would agree with the poet that
there are no words great enough to describe the magnitude of the Son or the Father. The problem is not with the subject of the verse but with the misplaced credit for the verse, on the poet instead of the Divine. As such, every time the poet thinks that he has captured the essence of his subject, he finds himself “blott[ing] what [he] had begun.”

Interestingly, in the Williams Manuscript, the name of the poem was not “Jordan II.” The name was “Invention” a title that certainly describes his own process of writing and the ways that “Herbert thinks he went wide of the mark in his own earlier sacred poetry” (Tuve 185). By the last stanza, the poet has started to see his mistake; he begins to shift from an egocentric attitude to one that focuses on the true giver of verse, God:

As flames do work and wind, then they ascend,
So did I weave myself into the sense.
But while I bustled, I might hear a friend
Whisper, How wide is all this long pretence!
There is in love a sweetness ready penned:
Copy out only that, and save expense.

God is the giver of verse, and with His aid, the poet can “copy” what really matters, the personification of love itself, God. Until the poet recognizes his own weakness in writing, he simply “aim[s] more at verse, then perfection” (Vaughan 85), and perfection is what he seeks, repose according to St. Augustine, “For Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee.” Herbert creates in The Temple an interesting impression of versification that is not solely contained in “Jordan II.”

“Jordan I,” as might be expected, also critiques the concept of versifying, but Herbert is even more direct in this poem than in the previous one. He takes familiar secular
notions of Petrarchan poetry and banter with them, moving from one example to another and finally culminating in his own view of poetic mastery:

Who says that fictions only and false hair
Become a verse? Is there in truth no beauty?
Is all good structure in a winding stair?
May no lines pass, except they do their duty
Not to a true but painted chair?
Is it no verse, except enchanted groves
And sudden arbours shadow coarse-spun lines?
Must purling streams refresh a lover's loves?
Must all be vailed, while he that reads, divines,
Catching the sense at two removes?
Shepherds are honest people, let them sing:
Riddle who list, for me, and pull for Prime:
I envy no man's nightingale or spring
Nor let them punish me with loss of rime
Who plainly say, My God, My King.

Herbert finds in the Petrarchan traditions that focus on the "false hair" of a beautiful woman or the "purling streams" that "refresh" a "lover" to be of no consequence. All such poetry accomplishes is to reflect a "painted chair," not a real chair. But Herbert's verse is different because it is "plain," the words of an "honest Shepherd," and the real truth worth speaking of is that which the poet proclaims to his Shepherd, "My God, My King." So to such an end is Herbert's verse aimed. "Jordan I" undeniably solidifies
Herbert's understanding of poetry, both secular and sacred. His mocking of secular verse justifies his need for sanctification both as an individual and as a poet. Moreover, Herbert does not just perceive the difference between traditional poetry and his own, but he recognizes *why* it is different.

The all-important *why* gracefully interweaves the same underlying principle as is interwoven in "The Pulley." Grace and works are delicately and symbiotically connected, each playing a necessary role in the poet's search for salvation. Herbert subtly intertwines grace and works in "The Pulley." According to the *Book of Common Prayer*, both had place in a Christian's life, a concept closer to the Catholic Church than the Protestant concept of salvation, wherein grace ultimately trumps anything that the individual might do of his/her own free will. Section XII in the "Articles of Religion" in the *Book of Common Prayer*, *Of Good Works*, reads as follows:

> Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment, *yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ*, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit. [italics added for emphasis].

Although Herbert was quite obviously an Anglican and the Church of England, while it was certainly interested in good works as a way to demonstrate one's faith and obedience in Christ, maintained that grace still plays the larger role in salvation. "The Pulley" would seem to place Herbert somewhere in between The Church of England and traditional Catholics. Section XXXI in the "Articles of Religion" in the *Book of Common Prayer*, *Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross*, states:
The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

Grace still holds ultimate sway over works or individual action. So what is the balance between the two? What does Herbert represent? The very subtle answer to that question lies in the twenty lines of "The Pulley," quoted again here to help demonstrate Herbert's concept of grace and works. Certainly for Herbert, grace is necessary for salvation, but his view of works, at least as a close study of The Temple suggests, is much stronger than the Anglican doctrine as defined in the Book of Common Prayer. Herbert’s concept of works and grace is eloquently linked together in the closing lines of the poem. "If goodness lead him not, yet weariness/May toss him to my breast." To be weary is to have been working and doing works. But Herbert immediately follows the concept of weariness with something quite different. The verb “toss” is the most significant verb in the entire poem, for on it alone rests grace. To be tossed by something is to be compelled by some power other than one's own. What the poem becomes is a fragile relationship between working to become weary enough to be in a position to be tossed into the Rest of God, the Rest of the New Testament, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. 11:28).

Herbert can become weary in writing the lines and producing the meter of his poetry, but he needs God’s assistance to make it holy. God must lend His hand to give “heat,
light, and motion” to the poetry, not unlike what He did for Elijah during the contest with the priests of Baal in the 18th chapter 1 Kings. Recognizing his own inadequacy, Herbert asks in “Employment (1)” that even though he “is no link of thy great chain [...] place me in thy consort; give one strain/To my poor reed.” Though Herbert here discusses his art in terms of music, the lines are just as rightly applicable to his poetry, particularly if W.H. Auden’s summary of Herbert as a “skilled musician” and a poet who had a “gift for securing musical effects by varying the length of the lines in a stanza” (236) is taken into account. Auden goes on to note that Herbert had the “subllest ear” of any in the school of meta-physical poets (236). As such, it would be well to see Herbert’s art as an extrapolation of music and words. “Easter Wings” continues Herbert’s trend toward a final acceptance of God’s grace in sanctifying his verse, in musical terms. He again asks God directly for help:

O let me rise

As larks, harmoniously,

And sing this day thy victories.

What should never be forgotten is the process through which such “harmonious” emotions are achieved.

Does the poet have merely to acknowledge God’s assistance in the process, as Homer and Virgil acknowledged the Muse? Absolutely not. The poet must also take action to discover God’s grace through poetry. Again, the poet must, as every individual must, become “weary” before being “tossed” into God’s repose. Only through living and constructing poetry can grace be attained. Stanza six of “The Flower” is, perhaps, the
best example of Herbert’s intense and complex understanding of God’s role in the poet’s verse:

And now in age I bud again,
After so many deaths I live and write,
I once more smell the dew and rain,
And relish versing.

The poet here has achieved reconciliation between his own desire to write poetry and the necessary why of writing poetry.

Herbert also knows that only by actually going through the motions of writing a conventional poem, is he able to acknowledge, “My God, My King.” Herbert wittily plays out such a theme in “Denial.” As the poet proceeds through the painful process of writing (painful also to the reader because the poem lacks a cohesive rhythm and rhyme) he finally comes to the last moment of pleading for God to “mend [his] rhyme.” Thankfully for the reader, the rhyme is in fact mended in the final stanza:

O cheer and tune my heartless breast,
Defer no time;
That so thy favours granting my request
They and my mind may chime,
And mend my rime.”

The Temple is Herbert’s own restless attempt to weary himself in search of his Lord, to place himself in a position to have the discordance and dissonance of his own life “mended.” More than that, though, is Herbert’s concentrated discovery that without the grace of God, his restless searching, though the act of versing, is just empty seeking, an
emptiness like that of the astronomer, diver and chymick of “Vanity (I)” who “find out death; but missest life at hand.” The devotional poet needs God’s sanction; otherwise his “thoughts are all a case of knives” bent on destruction, “wound[ing] and pink[ing] [the poet’s] soul” (“Affliction IV” lines 7,12).
CHAPTER 5

HERBERT’S PRACTICAL RESTLESSNESS

Restlessness is not found just in Herbert’s own conscientious writing. Notable to Herbert are the various forms that restlessness takes. Herbert’s unique position as a rural Anglican priest, known to his parishioners as “Holy Mr. Herbert,” (Abrams 1369) allowed him to practice those “personal rhythms” of good works (Pahlka 200) that found voice in The Temple. The concepts of grace and works often form and even define the dichotomous relationship between traditional Catholic and Protestant theology. Traditionally, Protestants have focused on the fallen condition of humanity and the need for grace to play the larger role in humanity’s salvation.19 Catholics, while certainly not rejecting the concept of grace, also focus on the importance of works to gain salvation. These two traditional beliefs of Catholics and Protestants are well known and are not subject to question in a study of Herbert, exactly. What is necessary, though, is to determine to what extent Herbert, as an Anglican, adhered to the concepts of grace and works in both action and writing. A brief study of grace vs. works as defined in “The Pulley” has already been mentioned. But how Herbert’s view of grace and works provides him with a basis for his practical restlessness is still up for discussion.

When Martin Luther determined to challenge the Catholic authorities in 1517 with his 95 theses, he did not intend that a completely separate church would be formed. The Reformation was so named not because of what resulted from Luther’s arguments but
rather from what Luther's original intention was, to reform the Catholic Church, not become a splinter of the mother church. Such was the split between the Catholic Church and the Church of England. Certainly King Henry VIII was nothing if not influential in the split in 1534, but what is even more important than Henry's interest in changing wives is the way that the Church of England eventually came to view itself and its relationship, theologically, to the Catholic Church.Traditionally, Catholics were very much interested in works and grace, holding to the philosophy propounded in James 2:14-17 and 26 that faith without works is dead. On the other hand, the Protestants emphasized grace in their worship. The Anglicans, since they split from the Catholic Church were obviously Protestant in the truest sense of the term, non-Catholic. Even so, they were more closely allied with the Catholic Church, fundamentally, than other Protestant religions.

Henry R. McAdoo's book (himself a former Bishop of Ossuary) The Unity of Anglicanism contains various lectures designed to answer questions of self-identity and self-understanding within the Anglican Church. McAdoo, in addition to citing various modern Anglican scholars and referencing modern Anglican theological concepts, makes an effort to historically present the Anglican self-identity. In so doing, he notes the 1592 publication of Bishop John Jewel's Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Bishop Jewel dedicated the book to Queen Elizabeth, the book having been published with the Queen's authority. According to McAdoo, Bishop Jewel took great care to "refute the accusation 'that we had rebelliously withdrawn ourselves from the Catholic Church'" (13). McAdoo continues to stress that the Anglican Church was not simply a theological go-between for Catholic and Protestant beliefs. Rather by the time of Jewel's Apologia, what McAdoo
calls Anglican self-understanding was much more likely to view its position as having
"recovered" its "Catholic heritage [...] in its original purity through the process of
Reform" (13). McAdoo stresses that Anglicans saw themselves and any deviation,
doctrinally, from Catholicism or mainstream Protestantism, not as an attempt to "achieve
as a stated objective a medial position" but to bring about the "continuity" of the
Primitive Church (14). Bishop Jewel is quite clear on this point in the *Apologia.*

If Anglicanism is viewed in the context of what it believes itself to be, one is then
able to admit that some Catholic elements and some Protestant elements are recognizable
in Anglican theology. The Anglican Church during Herbert’s time was one that had
been founded on the belief that preserving the apostolic church was the objective of the
split from the one Catholic Church, but doctrinally, the two churches had tremendous
similarities. Such a situation makes reading Herbert a bit easier and certainly less
problematic when dealing with poems like "The Pulley," with its equal balance of grace
and works.

Such an understanding also leads to a potential bridge in the wide chasm that has
dominated Herbert studies to this point, a chasm that Stanley Stewart attests to in *George
Herbert.* Trying to place Herbert in a purely Catholic or Protestant camp has been
problematic in recent years and has only served to limit the basis for Herbert studies.
Confining Herbert to one side or the other is, perhaps, counter-productive to an inclusive
understanding of Herbert and *The Temple.* Stanley Stewart begins to build the needed
bridge between the two critical camps through a discussion of Herbert’s association with
Ferrar, the man entrusted with *The Temple* manuscript. Stewart notes that although
Herbert did not know that Ferrar would "become his first editor," Herbert could "expect a
sympathetic reading from him” (59). Indeed Stewart very directly states that the work being done at Ferrar’s Little Gidding was not “uniquely Protestant, surely not Puritan, and might even be described as Catholic” (59). But is such an argument a forced argument from a decidedly modern perspective? Is evidence available to suggest that Stewart’s argument is viable? Stewart provides an interesting form of evidence in chapter two of George Herbert, “George Herbert and the Church.” Stewart notes that Little Gidding was not considered to be a purely Protestant community in the seventeenth century. He reminds readers that Herbert’s healthy association with a community that was “regarded by many of [Herbert’s] fellow Englishmen as papist” refutes the one-sided view of Herbert as simply a “Protestant and Puritan poet, almost as if the terms were identical” (26). In an age when religion and politics were often fused into one cord, Herbert’s unique position in the middle, neither completely Protestant nor completely Catholic, is notable and should be a strong basis for considering the poems in The Temple, particularly the poems found in the middle section, “The Church.”

Herbert was not a religious extremist, and in his poem “To His Serene Majesty,” he praises the tolerance with which James I negotiated between the Puritans and the Catholics:

Endowed with this ability, you endure

With greater confidence as Puritans

And Roman Catholics arouse the waves

Between which you, the Shepherd, drive your sheep,

Safest in a via media. (qtd. in Stewart 31)
The *Musae Responsoriae*, Herbert's treatise “defending” the *Book of Common Prayer*’s use, paints a picture of James as a “great shepherd of his flock” who kept the Church of England from falling into extreme positions and kept it on the “true middle way” (Wall 22). If Herbert praised the secular leader, King James I, for his middle position between what Herbert viewed as extremes, how much more inclined would he himself be to take a distinctly central religious position, as a man of faith and a man of secularity? Stewart notes that Herbert directly tied Puritans with Roman Catholics as “extremes on a continuum, with the Church of England in the middle” (31). John N. Wall even goes so far as to allow Herbert a complete disassociation of himself with politics or extremes (2-3). In light of both Stewart and Wall’s observations, Henry McAdoo’s insightful lectures about Anglicanism and its relationship to Catholicism only reiterate what is evident in Herbert’s poetry, that as an Anglican he was neither devoid of Protestant tendencies nor willing to completely renounce the Catholic Church as heretic or valueless. The potential gulf then between Protestants and Catholics on grace and works was naturally bridged in Herbert’s Anglican mind, allowing him often to focus on his interest in good works and the magnifying of the admonition of James to live one’s faith through good works, a practical and physical form of restlessness that found active voice in *The Temple*.

Toward the end of *The Unity of Anglicanism*, McAdoo makes a relevant observation about Anglicanism by quoting from the 1976 Venice Statement on Authority in the Church: “It is not enough for the Church simply to repeat the original apostolic words. It has also prophetically to translate them in order that the hearers in their situations may understand and respond to them” (61). McAdoo might well have been paraphrasing George Herbert’s “The Windows” or “The Country Parson” instead of quoting the Venice
Statement. Herbert's religion is not one of passivity. As Stanley Stewart writes, "the light of God's Word was to shine through in every aspect of the priestly life" (61). One of the most potent aspects of Herbert's religion in the seventeenth century was the emphasis on the practical.

The Anglican Church was very much focused on how an individual magnified the inner spirituality that s/he gained through accepting the atonement of Jesus Christ, the central point for all Christianity. Henry McAdoo's book *The Spirit of Anglicanism* cites one particular seventeenth century theologian whose works embody the active element of Christianity, Jeremy Taylor who was born in 1613 and was ordained by Bishop Laud in 1633. Bishop Taylor wrote several books that were concerned with what McAdoo terms "practical divinity" (54). Although Taylor was not ordained a bishop until the year that Herbert died and *The Temple* was published, the concepts that Taylor outlined were very much alive and finding voice before the publication of his works. In fact, McAdoo goes so far as to connect Taylor and Herbert in the following statement: "[...] because he [Taylor] wrote devotional books his relevance had a context of inwardness also for something common to St Bernard's sermons on the Song of Songs, to George Herbert's poems, and Á Kempis is in him too" (56).

Taylor was not the only one to see the active life of a Christian as a natural extension of one's duty to God. Bishop McAdoo has written a more recent book entitled *Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality* that is even more pronounced in its emphasis on the seventeenth century Anglican's view of practical divinity. The book contains an interesting chapter, "The People in the Pews," that gives a very direct commentary on practical Anglicanism by outlining the lives and philosophies of several people who
actually lived the Anglican life and did so without the deep philosophy of the religion that can so often obscure the simplicity of the every day Christian’s life. The chapter begins with an interesting quote by Robert South (1634-1716), a man who declined the bishopric of Rochester and the Deanery of Westminster all in the same year. The reason he did so is given by McAdoo in South’s own words. In short, South protested the “naked, unoperative, faith” that he felt dominated religious circles of his time (qtd. in McAdoo 19).

The quote by Robert South with which McAdoo chooses to begin his chapter is helpful to a thorough study of George Herbert’s practical restlessness. “The very life of religion consists in practice” (McAdoo 19). Life must be lived and lived according to an inner spiritual understanding of what rests beyond the material, rest in Jesus Christ, only to be attained by living life. McAdoo paraphrases South’s words by stating that “our religion must cause us to do something and to become something. It must work on us externally and internally and be seen to do so” (19). George Herbert’s poetry indicates his own willingness to do and to become. In a previous section, Herbert’s unique perspective on death was discussed. One will remember that Herbert’s key to being comfortable with his own death was in the assurance he took that how one lives is much more important than how long one lives. In doing, a person becomes and in becoming one is prepared to be “tossed” to the “breast” of the Lord. Doing and becoming is the practical restlessness that Herbert sought during his life and is the practical restlessness that is vocalized through the speaker of his poems.

Herbert himself was an active man, particularly during his ministry in the Bemerton Parish. Herbert’s famous biographer Izaak Walton indicated that the poor people of the
parish would lay aside their ploughs upon hearing Herbert's congregation bell. Walton further states that the bell “brought most of his Parishioners, and many gentlemen in the Neighbourhood, constantly to make a part of his Congregation twice a day” (qtd. in McAdoo 20). Herbert’s very acceptance of the rural parish at Bemerton is proof of his willingness to forsake a life of ease and aristocratic company. Izaak Walton reminds us that Herbert was a man of aristocratic tastes and temperaments who had a love of “Court-conversation,” and while he was a young man at Cambridge exercised “a laudible ambition to be something more than he then was” (274). Herbert’s love of the Court and his ambition to become an integral part of it “drew him often from Cambridge to attend the King wheresoever the Court was” (274). Ultimately, though, Herbert gave up his aristocratic ambitions and “betook himself to the Sanctuarie and Temple of God, choosing rather to serve at Gods Altar, then to seek the honour of State-employments” (Ferrar 59). Herbert was neither a Dean of St. Paul’s nor an Archbishop of Canterbury. He was a simple country parson with a great capacity for love. His practical divinity is attested to again and again by Nicholas Ferrar in the Preface to the 1633 edition of The Temple, particularly with respect to Herbert’s rebuilding of the parish church. Izaac Walton even goes so far as to say that Herbert became so consumed with the “Rededification” of the church, that he “became restless, till he saw it finisht” (278). Surely Herbert’s own life attests to his belief that restless activity through good works was a crucial marker in the Anglican road toward final rest in the presence of God, a concept shared by other seventeenth-century Anglicans.

Herbert’s poetry, not just his life, is filled with the practical divinity of his time. “The Windows” is the clearest example of Herbert’s practicality and so warrants primary
examination. The poem is most clearly about the struggle of the clergyman to fulfill his religious duty to his parishioners. The priest primarily is responsible for teaching his parishioners the "eternal word" of God and then helping them to act on the word, since the obligations of the priest were three fold, first to teach the word of salvation, second to build that base of knowledge, and third to help his parishioners put that knowledge into practice (Wall 82-83). Unfortunately, the speaker comes to realize that he is simply a "brittle crazy glass," incapable of truly exhorting the word of God in a way that makes it more than just a "flaring thing" that "doth vanish" immediately after it leaves the priest's lips. What the speaker confronts is quite simply the inefficacy of language, the inability of language to make a final and absolute impression on the mortal mind or heart. Herbert senses within his own poem exactly what the limits of that poetry truly are. His verse has been a "long pretence" ("Jordan II") that hollowly "in the ear, not conscience ring[s]." What Herbert tends toward in "The Windows" is much closer to the practical divinity with which his life was so closely interwoven.

As in the final stanza of "Jordan II" when the speaker recognizes that his "curling metaphors" require God to illustrate a "love already penned," the speaker of "The Windows" comes to a steady and deliberate recognition of his own humble position as a window through which the light of God can shine, a "window to thy grace." The speaker's agonizing awareness of how God's light can filter through the priest, is the poignant irony in the poem. It is not through language, the only conduit Herbert has to share his concept of practical divinity with a modern audience, but through actual application, that the priest can develop a life that allows God's "life to shine within" him. As language vanishes, there is something that stays, action. Herbert's poem, "The Star"
mentions three elements that will help the searching person fly to God's presence, light, motion, and heat. Interestingly enough, all three can be found in a biblical passage with which Herbert must have been familiar, Matthew 5:14-16:

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.

Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your father which is in heaven.

Light is certainly present, as is fire, to generate heat. The last item, motion, is also present, as it is relevant to Herbert's poem "The Windows." A man does not have a candle and hide it under a bushel, rather he uses it wisely to light the world around him; the light is lit through the good works of the individual, the activity of the individual, the motion of the individual. Elizabeth Clarke in her book Theory and Theology in George Herbert's Poetry has given three interesting definitions for the trinity of elements in "The Star." First, light is to bring wisdom. Second, heat is to "kindle love." Third, motion is to "be effective" (270). To be effective is exactly what the speaker of "The Windows" longs for more than anything else. He wants to impart God's "eternal word" in a way that will help his parishioners to, as Robert South put it, become something. He desires to have an effect on the conscience, the reasonable faculty, something that is in close proximity to what Jeremy Taylor advocated when he said that "I affirm nothing but upon grounds of Scriptures, or universal traditions, or right reason discernible by every disinterested person" (qtd. in McAdoo, Spirit of Anglicanism 53). What Herbert hopes to accomplish is a change within the reasonable faculty of his congregation, the faculty that
is more adept at achieving practical change and practical experiment upon the “eternal word” of God. Knowledge, therefore, of Christian doctrine alone is not enough to make even the priest worthy of God’s light within, for doctrine is expounded through speech alone. But doctrine combined with action is the solution to a post-lapsarian and carnal world. According to John N. Wall, Herbert frequently emphasized the “active life of the visible Church,” a point exemplified by the final stanza of “The Windows:”

Doctrine and life, colours and light, in one

When they combine and mingle, bring

A strong regard and awe; but speech alone

Doth vanish like a flaring thing,

And in the ear, not conscience ring.

“The Windows” is not the only place where Herbert makes use of the practical divinity that he knew to be a necessary building block of Anglicanism.

“The Thanksgiving” takes the ideas in “The Windows” to an even more specific platform of practical divinity by “end[ing] in a series of promises” (Stewart 93) that the speaker makes in an effort to make up for the great gift of atonement from his Lord. Particularly striking are lines 19-22:

If thou dost give me wealth, I will restore

All back unto thee by the poor.

If thou dost give me honour, men shall see

The honour doth belong to thee.

Herbert, the practical Christian who rebuilt the church in his parish from his own funds, considers himself but a humble servant and knows that all of his activities have but one
goal – the praise of God’s name as St. Augustine advocated in the *Confessions*, and the attainment of the humility that is required to become “as a little child” for such is required in the kingdom of God (Luke 18:17). Not only does Herbert promise to benefit others by his actions, but the last half of the poem is devoted to specific promises about Herbert’s own life and the changes that he knows must occur if he is truly to edify God and allow the Lord’s light to shine through him, as he knows is the duty of a priest. Since humankind cannot repay the Lord for his sacrifice, “Then for thy passion—I will do for that—Alas, my God, I know not what,” it only remains for “the ongoing life of the Christian community, expressed through the disciplines of the *Book of Common Prayer*,” to be the “context in which men and women must find themselves and their God” (Wall 26). Herbert’s practical divinity and ongoing search to find his God and earn a place with Him is a formidable piece of Herbert’s restless life that gave him the confident humility to exclaim at the end of his life:

I do not repine but am pleas’d with my want of health; and tell him, my heart is fixed on that place where true joy is only to be found; and that I long to be there, and do wait for my appointed change with hope and patience. (qtd. in Sherwood 120)

Doctrine and life, the living of one’s life, are indispensable, parallel tracks; without each track, humanity’s quest, including Herbert’s quest, to regain God’s presence would unavoidably and disastrously derail.
CONCLUDING NOTE

George Herbert’s poetry is an integral part of seventeenth century literature and an important basis for seventeenth century studies. Poems from The Temple are frequently anthologized and studied by literature and non-literature students alike. One of the most often anthologized poems is “The Pulley” and understandably so. Critics have disagreed about the exact intention of the metaphysical conceit of the pulley as well as the origin of the verbal word play that makes the poem so memorable. Although critics have not come to any consensus on the origin of the poem’s diction, one strong argument is for St. Augustine’s Confessions and his famous statement concerning the inevitable restless hearts of humanity in their post-lapsarian separation from God. Is restlessness, then, a positive or negative consequence of the Fall?

“The Pulley” holds the answer. The restlessness of George Herbert is not the restlessness of Milton and his fallen angels in Paradise Lost, and it is not the restless curiosity of Marlowe’s Faustus. Herbert’s restlessness is a gift from God to humanity in an attempt to help them become weary with constant striving, finally to be tossed to His breast through His merciful grace. “The Pulley” provides the foundation for Herbert’s positive perception of his own restless heart. Like Augustine, Herbert knows that the treasure he has sought to lay up for himself is indeed a treasure in heaven, the one jewel God did not bestow on his creatures. He kept the Rest. But he provided a way for humanity to be pulled up to Him—restlessness. Herbert’s embracing of both mental and physical restlessness gave the world Herbert’s greatest gift, The Temple.
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9 "Touching Mr Herberts book it hath he most generall approbation yt I haue knowne any as it well deserues I haue been importuned by diuers freinds for some of ym London affords non & complaint is made att Cambridge yt so few coppyes were printed. If you haue store I shalbe beholding for such a sopply as you may afford." See Amy Charles and Mario Di Cesare, *The Bodleian Manuscript of George Herbert's Poems: A Facsimile of Tanner 307* (Delmar: Scholar's Facsimiles & Reprints, 1984): xi.

10 The *WM* contains several poems that have corrections made in Herbert's own hand, probably with a "soft gray pen. Of course, the final *BM* that became the printed edition was not sent to the printers in Herbert's hand. Herbert gave his "little Book" to Nicolas Ferrar who had it re-copied at the religious community of Little Gidding before being sent to the printers for final publication. The *BM*, therefore, is in the hands of the copyists and not Herbert's. The *WM*, however, was closer to Herbert, as evidenced by the editorial changes in his own hand. See Amy Charles, *The Williams Manuscript of George Herbert's Poems: A Facsimile Reproduction With An Introduction by Amy M. Charles* (Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977).

11 In chapters three and four of her text, Malcomson argues that Herbert's poetry experiences a definite shift in poetic language from a secular tone to a more spiritual one, thereby indicating that his taking of the deaconship in 1626 and the Bemerton Parish in
1630 would have accounted for the change to a more religious poetic voice. See Cristina Malcolmson, *Heart-Work: George Herbert and the Protestant Ethic* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

12 Amy Charles notes that the *WM* is not as complex in its arrangement as the *BM* and is "less imaginative and less subtle in its more direct approach, its linking and pairing of poems, and its progression from the acknowledgement of God's love in sacrifice to the full knowledge of joy and the final acceptance of God's love in sacrifice." See *The Williams Manuscript of George Herbert's Poems: A Facsimile Reproduction With An Introduction by Amy M. Charles* (Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977): xxix-xxx.

13 Anthony Low notes the following: "The seventeenth-century in England saw a great flowering of religious writings of all kinds, from collections of sermons to devotional treatises to polemical tracts. Religious enthusiasm does not, of course, guarantee great poetry, but the climate of the age fostered rapid growth of interest in the methodology of religious devotion. This growth was stimulated by the remarkable outpouring in Europe of great devotional writing: one thinks of Saint Ignatius Loyola, Teresa of Avial, John of the Cross and Francis de Sale [...] in such a setting, it is no surprise that poets like Herbert, Vaughan, and Traherne should be not only thoroughly learned and technically expert in their craft, but also widely read and deeply literate in theological, religious, and devotional matters." See Anthony Low, "Metaphysical Poets and Devotional Poets," *George Herbert and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Poets*, Ed. Mario A. Di Cesare (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978): 226-227.
Low notes that the Imagination step can be accomplished by two methods. First, through "composition of place" or imagining a scene in vivid detail. Second, through "composition by similitude" or taking an abstraction and "making it more powerful imaginatively by embodying it in a concrete image or metaphor." See Anthony Low, "Metaphysical Poets and Devotional Poets," *George Herbert and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Poets*, Ed. Mario A. Di Cesare (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978): 228.

Low also terms this step the moment of resolution when the individual gains a "hatred of sin, fear of dying and damnation, [...] gratitude and love toward God," and a strong resolve to effect significant life changes. See Anthony Low, "Metaphysical Poets and Devotional Poets," *George Herbert and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Poets*, Ed. Mario A. Di Cesare (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978): 228.


The anti-masque figures were often grotesque or comic figures that served to antagonize the masquers. These parts were never played by members of the court. Adams states that the anti-masquers might be “pygmies, satyrs, witches, Irishmen, alchemists.” See Robert M. Adams, Introduction, *Ben Jonson’s Plays and Masques*, Comp. and ed. Richard Harp, 2nd ed (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001): xv.

Certainly one of the most graphic examples of such Protestant faith is the American Puritan, Jonathan Edwards. His famous sermon, “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” is nothing if not direct and translucent. Even two hundred years after he wrote the sermon, readers find no reason to question the individual’s reliance on grace, based on Edwards’ illustration.

What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works: can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone (14-17). For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also” (26).

Jewel claimed that Anglicans had not “changed anything taught and approved by the fathers, but only errors, superstitions and abuses...which lawful reformation of our Church...is so far from taking from us the name or nature of true Catholics...or depriving us of the fellowship of the apostolic Church or impairing the right faith, sacraments, priesthood and governance of the Catholic Church that it hath cleared and settled them on us.” McAdoo further quotes Jewel, who indicates that the Anglicans have not disowned
the Catholic Church and should not be viewed in that manner by the Catholic Church. They had instead gone directly back to the source of the Church, thereby not “plant[ing] [a] new religion, but only [...] preserv[ing] the old that was undoubtedly founded and used by the Apostles of Christ and other holy Fathers in the Primitive Church.” See Henry R McAdoo, *The Unity of Anglicanism: Catholic and Reformed* (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Company, Inc., 1983): 14-15.


23 Stewart suggests that critic Barbara Lewalski has identified Herbert as “quintessentially Protestant,” a viewpoint that differs from Rosemond Tuve and Louis Martz, both of whose “analyses [are] based on such artifacts as missals, breviaries, primers, pontificals, rosaries, Books of Hours, the *Biblia Pauperum*, responsories from Holy Week, and directives on devotion from the saints, including Saint Ignatius.” See Stanley Stewart, *George Herbert* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986): 58.

24 Stewart notes that Richard Crashaw, the unconcealed Catholic poet spent time at Little Gidding and was perfectly content in the religious community. Crashaw’s “Roman Catholic sensibility did not feel out of place there, and Archbishop Laud approved of the settlement’s monastic regime.” See Stanely Stewart, *George Herbert* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986): 26.

Taylor’s books *Holy Living* and *The Great Exemplar* emphasize what Taylor considered to be a “mainstay” of Christianity, “the life of religion.” Taylor was interested in how the man of God lived his life, a point that is magnified in *The Great Exemplar*, a book that contains “discourses, meditations, and prayers, in which the devotional blends with the practical.” Furthermore, *Holy Living* embraces such topics as “humility, pride, obedience, the several duties comprised in justice, business transactions, the question of restitution, faith, hope, charity and the external and internal act of religion.” McAdoo continues by stating that Taylor’s ideas “fit into the seventeenth-century pattern,” a pattern that is evident in Herbert’s poetry as well. See Henry R. McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism: a Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Scribner, 1965): 54.

“As for worldly matters, his love and esteem to them was so little, as no man can more ambitiously seek, then he did earnestly endeavour the resignation of an Ecclesiasticall dignitie, which he was possessour of. But God permitted not the accomplishment of this desire, having ordained him his instrument for reedifying of the Church belonging thereunto, that had layen ruinated almost twenty yeares. The reparation whereof, having been uneffectually attempted by publick collections, was in end by his own and some few others private free-will offerings successfully effected.” See Nicholas Ferrar, “Preface to ‘The Temple,’” *George Herbert: The Critical Heritage*, C.A. Patrides, Ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983): 60.

McAdoo cites in *Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality* several lives of seventeenth-century Anglicans, including Robert Boyle, the son of the “richest subject of
the Crown in his day.” Boyle is best known for his exploration and discoveries in chemistry, but what is more important about Boyle is his view of religion and its practical application to the most practical of all endeavors—science and learning. Unlike many theologians and scientists that both preceded and succeeded him, Boyle believed that secular study only served to enhance one’s spirituality and that natural studies and theology were “complementary.” See Henry R. McAdoo, *Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality* (Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1991): 36-39.
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