Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme

Neighbourliness and Toleration in the Work of George Herbert

Angela Balla

Volume 35, Number 2, Spring 2012

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1105835ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i2.19373

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)
2293-7374 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Balla, A. (2012). Neighbourliness and Toleration in the Work of George Herbert. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, *35*(2), 113–141. https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i2.19373

Article abstract

Des spécialistes de l'histoire sociale ont récemment développé le récit triomphal de l'essor de la tolérance religieuse et l'ont rendu populaire parmi les historiens de la culture, en montrant comment ont alterné et même coïncidé les périodes de persécution et de tolérance. Pour ces historiens sociaux, la tolérance des divisions religieuses s'est en partie développée par la valorisation des relations de bon voisinage. Mais quelle est la relation véritable entre le bon voisinage et la tolérance ? L'oeuvre de George Herbert offre une réponse provocatrice à cette question, puisque son oeuvre poétique The Temple (1633), examinée en lien avec son guide en prose A Priest to the Temple, Or, the Countrey Parson (1652), montre comment une « imagination de la persécution » peut céder à une grandeur de pensée et l'action. L'auteur, en basant son analyse sur des sermons d'état, des injonctions, et des manuels pastoraux, A Priest to the Temple, Or, the Countrey Parson (1652), construit le récit de la relation entre le bon voisinage et la tolérance, et montre comment il fonctionne dans l'oeuvre religieuse en prose et en vers de Herbert. Bien que ces deux valeurs soient différentes, Herbert montre dans quelle mesure elles peuvent parfois être étroitement apparentées. Dans la mesure où ses lecteurs suivent la proposition d'Herbert en allant aussi loin qu'il est possible de travailler avec les autres pour accomplir la volonté de Dieu, ces lecteurs présentent une pratique de la tolérance avant que celle-ci soit théorisée en tant qu'idéal dans la deuxième moitié du dix-septième siècle.

Neighbourliness and Toleration in the Work of George Herbert

ANGELA BALLA
University of Alabama in Huntsville

Des spécialistes de l'histoire sociale ont récemment développé le récit triomphal de l'essor de la tolérance religieuse et l'ont rendu populaire parmi les historiens de la culture, en montrant comment ont alterné et même coïncidé les périodes de persécution et de tolérance. Pour ces historiens sociaux, la tolérance des divisions religieuses s'est en partie développée par la valorisation des relations de bon voisinage. Mais quelle est la relation véritable entre le bon voisinage et la tolérance ? L'œuvre de George Herbert offre une réponse provocatrice à cette question, puisque son œuvre poétique The Temple *(1633), examinée en lien avec son guide en prose* A Priest to the Temple, Or, the Countrey Parson *(1652), montre comment une « imagination de la persécution » peut céder à une grandeur de pensée et l'action. L'auteur, en basant son analyse sur des sermons d'état, des injonctions, et des manuels pastoraux,* A Priest to the Temple, Or, the Countrey Parson *(1652), construit le récit de la relation entre le bon voisinage et la tolérance, et montre comment il fonctionne dans l'œuvre religieuse en prose et en vers de Herbert. Bien que ces deux valeurs soient différentes, Herbert montre dans quelle mesure elles peuvent parfois être étroitement apparentées. Dans la mesure où ses lecteurs suivent la proposition d'Herbert en allant aussi loin qu'il est possible de travailler avec les autres pour accomplir la volonté de Dieu, ces lecteurs présentent une pratique de la tolérance avant que celle-ci soit théorisée en tant qu'idéal dans la deuxième moitié du dix-septième siècle..*

Social historians have recently complicated the triumphal narrative of the rise of religious toleration popular among intellectual historians by showing how periods of persecution and toleration were interspersed or even coincided.[1] At the local level, for instance, the collective desire for peaceful coexistence among religiously diverse groups could resist the pressure to persecute generated by official edicts.[2] Toleration of religious divisions stemmed in part from a shared

valuation of neighbourliness.[3] This phenomenon invites closer inspection, for how do neighbourliness and toleration relate?[4] Does the movement from one to the other depend on an action, its motive or frequency, another factor altogether, or some combination of these things? The work of George Herbert offers provocative answers, for his poetic volume *The Temple* (1633), read in light of his prose manual *A Priest to the Temple, Or, the Countrey Parson* (1652), shows how something like a "persecutory imagination" can give way to expansiveness of thought and action.[5] The principled and yet empathetic community of the faithful that Herbert seeks to strengthen and enlarge has at its core spiritual humility. To the extent that his readers exercise such humility in public action as well as private devotion, they practise Christian neighbourliness.[6] Herbert suggests in his prose and especially his poetry that neighbour-regard can foster religious toleration. Insofar as readers identify with his lyric speaker, they learn to have compassion on those who err and to avoid alienating them. Herbert thereby encourages readers to create peaceable communities that leave religious rebuke and punishment to the proper authorities. While neighbourliness and toleration are not the same, Herbert illumines how closely related they can be.[7] His work therefore deserves a place in — and highlights the value of — a literary history of toleration.[8]

To develop such an interdisciplinary history, we need to redress the critical blind spot to Herbert's consistent concern with neighbours even among scholars interested in early modern notions of neighbourliness. On this subject, historians and literary critics alike assume a divide between Herbert's prose and poetry. Although they recognize that his prose works of pastoral care underscore love for neighbour, they frequently suppose that his religious verse lacks that emphasis. For example, Naomi Tadmor cites Herbert's field guide for rural clergy, *The Countrey Parson*, to prove that "neighbourliness was a crucial norm" in early modern England.[9] Quoting from Herbert's manual, she avows that "Clergymen were to extol among their neighbours and parishioners 'charity in loving walking and neighbourly accompanying one another, with reconciling of differences.'"[10] Yet nowhere does Tadmor turn to *The Temple* for evidence of neighbour-regard. Similarly, Eamon Duffy includes the same quotation from Herbert to show how Rogationtide processions, "so much valued by Herbert," functioned "as celebrations of communal identity."[11] But Duffy too bypasses *The Temple*, perhaps because he fails to see in it other ritualistic affirmations of neighbourhood. As much as one may wish to attribute these scholars' reticence

to discuss poetry solely to their training as historians, the fact that literary critics also struggle to find in Herbert's verse the stress on neighbourliness that animates his prose indicates another reason for the oversight.

One likely candidate is the belief that Herbert's religious poetry deals more with the speaker's relation to the divine than to his neighbours. Paul Cefalu, for instance, notes that "flesh and blood neighbors and fit objects of charity… people the pages of Herbert's pastoral writings," but Cefalu declares that this is not the case with the lyrics of *The Temple*: "Neighbors are shadowy, haunting figures in 'The Church' generally. Their existence, once postulated, is routinely absorbed or cancelled by the speaker's intense desire to find intimacy with God."[12] In assuming that Herbert limits his concern with neighbours to *The Countrey Parson* and the homiletic poem "The Church-porch," the first section of *The Temple*, Cefalu overlooks Herbert's interest in charitable conduct within the volume's remaining two sections, the devotional lyrics of "The Church" and the prophetic poem "The Church Militant." Cefalu therefore misses how these latter sections dramatize the speaker's attempts to live out the teaching on charity offered in the former section. Rosemond Tuve comes closer to observing Herbert's commitment to community in *The Temple* when she tackles in its lyrics "the disastrously difficult problem of 'love thy neighbour *as thyself*.'"[13] But when she turns Herbert's concern with neighbours into a "great Augustinian emphasis upon God the *Creator*," she effectively avoids that concern's social and political import.[14] Only in passing does she assert that "Herbert's wellnigh perfect understanding of what it means to *love* our neighbour is assuredly visible in his poems, and it is firm, just, clear, subtle, bearing fruit inescapably in constant actions of high generosity and a humility so based as to rehabilitate the very word *charity*."[15] Since Tuve does not define "constant actions of high generosity," she leaves the ethics of neighbourliness and its relation to toleration unexplored. Her provocative phrase compels us to ask how generous one needs to be before acts of good will toward neighbours differing in matters of faith extend to religious forbearance.

Answering this question requires a broader investigation of Herbert's work than scholars interested in neighbourliness have undertaken. To appreciate how Herbert urges charitable action towards disagreeable neighbours in a pervasive effort to foster spiritual community, we need to probe the connections between his prose and poetry, ties that often historians neglect and literary critics minimize. Moreover, we need to examine all three sections of his poetic vo-

lume to see how Herbert ushers readers into *The Temple* for multi-confessional worship and out of *The Temple* for neighbourly forbearance. In this essay, I argue that Herbert cultivates compassion for the religiously wayward by showing how easy it is to fail to worship God aright. Insofar as readers apply this lesson in humility to their own lives, they become more apt to avoid the kinds of quarrels, rents, and schisms that Herbert knew plagued the Christian Church at all levels. To make my case, I first inspect Herbert's teaching on charity in *The Countrey Parson*, contextualizing this teaching with state sermons and injunctions in order to link it with neighbourliness. Then, in section two, I read "The Church-porch" as a deliberately rough lesson in charitable neighbourliness, one that exposes the deeply ingrained impulse to judge others. Section three illustrates how the oscillation between proud religiosity and humble devotion characterizing the lyrics of "The Church" gives rise to a neighbourliness conducive to religious toleration. As I contend in section four, Herbert exhorts this behaviour in "The Church Militant," for while he points out how difficult such behaviour is to sustain, he reveals how much readers stand to lose if they do not make the effort. Ultimately, I suggest that readers who follow Herbert's lead in going as far as spiritually possible to work with other Christians to do God's will exhibit toleration as a practice before toleration becomes theorized as an ideal in the later seventeenth century.

I. Reducing man to charity in Herbert's pastoral prose

At the outset of *The Countrey Parson*, Herbert proclaims that "A Pastor is the Deputy of Christ for the reducing of Man to the Obedience of God."[16] Despite the confidence with which Herbert outlines the mission of the pastorate, he understands that pastors must have a principle to guide their actions, lest they inadvertently crush parishioners' spirits in attempts to humble them. Herbert therefore insists that charity ought to be the parson's "predominant element" (*Works*, p. 244). But what does it mean for a pastor to be "full of Charity" (*Works*, p. 244)? Aside from specifying that "justice is the ground of Charity," he offers little definition (*Works*, p. 262). Instead, he illustrates charitable actions, such as a pastor training his household to minister to the sick, giving alms to the poor, and inviting all parishioners annually to his table (*Works*, pp. 239, 243). Still,

some confusion remains. Is charity a "rellish" on works or the "good deeds" themselves (*Works*, p. 244)? If good deeds, then which ones, or does it matter?

Herbert's refusal to spell out the meaning for such a pivotal word is less surprising given that, for many writers in the period, "charity" is an umbrella term for a range of behaviours, some of which may seem contradictory. As Alexandra Walsham points out, charitable conduct in early modern England encompasses "turn[ing] the other cheek" and "loving persecution," "cordial discussion" and "punitive coercion."[17] The assumption linking these disparate behaviours is that one should maintain loving peace with one's religiously divergent neighbours so far as Christian orthodoxy allows. Depending on the situation, then, "charity" could entail either forbearance or punishment.

What goes underemphasized in Walsham's thorough study is that, more often than not, the practice of what she calls "charitable hatred" — the forceful extirpation of religious nonconformity for the common good — was limited to those in positions of political and ecclesiastical authority. These officials typically did not enjoin the populace at large to undertake such dangerous work. The notable exceptions to this rule were churchwardens and their assistants, elected laymen who had royal sanction to present dissenters to the bishop for censure and punishment.[18] For most of the laity, however, neighbourliness emerged as the behavioural ideal largely through the Book of Homilies, first issued in 1547 under Edward VI and later reissued in 1623 under James I. The notion of neighbourliness as a moral good comprising generosity and restraint is so important that it appears even in the passage from the sermon on charity that Walsham uses as her epigraph. After the anonymous author establishes that "it is aswell [sic] the office of charitie, to rebuke, punish, and correct them that be euill, as it is, to cherishe and reward them that be good and innocent," the author affirms, "to al suche ["good & euill, frend and foo"], we ought (as we maye) to do good."[19] The key phrase is "as we maye": one ought to shower kindness upon as many people as one can. Charitable love thus outshines charitable hatred as the action that assures "that we be the children of our heauenly father, reconciled to hys fauor, very membres of Christ" (sig. L3r). While charity can involve the condemnation of neighbours, the writer suggests that whenever possible his audience — the uneducated laity and the sometimes uneducated clergy — ought to treat kindly those who disagree and to leave chastisement to officials better suited to discern when it is truly necessary.

Lest restraint seem optional, the gentle stress on peaceful interaction present in "An homelie of Christian Loue and Charitie" grows firmer later in the volume, in "An homelie agaynst contencion and braulynge." The author asserts that "emong all kyndes of contencion, none is more hurtfull, then is contencion in matters of religion" (sig. X3v). To prove his point, the author surveys the damage in a passage worth quoting in full:

> to many there be, which vpon the Alebenches or other places, delight to propounde certaine questions, not so muche perteyninge to edificacion, as to vainglory and ostentacion: and so vnsoberly to reason and dispute, that when neyther party will geue place to other, thei fall to chydyng and contencion, and somtyme from hote wordes, to further inconuenience. Sainct Paule could not abyde to heare emong the Corinthians, these wordes of discorde or dissencion: I holde of Paule, I of Cephas, and I of Apollo. What would he then say, if he hearde these woordes of contencion: (whiche be now almoste in euery mans mouth) he is a Pharisei, he is a gospeler, he is of the new sorte, he is of the olde faythe, he is a new broched brother, he is a good catholique father he is a papist, he is an heretique. (sigs. X3v-X4r)

Two issues here warrant attention. First, considering how many people "propounde certaine questions" about religion for "vainglory" rather than for "edificacion," we should ask how often the author really wants the masses to follow his earlier injunction to "rebuke…them that be euill." Second, even though some people's motives for raising religious questions are virtuous, good motivations can quickly erode as the debate "falls" to vicious passion. As Herbert knew, vices can be hard to detect "because of the suddain passing from that which was just now lawfull, to that which is presently unlawfull, even in one continued action" (*Works*, p. 264). So we should also ask when the writer thinks initiating religious debate is worth the risk of spiritual alienation, for oneself or others.

Notably in this homily, the author prods parishioners toward neighbourliness by instructing them "to be meke towarde al men" (sig. X3v). To those who wonder how they can be meek without compromising religious truth, the author instructs them to forgive:

> Thyne neighbor hath peraduenture with a word offended the: cal thou to thy remembraunce, with howe many wordes & dedes, how greuously thou hast offended thy lord God. What was man, when Christ dyed for hym? Was he not his enemye, and vnworthy to haue hys fauor and mercye? Euen so, with what gentlenes & pacience doeth he forbeare, & tollerate the, although he is dayly offended by the? Forgeue therfore a light trespasse to thy neighbor. that Christ maye forgeue the, many thousandes of trespasses, which arte euery day an offendor. (sigs. Y3r-v)

We might well wonder what the author means by "a light trespasse"; surely not every insult to Christian orthodoxy ought to be overlooked. Yet the author fails to specify which errors merit reprimand; he only advises restraint toward erring neighbours so as to avoid hypocrisy and to maintain the peace. Those vexed by others' transgressions should give their neighbours the benefit of the doubt wherever possible, recalling God's decision to "forbeare, & tollerate" one's daily offenses. That James I upheld the Elizabethan Church's teaching on this issue in his "Directions for Preachers" (1622) testifies to the state's conviction that peaceably resolving religious dissension had enduring importance. In fact, James I commands that licensed preachers redress error using discernment, biblical knowledge, and verbal acuity tempered by self-discipline:

> noe preacher of what title or denominac[i]on soever shall causlesly & without invitac[i]on from the text, fall into any bitter Invectives & undecent rayleinge speeches against the persons of either Papists or Puritanes, but modestly & gravely when they are occasioned thereunto by the text of Scripture, free both the doctrine & discipline of the churche of England from the aspersions of either adversary especially where the auditory is suspected to be tainted with the one or the other infection.[20]

Echoing the Elizabethan homily against contention, James I reminds pastors that if they are not careful enough about the way they undertake their duties, they will "fall" into the very mire from which they hope to rescue their flock.

Herbert absorbed official instructions on how to shepherd a religiously diverse community, as his chapter "The Parson arguing" proves. Herbert's pastor balances bold initiative with humble reserve when dealing with those who have fallen from the true faith (or who have never arrived there to begin with).

Here, as earlier in his treatise, Herbert utilizes the metaphor of reduction to describe the goal of pastoral care. Notably, the means he selects "to reduce them ["that hold strange Doctrins"] to the common Faith" are all charitably kind rather than charitably hateful (*Works*, p. 262). He specifies that prayer "may effectually pierce their hearts, and convert them," as will "a very loving, and sweet usage of them," and especially "the observation what is the main foundation, and pillar of their cause, whereon they rely" (*Works*, p. 262). If these strategies fail, the parson can still count on the persuasive power of his own character, manifested in "a strict religious life" and "an humble, and ingenuous search of truth," wherein he is "unmoved in arguing, and voyd of all contentiousnesse" (*Works*, p. 263).[21] To be sure, Herbert admits in "The Parson in Gods stead" that "*the malice of the person, or hainousness of the crime*" may require the "*righteous punishment of unrighteousnesse*" (*Works*, p. 254). Yet Herbert's approach to religious misconduct shows that charitable neighbourliness ought to triumph over unmitigated zeal.

That said, Herbert is no slacker when it comes to parish discipline. Even as he prevents the parson from lording it over his flock, largely by placing "the whole order and discipline of the Parish" into the hands of churchwardens, Herbert "wisheth them by no means to spare any, though never so great" (*Works*, pp. 269, 270). Indeed, Herbert's admonishment to these men, "Do well, and right, and let the world sinke," is hardly conducive to forbearance (*Works*, p. 270). His declaration that "the Church-wardens rule" ought to be the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of 1604 only further sanctions intolerance (*Works*, p. 270). As directed by bishops, churchwardens and their assistants are to censure "Impugners" of the King's Supremacy (Canon 2), the Church of England's apostolic authority (Canon 3), public worship (Canon 4), Articles of Religion (Canon 5), rites and ceremonies (Canon 6), and ecclesiastical government (Canons 7, 8); lay officials are also to censure schismatics, whether they are "Authors" (Canon 9) or "Maintainers" of unorthodox belief (Canons 10–12).[22] Should nonconformists fail to respond suitably to such censure, churchwardens and their assistants may present them in ecclesiastical court (Canons 90, 109–17). Herbert adds weight to the churchwardens' office when he makes it obligatory, propounding that "If [the country parson] himselfe reforme any thing, it is out of the overflowing of his Conscience, whereas they [the churchwardens] are to do it by Command, and by Oath" (*Works*, p. 269).

Herbert apparently suggests that the churchwardens' reach surpasses the parson's in the struggle to safeguard orthodoxy.

But a second look at Herbert's approach to religious diversity reveals how he bridles lay authority in an adroit negotiation of ecclesiastical and political power. Although early Canons confirm churchwardens' responsibility to police dissent, Canon 113 states that "euery such Parson and Vicar…should haue the chiefe care for the suppressing of sin and impietie in their Parishes."[23] Herbert must have known that the 1604 Canons eventually bestow greater authority upon ministers than churchwardens.[24] So in urging churchwardens to follow the Canons, Herbert smoothly elevates the parson as the parish's behavioural model. To ignore this deft maneuver, as Christopher Hodgkins does when he claims that for Herbert "churchwardens are the true advance guard of church discipline," is to miss Herbert's sophisticated strategy for local reform.[25] Essentially, Herbert subjects his parson to the churchwardens' ecclesiastical and political authority directly in *The Countrey Parson* only to reassert indirectly the parson's greater spiritual authority through the Canons of 1604.[26] Michael Schoenfeldt's incisive observation that for Herbert "devotional postures of submission [are] continually contaminated by the subtle forms of opposition or ambition they both enable and disguise" applies in this case, though with a difference: whereas Schoenfeldt traces the ways in which social and political ambitions "interpenetrate" Herbert's religious work, I highlight how Herbert's piety shapes his attempts to wield ecclesiastical and political influence.[27] The delicate power play within Herbert's manual, combined with the text's uncertain composition date, suggests that under Stuart rule Herbert resisted growing challenges to the *via media* fostered by the Elizabethan Settlement beloved by him from his youth.[28]

These challenges could lead to violence, especially under Charles I's Archbishop William Laud. Norman Jones points out that the religious conflict that characterized the Stuart regimes was often avoided under Elizabeth I because "in all this confusion the Crown only demanded minimal outward conformity, allowing local groups to work out their own *via media*, substituting political loyalty for religious orthodoxy.…Run by local authorities responding to local conditions, these little commonwealths conformed but mitigated or ignored the deviation of their neighbors."[29] While Herbert cannot countenance disobedience to God or King, he does favour a "little commonwealth" governed not by churchwardens but by the lowly country parson, whose "pulpit is his joy and

his throne" (*Works*, p. 232). As a result of Herbert's scrupulous argumentation using both "Doctrine and life," the gentle forms of pastoral care outlined in *The Countrey Parson* ultimately excel lay coercion as the best way to root out heterodoxy.[30] That Herbert's parson prefers to withstand challenges to his faith in hopes of reducing an offender to obedience, rather than jumping to present him or her to the authorities, demonstrates how much Herbert values humble forbearance over strict punishment.

II. Charity and the pursuit of neighbourliness in "The Church-porch"

Whereas *The Countrey Parson* instructs clergy how to reduce others to obedience, "The Church-porch" teaches a young man how to restrain imprudent impulses. At stake in the homiletic poem is not just personal ethics but national morality. England is "full of sinne" because "sloth" infects many who guide the next generation of gentry, the class charged with exemplifying Englishness (*CEP*, 91). As a result, the country's shepherds have become sheep: "most / Are gone to grasse, and in the pasture lost" (*CEP*, 95–96). Hoping to humanize the fold, Herbert's speaker seeks to renew in his young audience the charitable neighbourliness critical to England's spiritual and social reform.

Yet the means Herbert uses to accomplish this objective have frustrated critics who protest the poem's "dull rhythm and language and…strained wit," as well as its "long, disjointed, and worldly" nature.[31] Certainly, "The Church-porch" does not meet the high standards of musicality and intellectual subtlety evident in *The Temple*'s lyrics. Just because the poem falls "flat," however, does not mean that it fails.[32] Herbert exploits the weaknesses of didactic verse to create a deliberately problematic lesson in virtue. His odd poem arouses judgmental tendencies that they may be reduced, if not by the shock of their discovery, then by the pain they cause. Against Stephenie Yearwood's claim that "The Church-porch" is a "pre-Christian" poem which "gives more advice on social propriety than on sin," I argue that Herbert laces his Christian poem with pre-Christian "bait" (*CEP*, 4).[33] Through his speaker, he offers "advice on social propriety" directly to the youth and indirectly to readers in order to expose how virtually any response to this advice harbours the sin of pride. Herbert thereby tries to humble his audience into regarding charitably neighbours who are easy to scorn, such as debased parishioners, an awkward preacher, or even

a bad poet. Stanley Fish avers that Herbert constructs "The Church-porch" as "a catechistical poem" to teach readers how to live according to "precepts," only to reveal in the next poem, "Superliminare," that these rules cannot be followed perfectly.[34] But I assert that "The Church-porch" already humbles readers while pointing them toward a charitable Christian life.

Herbert provides unconventional pastoral care to his varied flock using an increasingly complex approach. At first, the speaker teaches the youth to make moral decisions without lapsing into judgmental behaviour. Confidently enjoining him to "Abstain" from lust, "Omit" oaths, and "Flie" idleness, the speaker implies that being good is as simple as resisting bad action (*CEP*, 13, 62, 79). Over the course of the poem, though, the speaker complicates this counsel to the point where the boundary between virtuous discrimination and vicious prejudice blurs. At one point, the speaker orders the youth: "Slight those who say amidst their sickly healths, / Thou liv'st by rule. What doth not do so, but man?" (*CEP*, 133–35). The dual meaning of the verb "slight" suggests that virtue requires the youth to separate from beastly neighbours and to look down on them.[35] Such moral latitude arising from semantic ambiguity appears later, in a stanza on the improper use of wit. The speaker advises against finding too much humour in one's jokes, "lest in the jest / Thy person share, and the conceit advance" (*CEP*, 231–32). The play on "conceit," which refers both to the premise of the joke and the pride in its delivery, indirectly criticizes the jester's behaviour. But the next line, "Make not thy sport, abuses," allows the youth's felt superiority so long as he does not indulge it often or publicly (*CEP*, 233). Such teaching interferes with the spiritual egalitarianism that the speaker champions when he declares, "All equall are within the churches gate" (*CEP*, 408).

Although the speaker falters in upholding this ideal, he still attempts to persuade the youth to exchange his judgmental outlook for a more charitable one. In a powerful bid for empathy, the speaker asks, "Why should I feel another mans mistakes / More, then his sicknesses or povertie?" (*CEP*, 309–10). If this line of questioning falls short of "gently mov[ing]" the young man toward grace, then the speaker has a not-so-subtle threat ready: "Give to all something; to a good poore man, / Till thou change names, and be where he began" (*CEP*, 312, 377–78). Herbert is particularly fond of such deflating utterances. Typically, they compel the youth to amend his attitude. Less frequently, they indict him for unacknowledged flaws, as when the speaker needles the youth: "Jest not at preachers language, or expression: / How know'st thou, but thy sinnes made

him miscarrie? / Then turn thy faults and his into confession" (*CEP*, 439–41). Surprisingly, the youth must take responsibility for his transgressions and his neighbour's. Whatever entertainment Herbert's readers get from witnessing this rebuke, such pleasure is diminished once they realize that the speaker's chastisement applies to them.

Herbert's choice to employ such a sophisticated and indirect pedagogical strategy indicates his conviction that one's avoidance of the truth about oneself is a greater problem than one's censoriousness toward others. Though people do "miscarrie" and make "mistakes," Herbert suggests that one ought to be wary of scolding them before surveying oneself, for several reasons. First, there is the risk of hypocrisy, for whenever one accuses another of a sin, one implicates oneself, a point Jesus makes in his Sermon on the Mount when he asks, "why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brothers eye, but considerest not the beame that is in thine owne eye?" (*AV* Matthew 7:3). Second, should one be free of the sin one finds in someone else, one may have committed a different sin that contributed to a neighbour's fall. Both of these reasons undergird the speaker's suggestion that "thy sinnes made him miscarrie." Third, even if one's moral slate is clean, one can still sin in the act of accusing a person if one succumbs to unjust passion, a possibility that intensifies the speaker's dictate, "turn thy faults and his into confession."

My goal in spelling out these options is to show how Herbert expands the conventional prohibition against bearing false witness, the Ninth Commandment in the Decalogue, in order to urge forbearance among those prone to judge others. Ian Green observes that it was customary for catechists of all confessions to interpret the ban on false witness broadly, so that it encompassed "not just open perjury, but also reproaches, backbiting, and telling lies that would cause a neighbour loss."[36] Herbert outdoes many of his contemporaries because he shifts the focus away from lies told about a neighbour to lies told about oneself. Not even Bishop of Winchester Lancelot Andrewes goes so far. True, Andrewes ends an explication of the Ninth Commandment by avowing, "we must neither affirme any untruth, nor deny any truth of ourselves, nor of any other."[37] But Andrewes's decision here to place truth about self before truth about neighbour is unusual because the bulk of his over 30-page discussion comprises statements made about neighbours.[38] Viewed in this context, Herbert's stress on the probability of lying about oneself in the process of condemning someone else is significant. If Green is right that

over the course of the period "The emphasis [within many expositions of the Ninth Commandment] had slipped…from an absence of perjury or malice to a positive effort to promote social harmony," then Herbert's push toward neighbourliness using a Christian reinterpretation of Mosaic law deserves attention.[39] Herbert not only urges a peaceable transformation of English society from the inside out, via a reformation of the self. He also develops a renewed interest in community-building among Decalogue commentators in verse that surpasses the limits of both homiletic prose and didactic poetry.

"The Church-porch," then, is not so much "a parallel to the decalogue" as an imaginative engagement with it, for the poem uses the Ninth Commandment as a lens through which to view other moral imperatives.[40] Herbert appears fond of this approach, for he employs it in *The Countrey Parson* in a way that reminds readers that truth-telling about oneself serves as the ground of moral action. In his discussion of how a parson can teach parishioners to scan themselves for sin effectively, Herbert offers a sample scan utilizing the Tenth Commandment against covetousness. Applying the ban with such care that he feels the need to explain, Herbert declares: "there is a Justice in the least things, and for the least there shall be a judgment. Country people are full of these petty injustices, being cunning to make use of another, and spare themselves" (*Works*, p. 265).

For Herbert, a person's ability to heed the Tenth Commandment, or indeed any law, depends on that person's willingness to be rigorously honest about him- or herself. Honesty, of course, requires humility. As long as parsons allow folk to be "cunning to make use of another, and spare themselves," congregants will not be able to pursue much of anything spiritually worthwhile, in or out of church. Having noted this problem in *The Countrey Parson*, Herbert seeks to rectify it in "The Church-porch" through a flawed speaker whose pedantic preaching may well drive away those who hear it. Which way the young man and Herbert's readers go, however, is up to them. Because Herbert knows "A verse may finde him, who a sermon flies," the lyrics of "The Church" wait for those with ears to hear their message (*CEP*, 5). Yet Herbert's choice to display the danger of judging others in the opening section of *The Temple* demonstrates his investment in recreating a culture in which forbearance toward others' missteps is not only possible but likely.

III. "Keeping neighbourhood" in "The Church"

Given Herbert's deep concern with neighbourliness in "The Church-porch," it is odd that many critics assume he drops this concern in "The Church." One reason for this belief may be the tendency to interpret Herbert's lyrics in light of his section title, especially after John David Walker attended to the interlocking spatial and temporal structures of *The Temple*.[41] As Helen Wilcox observes, Herbert's decision to unify 162 poems with a church metaphor compels readers to consider his section from numerous "architectural, liturgical, spiritual and sacramental" angles.[42] While the critical move to understand religious subjectivity in terms of temple building and use is justified, this approach frequently evacuates "The Church" of everyone but the speaker and God. Those who resist this depopulation focus on Herbert's formal and rhetorical choices. Ramie Targoff, for example, perceiving that Herbert's lyric "I" admits a neighbourly "we," invites readers to "consider *The Temple* not merely as a book of poems, but also as a book of common prayers" evincing Herbert's "implicit willingness to render available to his fellow worshippers his formalized expressions of faith, doubt, hope, and praise."[43] Rosemond Tuve finds his "phrasings so just and acute that they take account of and take care of each man's differing subtleties of interpretation."[44] Still, these critics' interest in the communal function of Herbert's verse leads them away from its neighbourly content. To appreciate better the social and political import of "The Church," we need to see the cultivation of charitable neighbourliness as part of the construction of Christian selfhood within and beyond the lyric form.

Herbert's pastoral writings show that full communion with God and neighbour requires self-reduction, not self-destruction. For if the self were obliterated by the divine, community would be impossible. Stanley Fish thus goes too far in claiming that at "the moment of recognizing and entering into this wider, sacramental vision…the 'I' surrenders its pretence to any independent motion and even to an independent existence."[45] True humility in Herbert's lyrics involves submitting to God's "crosse actions," which bring the self down to healthy size by exerting spiritual pressure both vertically, through divine opposition, and horizontally, through human limitations (*CEP*, "The Crosse," 32). Herbert humbles his speaker further by having him oscillate between periods of condemnation and forbearance. To the extent that readers identify with the speaker, they go through a humbling process that primes

them to show compassion on those who err, starting with themselves. Herbert thereby encourages "certain passive qualities of restraint amongst neighbours," qualities which Keith Wrightson views as critical to "keeping neighbourhood."[46]

Few lyrics foster such restraint better than "Miserie," Herbert's version of the parable of the Pharisee and publican (Luke 18:9–14). Whereas the gospel writer describes the Pharisee's self-congratulation upon contrasting his imagined piety with others' supposed sins, Herbert dramatizes the speaker's self-righteous rant against man's failure to worship God properly. In doing so, Herbert brings the speaker to a point never reached by the Pharisee: the realization of personal guilt. One may wonder whether the poem takes a cue from "An homelie agaynst contencion and braulynge." For twelve of the poem's thirteen stanzas, the speaker offers a third-person account of others' failures rather than a first-person record of his own. Nonetheless, the speaker comes to know his part in the sordid story of human history in an astounding moral reversal:

> Indeed at first Man was a treasure,
> A box of jewels, shop of rarities,
> A ring, whose posie was *My pleasure:*
> He was a garden in a Paradise:
> Glorie and grace
> Did crown his heart and face.
>
> But sinne hath fool'd him. Now he is
> A lump of flesh, without foot or wing
> To raise him to the glimpse of blisse:
> A sick toss'd vessel, dashing on each thing;
> Nay, his own shelf:
> My God, I mean my self. (*CEP*, 67–78)

Although the speaker tries to worship God by sharing what he thinks is the truth about man's condition, the speaker implicates himself in the transgressions he surveys. Readers who inhabit the lyric "I" are caught by the speaker's self-accusation. In fashioning these lines, Herbert surely remembered his aim in "The Church-porch" to "Ryme thee to good" (*CEP*, 4). Where "The Church-porch" suggests that only knowing social ethics amounts to intellectual vanity, "Miserie" illustrates that relying on ethical rules as indicators of virtue breeds a

legalism whose fruit is hypocrisy. While it is important to take a moral inventory to ensure that God is worshipped with humility, Herbert reminds readers that the inventory one should take is one's own. There is danger in forgetting that "charitable hatred," as Walsham puts it, can easily slide into spite. Alongside the warning implicit in the poem's ending is an opportunity for the speaker to move beyond self-recrimination toward repentance and forgiveness. Whether he does so or not is unclear. The poem's avoidance of closure indicates that the moral verdict is still out on him, and on the reader.

Herbert affirms this point in a surprising way later in "The Church." Even as he champions familiar doctrine and discipline within "The British Church," he leaves room for efficacious spirituality within other denominations. Such a move makes him more generous than many contemporaries. At first, though, he lauds the personified Church of England's "perfect lineaments, and hue," and disparages the "Outlandish looks" of the Roman Catholic and the Reformed (Calvinist) Churches, who "either painted are / Or else undrest" (*CEP*, 2, 10, 11–12). Concluding stanzas confirm these bold assessments while celebrating the *via media* instituted by episcopacy and insulated by sea:

> But dearest Mother, (what those misse)
> The mean thy praise and glorie is,
> And long may be.
>
> Blessed be God, whose love it was
> To double-moat thee with his grace,
> And none but thee. (*CEP*, 25–30)

Faced with these arresting stanzas, Stanley Stewart cannot reconcile "the exclusive 'grace' accorded 'The British Church'" with "Herbert's ostensible gentleness and tolerance in matters of doctrine."[47] But there is no need to take Herbert's praise of British religion as an indication that he thinks only England and Scotland will be saved.[48] As Daniel W. Doerksen explains, the *via media* Herbert applauds "ha[s] to do with order and ritual only," not with doctrine.[49] Though Herbert believes that his homeland enjoys God's double gift of "a finished worship" set apart from continental conflict, favoured nation status does not preclude others from receiving salvation (a point he underscores in "The Church Militant").[50] If Herbert's spiritual openness gets occluded by politically

savvy religious fervour in "The British Church," his openness appears clearer in neighbouring lyrics. Two poems earlier, in "Sion," the speaker avers that the glory fit for heaven's king is not so much the "pomp and state" of outward forms as "one good grone" of inward reform (*CEP*, 7, 18). While "The British Church" implies that Herbert's "dearest Mother" best facilitates such groans, "Sion" suggests that they are not her exclusive purview.

Herbert does not highlight the poetic cluster's intimation that salvation is open to anyone who submits "a peevish heart" to God, whether or not that person's worship is "perfect," because he knows that religious controversy threatens spiritual communion (*CEP*, "Sion," 13; "The British Church," 2). This risk is high when people protest others' worship in ignorance and without first considering their own motives. Having illumined in "Miserie" how privately criticizing others' religious practices injures oneself, Herbert illustrates in "Church rents and schisms" how publicly contesting perceived offences has already devastated his "Mother" (*CEP*, 11, 24). He thereby militates against needless dissension. Figuring the British Church as a "Brave rose" attacked by a "foul" insect, Herbert attests that blind zeal robbed the church of her "beauteous glories" (*CEP*, 1, 4, 9):

> But when debates and fretting jealousies
> Did worm and work within you more and more,
> Your colour faded, and calamities
> Turned your ruddie into pale and bleak:
> Your health and beautie both began to break. (*CEP*, 16–20)

Because the worm of contention endangered ecclesiastical unity internally and externally, the Church's rapacious "neighbours…/ …rushed in, and cast them [the Church's "sev'rall parts" (*CEP*, 21)] in the dirt / Where Pagans tread" (*CEP*, 22–24). Herbert's poem demonstrates that when parishioners seek to rectify others' beliefs and behaviours at the expense of their own spiritual health, parishioners damage the very integrity they want to preserve, leaving the rose of the British Church in "shreds" (*CEP*, 9).

Helen Wilcox insightfully ties Herbert's decision to symbolize the Church as a rose to the biblical "rose of Sharon" (Song of Solomon 2:1); she also usefully connects the poem's "mood" to the Israelites' prayer that "the Lord…pity the temple profaned of ungodly men" (2 Maccabees 8:2).[51] As apt as her references

are, they do not fully capture Herbert's poetic argument, his gently indirect advocacy of restraint in matters of religious difference. For if "Church rents and schisms" evokes a Jewish lament over ungodliness, the poem points toward God's full answer to that prayer, found in Jesus's parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13:24–30). That story allegorizes the pastoral problem facing God's servants when unrighteous folk flourish amid their righteous neighbours, thereby increasing the risk that religious error will spread. Jesus says that when the field's owner heard his servants ask whether they should weed his land, he instructed them: "Nay: lest while yee gather vp the tares ye root vp also the wheat with them. Let both grow together vntil the haruest: and in the time of haruest, I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and binde them in bundels to burne them: but gather the wheat into my barne" (*AV* Matthew 13:29–30). Jesus's parable presents a different garden malady than does "Church rents and schisms." But both tales argue that believers should refrain from condemning others on the grounds that God alone can accurately distinguish true from false religion. As we have seen in *The Countrey Parson* and much of *The Temple*, Herbert does not want pastors to turn a blind eye toward sin, or parishioners simply to ignore their neighbours' religious errors. Yet Herbert urges restraint in dealing with disobedience on the basis of Christian humility. This type of forbearance yields not moral laxity, as some authorities feared, but a self-effacing love more likely to produce spiritual harmony than self-righteous scolding.

Herbert manifests this extraordinary love in "The Jews." According to Harold Fisch, the lyric is "the first clearly sympathetic reference to post-biblical Jews in the annals of English Literature."[52] Fisch rightly highlights Herbert's graciousness toward the Jews, especially compared to the anti-Semitism of Martin Luther.[53] What Fisch misses, however, is that the poem operates both as a wish for the Jews' conversion, and as an object lesson for Pharisaical Christians about the perils of hypocritical legalism. Herbert makes these perils more explicit later, in "Self-condemnation," when he advises those "who condemnest Jewish hate" to "Call home thine eye (that busie wanderer) / That choice may be thy storie" (*CEP*, 1, 5–6). Following advice in "The Church-porch" not to criticize another without first considering whether "thy sinnes made him miscarrie," the speaker of "The Jews" takes partial responsibility for the Jews' dwindling spiritual vigour:

Poore nation, whose sweet sap, and juice
Our cyens have purloin'd, and left you drie:
Whose streams we got by the Apostles sluce,
And use in baptisme, while ye pine and die:
Who by not keeping once, became a debtor;
And now by keeping lose the letter. (*CEP*, 1–6)

Readers accustomed to blaming the Jews for their fall from grace may well be shocked to learn that they have played a lamentable part in the Jews' decline. Herbert's provocative use of the word "purloin'd" indicates that Christians have stolen the Jews' "sap" under cover of apostolic authority, an act at once morally suspect and legally justified.[54] Yet the speaker pleads for the Jews' reform that they may be restored to their rightful place:

Oh that my prayers! mine, alas!
Oh that some Angel might a trumpet sound;
At which the Church falling upon her face
Should crie so loud, untill the trump were drown'd,
And by that crie of her deare Lord obtain,
That your sweet sap might come again! (*CEP*, 7–12)

Herbert's poetic groan reveals the importance of humility in encouraging a charitable neighbourliness that transcends geographical and temporal boundaries. In refusing to persecute Jews and Christians who make "a Jewish choice" while yet holding them accountable for their errors (*CEP*, "Self condemnation," 9), "The Jews" anticipates the ideal of forbearance hinted at in "The Church Militant."[55]

IV. Redeeming self and neighbour in "The Church Militant"

Readers of *The Temple*'s final section — "The Church Militant" and "L'Envoy" — may baulk at my claim that Herbert's chronicle of Christianity's pilgrimage through the global wilderness promotes forbearance.[56] As Sidney Gottlieb perceives, "The Church Militant" is "wickedly satiric," a quality not often associated with tolerance.[57] For all of the speaker's verbal assaults on

"Mahometan stupidities" and the "one Antichrist" of "new and old *Rome*," what is missing from this apocalyptic poem is the religious violence figured in Revelation, the base text of Christian apocalypse (*CEP*, 153, 206, 205). Though Herbert constructs "The Church Militant" as a survey of sin through the ages, he does not advocate the use of force to bring souls into line, nor does he dwell on the punishment God will eventually mete out to those who disobey Him. Indeed, there is far less emphasis on divine judgment in the poem than in John of Patmos's vision, for Herbert only mentions the word "judgement" twice, both times within the poem's last ten lines and without elaboration (*CEP*, 269, 277). While it is true that Herbert offers a sobering perspective on Christianity, concluding, as Lee Ann Johnson observes, "with the fate of Christian life in doubt," he does so to point readers in a positive ethical direction.[58] Rather than flee "westward" with the "pilgrime" of true "Religion," Christians should go within, uprooting with God's help the proud, hypocritical judgment that stifles charitable neighbourliness (*CEP*, 29). The fruit of that neighbourliness is religious toleration.

Herbert loosens the ground of readers' intolerance by exposing their vice. No matter how outlandish the transgression, he finds it in his double-moated neighbours. Employing the technique for humbling readers in "Miserie," the speaker of "The Church Militant" makes fun of pagan errors in ways that invite readers to join him. Should readers think themselves free of barbarities, the speaker shows them how wrong they are:

> Who makes a root his god, how low is he,
> If God and man be sever'd infinitely!
> What wretchednesse can give him any room,
> Whose house is foul, while he adores his broom?
> None will beleeve this now, though money be
> In us the same transplanted foolerie. (*CEP*, 115–20)

If idolatry links early modern Protestants with ancient pagans, legalism unites the English with the Israelites, a point familiar to readers of "The Jews." Despite the reform that gave "the Church a crown to keep her state," the Church of England cannot maintain her former glory because she aspires to intellectual vanity (*CEP*, 91). Following the dictates of "Sinne," who "sate / Busie in controversies sprung of late," the Church of England subjects herself to "Such

force, as once did captivate the Jews" (*CEP*, 161, 165–66, 192). Exalting law above conscience, the Church engages in persecutory behaviour sanctioned by the state, so that now "Religion stands on tip-toe in our land, / Readie to passe to the *American* strand" (*CEP*, 235–36). These prophetic lines, famously escaping censorship by the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University after Nicholas Ferrar's intervention, indicate how much England has to lose if the British Church continues to pursue its reforms through coercion.[59] Moreover, these lines reveal Herbert's spiritual generosity toward not just transplanted pilgrims, but also and especially Native Americans.[60]

Intriguingly, Herbert does not tie English self-righteousness to Jewish legalism as closely he links English idolatry with pagan worship. Perhaps he is aware of how dangerous highlighting that association would be. In order to make the full, horrific connection between English and Jewish legalism, readers have to go back over 200 lines, to where the speaker recounts how the Jews' glorious worship declined in language reminiscent of "*Ad Seren. Regem,*" "Sion," and "The British Church":

> …….King *Solomon*
> Finish'd and fixt the old religion.
> When it grew loose, the Jews did hope in vain
> By nailing Christ to fasten it again.
>
> (*CEP*, 21–24)

Herbert's typology between the Jews' crucifixion of Jesus and the English persecution of "Religion" stresses how willing he is to extend grace to those who do not share his love for the Church of England. That typology also serves as a courageous indictment of the persecution of nonconformists, a group that Herbert significantly refuses to align with a particular denomination. To him, the hands of the Christian Church can change.

The fact that even Americans — native and non-native alike — will lose their hold on spiritual truth, whatever its outward manifestation, demonstrates how invested Herbert is in humbling readers present and future. To him, no one is immune from the ravages of sin, not even the true Church, for its members have "set times / Both for their vertuous actions and their crimes" (*CEP*, 261–62). Herbert's realism about the inclination of the human will to sin makes God's redemptive action in the world more visible. Though sin shall "smother"

the Church, there will be a Church left to face God's judgment (*CEP*, 266). The Church's preservation is due not to the sufficiency of human worship, but to God's grace, a point the poem underscores when it concludes with the fourth iteration of a praising couplet: "*How dear to me, O God, thy counsels are! / Who may with thee compare?*" (*CEP*, 278–79). At the end of Herbert's version of history, God receives the glory for redeeming those who have learned not to judge their neighbours or themselves. Herbert does his best to put readers in that category, for who can tell for sure in "The Church Militant" exactly who these redeemed individuals are?

Since it was first published, *The Temple* has appealed to readers of diverse confessions and none at all partly because of Herbert's commitment to reducing himself and his readers to a state of spiritual humility.[61] If this humility does not lead readers to the Christian faith, it still prepares them to practise a charitable neighbourliness that overlaps with religious toleration. Such preparation begins in "The Church-porch," where Herbert informs readers that underneath their judgmental impulses lie unrecognized sins. Should readers miss the point, he reiterates it in "The Church," most clearly in "Miserie." Having illumined how easily the criticism of sin becomes the unauthorized condemnation of sinners, Herbert goes on to show the damage done to the community by such criticism in "Church rents and schisms," no matter how beautiful that community appears in "The British Church." Far from sanctioning schism or heresy, Herbert avoids the tragic irony of falling victim to the very spiritual errors he consistently opposes in his poetry. In "The Jews" he acknowledges the Jews' legalism without lording it over them, since doing so would replicate their self-righteousness. "The Church Militant" goes much further than previous poems in combating self-righteousness, warning readers about the spiritual peril of religious persecution and bearing witness that this threat is closer than readers realize.

Yet if, as I have argued, Herbert's advocacy of a charitable neighbourliness conducive to religious toleration is crucial to understanding his poetry and prose, why is his advocacy so indirect that scholars regularly miss it? One reason for Herbert's subtlety is that he experienced firsthand how politically provocative arguments for a measure of forbearance were. In 1623, in one of his greatest moments as Cambridge University Orator, he spoke before James I, praising Prince Charles's attempts to woo the Infanta Maria Anna of Spain. Aware that the Prince desired a retaliatory war after failing to secure the Spa-

nish Match, Herbert indicated that if Charles hoped to continue his father's pacific legacy, he must treat with England's longtime enemy.[62] That Charles did not appreciate Herbert's advice may be inferred from the fact that upon James's death in 1625, Herbert did not receive from Charles I the patronage given by his father.[63] Viewed in this context, Herbert's repeated reluctance to make the relation between neighbourliness and toleration explicit signifies his conviction that it was increasingly dangerous to do so under Caroline rule. Offering this kind of pastoral care was a political act as much as a spiritual duty, and one that demanded skilful negotiation of tricky territory. A mark of just how smoothly Herbert utilizes the ethics of neighbourliness laid out in his prose to move readers gently toward greater tolerance in his poetry is the continued blindness to his work among historians of religious toleration. Neither a manifesto that registers with intellectual historians, such as John Milton's *Areopagitica*, nor a record of actual conduct favoured by social historians, *The Temple* occupies the nebulous space between two broad categories of historical evidence. From that space, Herbert's verse works upon the minds and hearts of its readers, guiding them toward the practice of toleration with their religiously divergent neighbours. Such a view of Herbert invites a more literary history of toleration, one that would take account of other works besides *The Temple* that foster forbearance without necessarily championing it outright. With this kind of history, we could appreciate better how these literary texts articulated and strengthened an ethical foundation upon which later tolerationists could build.

Notes

1. For examples of the triumphal narrative, see W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*, 4 vols. (1932–40; reprint, Gloucester, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965); more recently, see Perez Zagorin, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003). Social historians combating this narrative include Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2007); and Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006). For an excellent recent survey of the historiographical terrain, see Kaplan, pp. 386–95.

2. See Kaplan, pp. 8, 250–64; Walsham, pp. 12–13, 231–32, 269–80.
3. Kaplan, pp. 251–52, 260–61; Walsham, pp. 273–77.
4. I am grateful to Linda Pollard for this question, posed in an untitled paper (presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Conference on British Studies, New Orleans, LA, October 2008, in partial response to my paper, "Religious Poetry and the Rise of Toleration: George Herbert's *Via Media*"), n.p.
5. John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). Although Herbert is no Puritan, he still depicts a lyric speaker who experiences anguish for sin before a God who seems absent at times. Herbert thus confronts a fear of spiritual abandonment that has roots in ancient Judaism but flowers in the predominantly Calvinist culture of late Tudor and early Stuart England. It is odd, then, that Stachniewski all but ignores Herbert. For passing references to Herbert's lyrics, one involving "To All Angels and Saints," the other concerning "Easter Wings," see pp. 266, 283, respectively.
6. I use the term "neighbourliness" to situate my work partly in relation to social histories that consider what Keith Thomas calls "the ethical code of the old village community"; for an outline of that code, see Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1971), p. 561; see also pp. 553–57, 561–67. For a study of how late medieval Catholicism shapes that code into a "holy neighbourliness" practised in urban as well as rural spaces, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale, 1992), p. 138; see also pp. 131–54. For a study of the term "neighbourliness" in early modern religious contexts and more modern historiographical ones, see Keith Wrightson, "The 'Decline of Neighbourliness' Revisited," in *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Norman L. Jones and Daniel R. Woolf (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
7. Norman Jones articulates one link between neighbourliness and toleration when he points to the "private treaties of toleration" that "generally avoided ideological conflict by concentrating on the pragmatic purposes of the community." See Norman Jones, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 135; see also p. 33.
8. For an example of this kind of literary history, though not one that positions itself as such, see Richard Strier, "Impossible Radicalism I: Donne and Freedom of Conscience," in *Resistant Structures: Particularity, Radicalism, and Renaissance Texts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 118–64.

9. Naomi Tadmor, "Friends and Neighbours in Early Modern England: Biblical Translations and Social Norms," in *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300–1800*, ed. Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter, and Miri Rubin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 150.
10. Tadmor, p. 150.
11. Duffy, p. 137.
12. Paul Cefalu, *Moral Identity in Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 149, 148.
13. Rosemond Tuve, "George Herbert and *Caritas*," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 22.3–4 (July–December 1959), p. 307.
14. Tuve, p. 308.
15. Tuve, p. 319.
16. *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. F. E. Hutchinson (1941; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 225 (hereafter cited in text as *Works*).
17. Walsham, pp. 238, 41, 250.
18. Intriguingly, many churchwardens did not want to present fellow parishioners for nonconformity. See Walsham, pp. 91–92.
19. Church of England, *Certayne sermons or homelies* (London, 1547), sigs. L2v, L3r (hereafter cited in text).
20. James I, "Directions for Preachers," in *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 383.
21. Christopher Hodgkins lists these means of persuading others to the true faith without connecting Herbert's desire to avoid contentiousness with either neighbourliness or toleration. See Christopher Hodgkins, *Authority, Church, and Society in George Herbert: Return to the Middle Way* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), p. 59.
22. Church of England, *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, 1604*, ed. H. A. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923). The word "Impugners" appears in the titles of Canons 2, 4–8 (sigs. D2r, D2v-D3v); the word "Authors" appears in the title of Canon 9 (sig. D4r); and the word "Maintainers" appears in the titles of Canons 10–12 (sigs. D4v-E1r).
23. Church of England, *Constitutions and Canons*, sig. R4v.
24. One indication that he sees his authority trumping that of churchwardens occurs in the chapter "The Parson praying," wherein he asserts his willingness to override cowed churchwardens and present "any of the gentry or nobility of the Parish"

who "sometimes" arrive late to divine service and disrupt others' worship (*Works*, p. 232). Notably, Herbert appears to target rudeness more than nonconformity.

25. Hodgkins, p. 54.
26. Wittingly or unwittingly, Herbert here engages in a power struggle similar to the one played out in the visitation articles for his diocese of Salisbury, which drew upon the 1604 canons. See Kenneth Fincham, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, vol. 1 (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1994). According to Fincham, in 1620 moderate Calvinist Bishop of Salisbury John Davenant utilized a highly modified version of the visitation articles first drawn up in 1619 by anti-Calvinist Bishop of Norwich John Overall (pp. xviii, xx). Overall's Article 6 required churchwardens to present preachers who maintained anything apart from the Bible and catholic teaching (p. 162). As Fincham notes, this requirement is an overly ambitious and illegal extension of the source for Overall's article, the 1571 canons, which "placed the burden of responsibility on the preacher not the churchwardens" (p. xvi). For the relationship between Overall and Davenant's articles, see pp. xviii, xx–xxi.
27. Michael C. Schoenfeldt, "Subject to Ev'ry Mounters Bended Knee: Herbert and Authority," in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 244.
28. Hodgkins argues convincingly that "the Settlement…formed Herbert's ecclesiastical and social ideal," specifying how "Herbert walked the increasingly lonely way of… [a] Calvinist nonabsolutist lower-church Episcopalian (Old Conformist)." See pp. 9, 11.
29. Norman Jones, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 5.
30. George Herbert, "The Windows," in *The Complete English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), line 11 (hereafter cited in text as *CEP*).
31. Arnold Stein, *George Herbert's Lyrics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), p. 14; Diana Benet, *Secretary of Praise: The Poetic Vocation of George Herbert* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984), p. 36.
32. Sheridan D. Blau, "The Poet as Casuist: Herbert's 'Church-porch,'" in *Essential Articles for the Study of George Herbert's Poetry*, ed. John R. Roberts (Hamden: Archon Books, 1979), p. 408; reprinted from *Genre* 4 (1971), pp. 142–52.

33. Stephenie Yearwood, "The Rhetoric of Form in *The Temple*," *Studies in English Literature* 23.1 (1983), pp. 132, 132n7.
34. Stanley Fish, *The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), p. 128; see also pp. 129–31.
35. See the *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "slight": "3. a. To treat with indifference or disrespect; to pay little or no attention or heed to; to disregard, disdain, ignore." Although this entry absorbs the two meanings I mention into one, there is a difference between detaching neutrally from others perceived as equals, and departing judgmentally from others perceived as inferior. Herbert plays on this difference.
36. Ian Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530–1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 464.
37. Lancelot Andrewes, *A Patterne of catechisticall doctrine* (London, 1630), p. 484.
38. See Andrewes, pp. 453–84.
39. Green, p. 465.
40. Elizabeth McLaughlin and Gail Thomas, "Communion in *The Temple*," *Studies in English Literature* 15.1 (1975), p. 111.
41. John David Walker, "The Architectonics of George Herbert's *The Temple*," *English Literary History* 29.3 (1962), pp. 289–305.
42. For a survey of relevant criticism, see Wilcox's preface to "The Church," *CEP*, p. 87.
43. Ramie Targoff, *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 104.
44. Tuve, p. 314.
45. Stanley Fish, "Letting Go: The Dialectic of Self in Herbert's Poetry," in *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), p. 173.
46. Wrightson, p. 26. The last phrase is an uncited period expression.
47. Stanley Stewart, *George Herbert* (Boston: Twayne, 1986), p. 28.
48. As Hutchinson explains in his headnote on "The British Church," Herbert acknowledges the political and ecclesiastical link between Scottish and English Churches forged upon James I's ascension and strengthened after Scotland reclaimed episcopacy in 1610. See Hutchinson, *Works*, p. 515.
49. Daniel W. Doerksen, "Recharting the *Via Media* of Spenser and Herbert," *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 8.3 (1984), p. 216.
50. George Herbert, "Ad Seren. Regem," in *The Latin Poetry of George Herbert: A Bilingual Edition*, trans. Mark McCloskey and Paul R. Murphy (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1965), line 13.

51. For a discussion of the "rose of Sharon," see Wilcox's preface to "The British Church," *CEP*, pp. 487, 489n1; for comments on the poem's mood, see pp. 487, 488.
52. Harold Fisch, *Jerusalem and Albion: The Hebraic Factor in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), p. 189.
53. Despite Luther's early generosity toward the Jews, especially in his apology *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew* (1523), Luther later lambasted their spiritual stubbornness in his treatise *On the Jews and Their Lies* (1543). See Martin Luther, T*hat Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*, in *Luther's Works*, ed. Walther I. Brandt, vol. 45, bk. 2, The Christian in Society (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), pp. 199–229; *On the Jews and Their Lies*, in *Luther's Works*, ed. Franklin Sherman, vol. 47, bk. 4, The Christian in Society (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 137–306.
54. The suspect nature of Christians' action in this case appears in the *OED*, s.v. "purloin": "2. a. *trans*. To make away with, misappropriate; to steal, esp. under circumstances which involve a breach of trust; to pilfer, filch."
55. Herbert's deep reservation about condemning others for their faults appears elsewhere in "The Church," as Kenneth J. E. Graham points out in his study of "Church-lock and key" and "The Priesthood." See Graham, "'Clear as heav'n:' Herbert's Poetry and Rhetorical 'Divinitie,'" *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 29.2–3 (2005): pp. 183–201, esp. p. 198.
56. For a survey of the debate over whether "The Church Militant" is a critical part of *The Temple* or simply tacked on to it, see Wilcox's preface to the poem, *CEP*, p. 665.
57. Sidney Gottlieb, "The Social and Political Backgrounds of George Herbert's Poetry," in *"The Muses Common-weale": Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Claude Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), p. 116.
58. Lee Ann Johnson, "The Relationship of 'The Church Militant' to *The Temple*," *Studies in Philology* 68 (1971), p. 202.
59. For a fuller account of the controversy surrounding this couplet, see Wilcox, *CEP*, pp. 683–84, n.235–36.
60. I am indebted to this journal's anonymous reviewer for offering the last insight.
61. For another perspective on why *The Temple* appeals to a diverse readership, see Daniel W. Doerksen, "'Generous Ambiguity' Revisited: A Herbert for All Seasons," *George Herbert Journal* 30.1–2 (2006), pp. 19–41, esp. pp. 26–29.
62. For a discussion of Herbert's at times strained rhetoric in this regard, see John K. Hale, "George Herbert's Oration before King James, Cambridge 1623," in *Acta*

Conventus Neo-Latini Cantabrigiensis: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Cambridge, 30 July–5 August 2000, gen. ed. Rhoda Schnur, ed. Jean-Louis Charlet, Lucia Gualdo Rosa, Heinz Hofmann, Brenda Hosington, Elena Rodriguez Peregrina, Ronald Truman, with an introduction by Gilbert Tournoy (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003), pp. 258–59, 258, n.14.

63. For an account of Herbert's diminished opportunities for preferment, see Hutchinson, *Works*, pp. xxx–xxxi, 601.