John Donne Journal
Vol. 13, Nos. 1 & 2 (1994)

A Priest to the Geneva Temple

Stanley Stewart

Christopher Hodgkins, *Authority, Church, and Society in George Herbert*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993. xii +231.

The Protestantizing of the Metaphysical poets has in the past decade or so expanded from an interesting challenge to what Christopher Hodgkins thinks of as the "traditional reading" (166) of Metaphysical poetry into a growth industry. It is as if a generation of readers were to view the writings of poets like Donne and Herbert through the eyes of an influential Miltonist, which is just about what happened. It seems fair to say that the spate of books on the Lutheran or Calvinist or Protestant or Puritan Donne and Herbert reflect an active phase of credulity regarding the method and vocabulary of Barbara Lewalski's *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton, 1979).

At first glance, the subtitle of Christopher Hodgkins' *Authority, Church, and Society in George Herbert* might appear to buck this trend: *Return to the Middle Way*. But in fact Hodgkins' thesis is that Herbert's *via media* was best articulated in John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, especially as the thought of that work was popularized by avatar of The Middle Way William Perkins. The drift of Hodgkins' argument is that, as a proponent of the Elizabethan "Old Conformity," which was itself "very, very nearly" Calvinist (20), Herbert sought a "regenerative nostalgia" in the form of a local and internalized version of the Tudor social order (214). In support of this view, Hodgkins explores many affinities between Herbert's thought and that of Calvin and his followers. Hodgkins' book is clearly written, for which Herbertians, whether they agree with him or not, should be grateful; this book is not marred by vapid posturing and stilted vocabulary imported from ersatz historical, sociological and psychological theory. In many respects, *Authority, Church, and Society in George Herbert* is an intelligent, learned and

thoughtful study of the ideas and practices that, especially after Herbert's death, divided England into warring factions. And in some respects, Hodgkins argues the case for a Calvinist Herbert effectively, by which I mean that he picks most of his examples well, often ignoring the evidence of unhelpful poems and parts of *A Priest to the Temple* (such as the work's title, which does not appear in the Index)—namely, those to which sensible critics defending the same thesis would not look for support.

Hodgkins' method is avowedly historical: Herbert, "like Perkins before him" (102), does or says X or Y; therefore, Herbert's views on election, church government, the sacraments and vestments were—to the left of Richard Hooker (166)—like those of William Perkins, Richard Bernard, and Joseph Hall (106). This method and these motifs run through the book: Herbert favored a "Genevan model of church discipline" (106); no Laudian (128), Herbert thought in a "peculiarly Protestant way" (155); against the Laudian regime, his views look "Puritanical" (104). Hodgkins repeatedly insists that Herbert was a Protestant, that is, that he in fact had "deep temperamental and doctrinal divergence from the Laudians" (64). The idea is that Laud overturned the abiding "Calvinist consensus" in England (63), replacing it with a tyrannical sacerdotalism of which Herbert disapproved—or would have disapproved, had he lived longer (Laud became Archbishop five months after Herbert died). The opposition that works for Hodgkins, then, is between "Protestantism" and Archbishop Laud; and according to this scheme, Hodgkins places Herbert on the "borderline between the `Old Conformist' and Puritan Positions" (172), inclining, like Thomas Fuller, to "moderate Puritanism" (211).

Because of how he has shaped his study, Hodgkins' argument stands or falls on his reading of two Herbert poems, "Lent" and "The Priesthood." The major chapters given over to those readings ("Power Disabled: Limited Authority in Herbert's 'Lent,'" "'Doctrine and Life': Herbert's Protestant Priesthood" and "Slowly to the Flame: 'The Priesthood' and Herbert's Hesitation") are the most energetically argued. They are also the least persuasive. As long as Hodgkins sticks to intellectual history, pointing out how "election," "ordination," "church government" and the "sacraments" in English thought and Herbert's writing were explicitly not in accord with Roman Catholic practice, he is on solid ground. But throughout the book, Hodgkins presses the less modest claim that Herbert was, in matters of theology and practice, toward John Greenwood from Richard Hooker, and that Herbert's beliefs and attitudes are never more convincingly represented

than in "Lent" and "The Priesthood." This strikes me as a tactical mistake. Elsewhere, when discussing Herbert's "Protestant" conception of the Eucharist, for example, Hodgkins astutely omits reference to "The Sacrifice" and "The Agonie," poems which not only derive from Catholic traditions, but are in fact amenable to a number of interpretations of the nature of the Host (we return to this matter in connection with Herbert's supposed "passing over" of the priest's sacramental functions). Similarly, Herbert's poem on the "Blest Order" assigned to impart the sacraments doesn't seem like a promising vehicle for the Protestantization of Herbert either. Yet, unaccountably, Hodgkins makes "Lent" and "The Priesthood" the centerpiece of his "root and branch" Calvinization of Herbert.

No one denies that there are "Calvinist" elements in Herbert, as there are in the Book of Common Prayer (especially in the prefatory "Of Ceremonies why some be abolished, and some reteined" (1630), which echoes Calvin's argument in the *Institutes* that different nations and different times require different liturgical observances). Problems in criticism arise when we take such categorical designations too seriously. As I have recently suggested,[1] when we are talking about "The Water-course," the designation "Calvinist" works well enough; Hodgkins finds the poem "obtrusively Calvinist" (21). At the same time, to characterize "Lent," the term "anti-Calvinist" might be just the one we are looking for. We might recall, for instance, that in the *Institutes* and *A Harmonie of the Three Evangelists*, Calvin exhibits disdain for Lenten observances. In answer to this expected objection, Hodgkins claims that "Lent" is "seriously flawed" (4), by which he means that the poem registers Herbert's misgivings about the liturgical observance of the forty days before Easter. Unfortunately, although Hodgkins skirts the issue, this belief would entail Herbert having misgivings about the Book of Common Prayer. But Hodges offers no evidence for this being the case.

In the Herbert canon, "Lent" is an uncharacteristically argumentative poem. In it, the speaker responds, point by point, to objections that Calvin made against Lenten observances. Although this is not the place to rehearse details of my argument about this poem, I will say that, given the comparison between Herbert's poem and Calvin's utterances on the subject, it is hard to see why "Lent" should seem [to Hodgkins or anyone else] inwardly at odds with the authoritarian principle that he [Herbert] defends (65). The Lenten observer in the poem forthrightly states: "The Scriptures bid us *fast*; the Church sayes, *now*." The issue at hand is two imperatives derived from two sources, neither of which the speaker finds difficult. Nevertheless, Hodgkins

finds evidence in this poem of Herbert's "deep temperamental and doctrinal divergence from the Laudians" (64) in the form of perceived "self-contradictions." Hodgkins concludes that, "if William Laud had written 'Lent,' it would consist of only these first four lines, and end, 'the Church says, *now*'" (69). But, by the same logic, had Calvin written the poem, these four lines wouldn't exist either; nor for that matter does it seem likely that Calvin would tolerate so much as the title of the poem, since he hated Lenten observances, as he did the liturgical calendar (with its infernal repetition of papist feast days).

Just as it is wrong to think that, for Herbert, the liturgical calendar was a theological excrescence to be dismissed in a casual footnote (151n), it is more than coincidental that Hodgkins doesn't mention "Obedience" anywhere in his book. And yet the calendar and obedience are—in the context of liturgical discipline and of Herbert's writings—related to each other in important ways:

> O let thy sacred will
> All thy delight in me fulfill!
> Let me not think an action mine own way,
> But as thy love shall sway,
> Resigning up the rudder to thy skill. (16-20)[2]

It is not for nothing that the speaker in "Obedience" would imitate the Christ of "Dialogue" ("*Follow my resigning*"), as he would do so, too, in going "part of that religious way" in "Lent." Hodgkins talks about the Puritan attack on Lent as if that attack were not also Calvin's; and he implies that, in his writing and in the discharge of his priestly office, Herbert shared the same hostility. But in fact Herbert's figure of going "part of that religious way" (toward forty days of denial) fits with an Anglican understanding of Matthew 5:48: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father which is in heaven is perfect." Nevertheless, in language reminiscent of Barbara Harman's figure of Herbert's "collapsing" poems, Hodgkins insists that Herbert's "Lent" undoes itself in the last stanza, this because the speaker seems to call for a spiritual rather than a literal feast. This is not a convincing line of reasoning. To ask the Christian to "banquet" the hungry only in a spiritual sense would do little to meet the demands of charity, which surely have something to do with the motive represented in the last stanza of "Lent." The wisdom here speaks against a literal understanding of religious language, as if acceding to the word or the form were all that counted. Herbert's readers would remember

Christ's rebuke: "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?" (Luke 13:15).

It seems dubious to say that, for Herbert, "'Lent' remains as a name and little more" (84). As set out in the Book of Common Prayer, Lent was an important part of the Christian year. The Propers for Lent prescribed the very biblical readings that, with his emphasis on Puritans preaching, one would think Hodgkins would find important. On Ash Wednesday, in the words of Joel, the priest enjoined the faithful ("with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning" [2:12]) to a holy Lent. The Gospel for the second Sunday in Lent made a similar appeal: "For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness" (1 Thess. 4:7). Here, fasting and the Christian calendar conjoin in a way Calvin, but not Herbert, disapproved.

In a similar way, Hodgkin's discussion of "The Priesthood" is skewed toward Geneva. This presents a problem because, in his focus on the Puritan theme of a godly if unlearned clergy, Hodgkins personalizes Herbert's conception of the priesthood almost to the point of not differentiating the priesthood from the priest. In this connection, the literalness of Hodgkins' biographical approach proves awkward, for Herbert held fast to the traditional distinction, which is why he offers instruction to the novice priest in *The Countrey Parson*, and why, in his poetry, a feeling of inadequacy sometimes overwhelms the speaker (in poems like "The Windows" and "The Priesthood"). The issue here is one of personal, not institutional, doubt. Paradoxically, following Stanley Fish in his Herbert-as-Hypocrite hypothesis, Hodgkins directs his doubt toward the formal situation separating priest from parishioner, suggesting that Herbert inclined toward a congregational approach. At the same time, Hodgkins argues that Herbert is to "some degree a manipulator and a snob" (101), and he compounds the calumny by explaining that because of "his relatively great birth," it is okay for him to be so, since aristocrats are like that: "What would we expect?" (101) The answer to this rhetorical question is simple: "We expect" that "we [should] expect" the offspring of great families to behave charitably. Indeed, to "expect" less requires that we reify a dehumanized essence of the very aristocratic disdain that Christian teaching sought to deflect, not only in aristocrats, but in commoners as well. (In Puritans, "disdain" was often expressed a snobbish impulse to "manipulate" and even punish those who enjoyed quite ordinary and innocent diversions). Although Hodgkins grudgingly allows that "it is not necessary to hear [in Herbert's remarks on homiletic technique] any note of hypocrisy

at all" (101), he is being too conciliatory toward—and insufficiently suspicious of—the "hermeneutics of suspicion." It is not only that one is not compelled "to hear any note of hypocrisy" in Herbert's *A Priest to the Temple*, but suspicion in this context must itself be subject to suspicion of linguistic pathology—of the sort of philosophical derangement for which Wittgenstein suggests therapeutic investigation.

The skeptical critic might ask: Who in Herbert's time would have read Herbert's instructions on preaching as "manipulative"? What parts of his instructions are hypocritical? How, if we do not perceive snobbishness in those parts, would perceivers of this element propose to teach us to perceive it? That is, what is the mechanism of perception employed here? Is there evidence that anyone in Herbert's time perceived it? If a perceiver answers in the affirmative, we must ask: Are there relevant seventeenth-century examples of this? On the other hand, should perceivers (for reasons they are unwilling to state) be unwilling to cite Jacobean instances of such inferences, what anecdotal information—other than their own claims that they perceive it—should be considered in adjudicating their claim? Personalities might come into consideration here, and, if so, Wittgenstein's remark is relevant: "I believe that if one is to enjoy a writer one has to *like* the culture he belongs to as well. If one finds it indifferent or distasteful, one's admiration cools off" (*Culture and Value* 85e). Accordingly, when critics use accusatory terms, such as "manipulation," "snobbery," and "hypocrisy," we might reasonably sense a "cooling" of admiration, a falling off of interest in, or even disbelief in the importance of, "the culture" of which (in this case) the offices of the priesthood were dispensed in seventeenth-century England. If pious sentiments and exhortation to pious acts offend us, we are reluctant to accord them charitable characterization.

I have mentioned that the Index to Hodgkins' book makes no mention of *A Priest to the Temple*. This is no oversight. For Hodgkins, Herbert "retains the title of 'priest,' yet he redefines *priesthood* primarily as the ministry of the word" (107). Further, Hodgkins finds that the term "priest" is somewhat of a problem, in that it implies Catholic or Anglo-Catholic overtones; and, since he would rather see these omitted, he uses the subtitle of Herbert's work, *The Countrey Parson*. Perhaps we should not object to this, although it somewhat dulls the point of the way in which Crashaw's *Steps to The Temple* echoes the title of Herbert's prose work as well as that of the more famous volume of devotional poems. Hodgkins provides a note on what some readers may regard as an omission: "Barnabas Oley's 1671 edition of *The Countrey*

Parson seems to have added *The Priest to the Temple* to Herbert's original title; therefore, I have chosen to refer throughout to the work as Herbert did" (1n). Now, it isn't clear why Oley's edition "seems" this way to Hodgkins, but even if we were to assume that Oley added the title,[3] the question would be: Why did he do that? In 1652, was this a judicious—or even a safe—thing to do? Was Oley a Roman Catholic, or an Anglo-Catholic, or any kind of Catholic, or even a notable supporter of Archbishop Laud? Then, too, wouldn't Oley's revision of Herbert's title give strong indication of how he read Herbert, and wouldn't that serve to aid us in finding out how others in the early 1650s may have understood *A Priest To the Temple, Or, The Countrey Parson His Character And Rule of Holy Life*? By eliding all reference to the title of Herbert's work, Hodgkins, by his own admission, omits a term that he regards as suspicious: "more suspect in Geneva: *prelate, bishop, curate, vicar*, and most questionable of all to Protestants, *priest*" (108-9). So would this choice of a single title call Herbert's "strong Protestantism into doubt?" (109)

But title of Herbert's prose work aside, we should address Hodgkins' claim that a close look at "The Parson in Sacraments" supports his Calvinist thesis:

> Thus the term *priest* is conspicuously absent from the one chapter in *The Countrey Parson* where a Roman Catholic or Anglo-Catholic might expect it most: "The Parson in Sacraments." Instead, the chapter stresses that only an experiential knowledge of biblical doctrine and of God's grace will make the Communion efficacious. (109-10)

I want to ask: Is this so? Is it true that Herbert "stresses . . . biblical doctrine" in his articulation of the two Anglican sacraments? Of the communion table, Herbert writes:

> The Countrey Parson being to administer the Sacraments, is at a stand with himself, how or what behaviour to assume for so holy things. Especially at Communion times he is in a great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break, and administer him. (257)

Why should "The Countrey Parson" be "at a stand with himself," or uncertain how to conduct himself? Because he recognizes that he cannot fully

apprehend "so holy things." They are a mystery. And note: Herbert's "Countrey Parson" doesn't look for a "scripturalist" explanation, and the fact that he doesn't conflicts with Hodgkins' insistence that Herbert is dedicated to a "scripturalist mission" (107) with respect to the sacraments. Frankly, I find "scripturalist" an odd characterization of Herbert's view of the "administration of the sacraments." If by a "scripturalist" administration of the Eucharist, Hodgkins means one imbued with a Calvinist, Puritan, Perkinsian, Presbyterian emphasis on less wit and more proof texts, then Herbert's view doesn't fit the designation, because it is marked by an infusion of the priest's being "at a stand with himself" and confused, full of wonder and mystery rather than at a loss for a relevant scripture. Herbert doesn't advise the novice "countrey parson" to think of proof texts concerning "this great work" (258). Rather, he is awed by the priest's primary function here: "to receive God . . . to break, and administer him." That is, the priest, not the congregation, "is at a stand"—confused—because it is he who, "[e]specially at Communion times . . . as being not only to receive God, but to break, and administer him." Now, it is important to recognize this personalization of the Host ("him"). The priest receives the Host, but he also breaks "him," and in so doing breaks the Body of Christ in order to "receive and administer him." Herbert's characterization doesn't speak of bread and wine, or of recalling an event 1600 years past. His figure is that of breaking, and what is broken—the body of "him"—is not only "the feast, but the way to it" (257-8).

Likewise, when we look closely at Herbert's instructions about baptism, we find that they are not particularly "scripturalist" either:

> He [the priest] willingly and cheerfully crosseth the child, and thinketh the Ceremony not onely innocent, but reverend. He instructeth the God-fathers, and God-mothers, that it is no complementall or light thing to sustain that place, but a great honour, and no less burden, as being done both in the presence of God, and his Saints, and by way of undertaking for a Christian soul. (258)

Hodgkins doesn't say what "scripturalist" or Calvinist or Protestant warrant Herbert cites—or what biblical warrant he *could* cite—for crossing the child at all, much less "willingly and cheerfully." Herbert praises the ceremony as "not onely innocent, but reverend," because many Calvinists, including Calvin, would not have approved. That is, he defends an Anglican practice, but not with a biblical citation. John the Baptist didn't "sign" Christ

when he baptized him in the Jordan; rather, God sent a sign of his approval in the form of a descending dove, not a cross. What is "scripturalist" about this conception of the two Anglican sacraments? What is Protestant or Calvinist—or even especially "reformed"—about making the sign of the Cross? As for the witness of the saints, what did Calvin say about them? Remember, the priest signs the child "in the presence of God, and his Saints." How many Calvinist or Protestant saints *could* have witnessed this willing and joyful, if in fact not biblical, sign of reverence?

Hodgkins argues that there is such a thing as "Herbert's language of a Protestant `priesthood,'" evidence of which entails believing that Herbert rejected the Elizabethan "hierarchical privilege in English country life" (108). The focus of his claim is on the theological significance of Herbert's protracted progress toward the priesthood, which Hodgkins finds "strongly Protestant" in its implications (128). In line with this thesis, stanza 1 of "The Priesthood" concerns Herbert's delay in being ordained. Then, with Bernard and Perkins, the poet "passes over sacramental duties" of the priest for a more Protestant interest in preaching (131):

> But th' holy men of God such vessels are,
> As serve him up, who all the world commands:
> When God vouchsafeth to become our fare,
> Their hands convey him, who conveys their hands.
> O what pure things, most pure must those things be,
> Who bring my God to me! (25-30)

Again, it is not clear what is particularly Protestant about these lines. If any poem reminds one of the compactly compressed ironies of "The Sacrifice," it is "The Priesthood," perhaps because, as Rosemond Tuve some time ago pointed out, the Good Friday Complaints were intoned by the priest:

> See, they lay hold on me, not with the hands
> Of faith, but furie: yet at their commands
> I suffer binding who have loos'd their bands. (45-47)
>
> . . .
>
> Then they condemne me all with that same breath,
> Which I do give them daily, unto death. (69-70)
>
> . . .
>
> *It is not fit he live a day*, they crie,
> Who cannot live lesse then eternally. (98-99)
>
> . . .

> They buffet him, and box him as they list,
> Who grasps the earth and heaven with his fist . . . (129-30)

Despite the liturgical echoes, Hodgkins employs "The Priesthood" to demonstrate Herbert's "Protestant" sensibility, this on the grounds that Herbert distinguishes *presbyter* from *sacerdos*. This fact, in turn, supports his view that Herbert doesn't think of the Eucharist as "mystical," but rather in the "Protestant" manner, as an occasion to exercise such Protestant virtues as faith and holiness. It is at just such junctures that Hodgkins could do with a rereading of C. A. Patrides' "A Crown of Praise: The Poetry of Herbert."[4] Not only does Patrides perceptively suggest that "[t]he Eucharist is the marrow of Herbert's sensibility" (17), but he reminds us, too, of how, in the contention about the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament, Herbert—and Anglican divines generally—sought to evade a strict, theological precision:

> While Calvinists claimed that Christ is present solely through the communicant's faith, Roman Catholics asserted (as a rather crude formulation had it) that he is present 'not only to fayth, but also to the mouth, to the tongue, to the lips, to the flesh, to the bowells of all Communicants'. Characteristically eschewing both extremes, Anglicans proclaimed in flexible if vague fashion that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are really and actually and substantially present and taken in the Eucharist, but in a way which the human mind cannot understand and much more beyond the power of man to express.' (17-18).

Too often missing in Hodgkins' book is attention to Herbert's subtlety when dealing with theological distinctions, a subtlety that is only pointed up in atypical examples, such as his unusual insistence on the ceremonial observances in "Lent."

Herbert is "flexible if vague" on some of the very things that Hodgkins hammers home as "Calvinist" and "Protestant" and "Puritan." Herbert may be less "flexible if vague" in "The Priesthood" than he is in "The Agonie," where the language allows for a range of interpretation of the manner of Christ's "Real Presence" in the sacrament, including transubstantiation: "Which my God feels (present tense) as bloud; but I, as wine." This is not to say that Herbert believed in transubstantiation (he didn't), but only that the

figurative language of the poem allows for a wide range of possible inferences regarding the mystery. In "The Priesthood," the figure is not one of the present tactile sensation of feeling liquid (blood and wine); nor is it, as Hodgkins claims, referring to his earlier discussion of communion, "spiritual rather than physical" (134). For that matter, even the efficacy of Hodgkins' contrast between spiritual and physical isn't clear. In any event, the figures of "service" and "Fare" designate the holy office of the Eucharist, according to the rite prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. The figure of "ascent" on which Hodgkins rests his earlier discussion of Herbert's Calvinist interpretation of the sacrament doesn't seem to fit here either. Rather, the "fare" to be consumed is "served," delivered by priests ("Who bring my God to me!").

Perhaps the most doubtful aspect of *Authority, Church, and Society in George Herbert* is the sense that Hodgkins would encourage that "Herbert seems inwardly at odds" with himself and with the liturgy of the Church of England. He often refers back to his discussion of "Lent," as if he has proven his point and can proceed on that basis. And he distorts the rhetoric of many Herbert poems: Herbert's speaker never advises anyone to "obey unquestioningly," only willingly. He implies that Herbert delivered his priestly offices with a Calvinist suspicion of the sacraments, which he Protestantized in every way he could. But in the absence of evidence of Herbert's discontent with the Book of Common Prayer, this insistence that Herbert "passes over the sacramental is the most unlikely aspect of his argument. In the Book of Common Prayer, the priest is instructed to be liberal toward the poor, to help the sick and dying, and to assist in such matters as writing the will. These injunctions do not conflict with advice given in *A Priest to the Temple*. The Book of Common Prayer lays out the liturgy, not only for Lent, but for private baptism and private communion for the sick, services for which Calvin, but not Herbert, disapproved. Again, as Amy Charles points out, although Herbert is seldom argumentative in these controversial matters, he is quite firm on perhaps the most important liturgical issue of the time:

> [Herbert] is . . . specific, though far from argumentative (let alone belligerent), in urging the most important of the Laudian practices, that of drawing near the altar and kneeling for Communion rather than remaining seated at the nave, or even coming to the chancel but declining to kneel.[5]

Herbert is, of course, not only specific but succinct on the subject: "The Feast indeed requires sitting, because it is a Feast; but man's unpreparednesse asks kneeling" (259). In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, the Book of Common Prayer stipulated that, when parishioners were too ill to receive the sacrament, the priest could take it for them. And if a sick person should "feele his conscience troubled with any weighty matter," the priest was instructed to invite him to "make a speciall Confession," after "which confession, the priest [was to] absolve him after this sort":

> Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners which truely repent and beleeve in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by his authority committed to mee, I absolve thee from all thy sinnes, In the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghoste, Amen. (1630, Q2)

It is no wonder that, with such responsibilities, one entering the priesthood might experience misgivings, or that he would express occasional doubts about his own worthiness "to break, and administer" God Himself. Be that as it may, it distorts Herbert's role as a priest to suggest that he "passed over" its sacramental duties for preaching. If anything got "passsed over" in administering the sacraments and on such occasions as the Visitation of the Sick, it appears that it was preaching.

It is too much to say that "strong evidence in Herbert's poetry suggests that he had deep ambivalence about the established church of his day as a secure bastion of godliness" (183-84). I am not sure that in "The British Church" we find even weak evidence of superficial ambivalence toward Herbert's "dear Mother" or her "perfect lineaments and hue."

In "Church-rents and Schismes," he does register concern regarding "debates and fretting jealousies." But there is nothing particularly Calvinist—or "peculiarly Protestant"—about that.

University of California, Riverside

Notes

[1]"Investigating Herbert Criticism," *Renascence* 45.3 (Spring 1993): 135-140.

[2]All citations from Herbert in my text are from *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. F. E. Hutchinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953; 1st pub. 1941).

[3]I assume that the definite article of *The Priest to the Temple* (1n), in Hodgkins' only reference to the title of this work, is simply a misprint and not an aspect of Oley's revision missed by later editors.

[4]*The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. C. A. Patrides (London: Dent, 1974), 6-26.

[5]Amy M. Charles, *A Life of George Herbert* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), 233.