THE TEMPLE IN HERBERT'S *TEMPLE*

Grant Garber

> All the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. (Eph. 2.21)[1]

Rosemond Tuve has said that George Herbert is "second to none in his achievement of artistic unity within the bounds of the single short poem, and each of these is again part of the aesthetically notable larger unity of his whole book."[2] The larger unity Tuve speaks of is echoed in the title of the book, *The Temple*, which Herbert uses as a symbol of the Christian church. The three sections of *The Temple*, entitled "The Church-Porch," "The Church," and "The Church Militant," have been variously expounded by modern readers, some of whom have too rigorously sought to identify them with the three parts of the Hebraic temple—the court, the holy place, and the holy of holies. As Barbara Lewalski has charged, they "have often tried to fit Herbert's structure to these terms as to a Procrustean bed."[3] Such a stretching of Herbert is, I believe, unnecessary, for as Tuve has accurately observed, the unity of *The Temple* "is an organic unity which can take care of the phenomenon of growth and change, rather than a constructed unity wherein each single classifiable part has its inevitable place."[4]

On the other hand there are those who would deny that Herbert ever intended the three sections "to share an interconnection." The evidence Lee Ann Johnson cites in support of this contention is flimsy:

> That Herbert never intended the poem ["The Church Militant"] to share an interconnection with the two preceding sections of the volume is supported by the early manscripts, and the inability of scholars to establish an integral link

[1] All quotations of the Bible are from the King James Version, 1611.

[2] *A Reading of George Herbert* (Chicago, 1952), pp. 201-202.

[3] *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton, 1979), p. 287.

[4] Tuve, p. 202.

> between "The Church Militant" and the body of preceding poems offers further argument for consideration of the poem as a separate entity. In view of this evidence, then, "The Church Militant" must be regarded as a separate composition structurally unrelated to the poems preceding it in *The Temple.*[5]

She quotes F. E. Hutchinson's note to

> *The Church Militant.* A new section of the 1633 volume, as also of both MSS., is marked by the use of "The Church Militant" as the page-heading for all that follows, as well as by FINIS after the preceding poem. In B there is a blank page between the sections, and in W five blank pages.

She then quotes Hutchinson again, who observes that "W has one advantage over the later manuscript [B] in having been overseen and corrected by the author."[6] She assumes from this that the poet must have sanctioned the five-page detachment of W, falsely implying that the one-page detachment of B does not carry the author's authority. This is misleading. For on the same page that Hutchinson points out W's *one* advantage, he concludes that "B brings us nearer the author's text than anything else that survives, and therefore its readings have the first claim on our respect." He then informs us that he has "resisted the temptation to adopt any words from W except in three instances." So although W may have been the only manuscript Herbert actually handled, B is the one which represents the "author's final judgment" because the corrections incorporated into B (except for a few "slips" as Hutchinson calls them) were probably supplied to the copyists by Herbert himself.

All this is critically important to the present topic because if W were in fact *the* manuscript sanctioned by Herbert, then no such book called *The Temple* would exist, there being no title to W, only to B and the first edition of 1633. But if B is our authoritative text, as Hutchinson says it is, then we ought to assume that the title to the book is Herbert's own invention and that all three sections do in some way relate back to the controlling concept of the temple, no matter how many blank pages may separate them. As Valerie Carnes has said:

[5] "The Relationship of 'The Church Militant' to *The Temple*," *SP* 68 (1971), 205-206.

[6] *The Works of George Herbert* (Oxford, 1941), p. lxxi. All quotations of Herbert are from this edition.

> Perhaps the best key to Herbert's intended principle of unity in *The Temple* is to be found in the title of the book itself. Throughout the various poems, the physical temple itself remains the collection's presiding metaphor, existing simultaneously as the Hebraic temple, the Christian church universal, the physical church of Herbert's own day, the human heart, and finally, the poems themselves as God's dwelling place.[7]

But even without the title, which I'm *not* willing to relinquish, the three sections were obviously interrelated in Herbert's mind as being different aspects of the church. It remains for the reader to keep that dominant theme in mind while reading the individual poems; for although many of them might seem to a modern reader to bear little or no relation to the church, in Herbert's schema they must have been relevant or he wouldn't have included them. We can say this of Herbert with a reasonable measure of confidence because he would often entitle a poem without mentioning it explicitly in the body–e.g., the "Jordan" poems, "The Pulley," "The Pearl," and "The Collar"–yet we know that all such titles operate as metaphysical conceits governing the poems' development. We can and ought to say the same for each of the three sections and also for the book as a whole.

Having now responded to Johnson's contention regarding the manuscripts and its titular implications, I am ready to accept the challenge of producing the missing "integral link" between "The Church Militant" and the rest of *The Temple*. I shall attempt to establish the coordinates of that integral link in the dimensions of both time and space, both geo- and topographical space as well as architectural and artistic space.

Rosemond Tuve has said that Herbert "reads history and biblical story as one great web of metaphor."[8] Nowhere in *The Temple* does Herbert weave his web of metaphor to encompass more time and space than in "The Church Militant." Adopting the form of Donne's "Anniversaries," Herbert traces the progress of the church-sun temporally from the shadowy days of its pre-figuring in Old Testament typology through its zenith in the New Testament reality all the way to its final setting prior to "Christ's last coming" (l. 231). Spatially, he sees the church's testimony moving constantly from east to west throughout history, moving from Egypt to Greece to Rome to Germany and to England before continuing on to America and finally arriving back to the east where it all started. Following the church-sun

[7] "The Unity of George Herbert's *The Temple*: A Reconsideration," *ELH* 35 (1968), 506.

[8] Tuve, p. 117.

metaphor from east to west is the sin-darkness trope. It begins its progress in Mesopotamian Babylon, finds its most sinister expression in the new Babylon of Romish popery, and then . . . the rest should be obvious.

Commenting on the scope of "The Church Militant," G. J. Weinberger has noted that it "represents, in effect, a shift in Herbert's attention from the individual road to salvation to the historical road."[9] If we consider this acute observation in light of the opening lines of "The Church Militant," what can we conclude about Herbert's intention in attaching this long and unusual poem to *The Temple*?

> Almightie Lord, who from thy glorious throne
> Seest and rulest all things ev'n as one:
> The smallest ant or atome knows thy power,
> Known also to each minute of an houre:
> Much more do Common-weals acknowledge thee.

It seems to me that there is an enlargement of vision occurring at the poem's outset. Herbert is asking the readers to try to conceive of a God that can view the span of all time at a single glance.[10] As John David Walker has said, "here the point of view is that of an omniscient being who in one glance perceives the sweep of human history."[11] In attempting to conceive of such a being, the readers must enlarge their own visions to include whatever belongs to history, both past and future history.

[9] "George Herbert's 'The Church Militant,'" *Conn R* 4 (1971), 49.

[10] Cf., "The Glance" stanza 3:

> If thy first glance so powerfull be,
> A mirth but open'd and seal'd up again;
> What wonders shall we feel, when we shall see
> Thy full-ey'd love!
> When thou shalt look us out of pain,
> And one aspect of thine spend in delight
> More then a thousand sunnes disburse in light,
> In heav'n above.

Here, "The Glance" indicates more than "thy first glance" described in stanzas 1 and 2, comprehending also that "one aspect of thine," which is capable of spending more delight than "a thousand sunnes disburse in light,/ In heav'n above."

[11] "The Architectonics of George Herbert's *The Temple*," *ELH* 29 (1962), 298. Although Weinberger, p. 49, rejects this observation in particular, the "Almightie Lord" seeing and ruling all things from his "glorious throne" compels its acceptance.

As Stanley Stewart has said in his article, "Time and *The Temple*," "'Church Militant' is an apocalyptic poem; its tone is detached and austere because its speaker sees the past, the present, and the future with equal clarity." This shift in time perspective, says Stewart, is indicated by the grand "FINIS" at the end of the "Church."[12] "The Church Militant," therefore, (the poem, not the actual church militant) speaks from the timeless "vantage point of Divinity" that it assumes at the outset.[13] From this "point" *out of* time, the church militant itself appears to a modern eye like a struggling corporation whose eventual and complete merger with eternity and the church triumphant is inevitable. Annabel Endicott and Stanley Fish in fact thought that the poem would have been called "The Church Triumphant" if it was meant to signify the perfect and complete church, but of course it wasn't. Herbert invokes the timeless and perfect perspective of the Divinity only in order to get a clear look at that imperfect portion of the church which moves through time, and not prematurely to absorb the entire church militant into its glorified partner.[14]

Yet when Stewart advocated a time shift, he unfortunately was not willing to acknowledge the corresponding shift in spatial perspective: "'Church

[12] "Time and *The Temple*," *SEL* 6 (1966), 97-110. Cf., Rev. 10:

> 5 And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven,
> 6 And sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer:
> 7 But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.

[13] Carnes, pp. 520, 523.

[14] "The Structure of George Herbert's *Temple*: A Reconsideration," *UTQ* 34 (1965), 230-236. *The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing* (Berkeley, 1978), p. 144. I prefer Walker's suggestion, p. 299, for "why this section is called 'The Church Militant' rather than 'The Church Triumphant'":

> Since Herbert unites the Biblical descriptions of the tabernacle and the temple in forming the structure of *The Temple*, a possible answer may be in Thomas Fuller's statement that as "the moving tabernacle typified the Church Militant; so the Temple resembled the Triumphant. . . ." *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* (London, 1650), p. 361.

Militant' follows 'The Church' in time, though not in space; the transition between the two poems does not have, as comparison with the Hebrew temple suggests, a spatial aspect."[15] Leaving aside for the moment the issue of the Hebrew temple, let us glance once more at the opening lines of "The Church Militant," where if God knows "each minute of an hour," he also knows every "atome" in *space*, including all the "Common-weals."

In "The British Church" Herbert had reached a plateau of sorts between the extremes of Roman Catholicism, "She on the hills," and radical Protestantism, "She in the valley." This poem should tell us that Herbert spatially or topographically limits his concept of "The Church" to the British Commonwealth's prescription for Protestantism. Although many, even most, of the experiences that he speaks of in "The Church" are typologically universal and, therefore, applicable in a sense to all Christians (or even, bleeding the matter of faith, to all readers), there is still this spatial or geographical limitation to be reckoned with. For his time Herbert believed that the British church was *it*:

> 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.

The two dimiters of this final stanza afford the Briton plenty of time—"And long may be"—to walk the via media and plenty of elbow-room too in which to walk it—"And none but thee." It almost seems here as though the sun will never set on the British church!

But with the enlargement of our temporal vision at the outset of "The Church Militant" comes a corresponding spatial enlargement. The true church is no longer limited to England. In their time, though no longer, Greece, Rome and Germany all bore the ark of testimony upon their ecclesiastical shoulders; and in the future, America will carry it (ll. 235-248). It seems to me that what Herbert has accomplished here in the transition from "The Church" to "The Church Militant" is the integration of his own British church into the vast complex of the universal church. Some readers have already cogently argued that the transition from "The Church-Porch" to "The Church" involves the integration of the individual into the communal

[15] Stewart, p. 98.

life of the church,[16] but no one has yet noted that *The Temple*'s consummate transition from "The Church" to "The Church Militant" entails the incorporation of the particular British church into the cosmic or universal church. Although its "place in the sun" is strictly circumscribed, the British church definitely has the ascendancy for a time as do others in their turn: "They have their times of Gospel ev'n as we" (l. 248).

Herbert's notion of the relationship between the cosmic and local churches seems, then, to be informed by certain Pauline ideas as received in Protestant exegesis. The terminology of John Saltmarsh (*The Smoke in the Temple*, 1646) helps to define the perfection of the church militant or visible church as a continuing process of edification in strict relation to the triumphant or invisible church:

> The invisible or mystical Church is made up of pure living stones; all is spiritual . . . and as it is here, in this spiritual, invisible, glorious building; so it is in the outward, visible Communion below, or building here, which is the Image of that above: The Temple here is according to that Pattern there; and as that is of true, real, essentially spiritual living stones; so the Church here is to consist of such as visibly, formally, and outwardly appear so. . . .[17]

But the "apostle Paul"[18] himself gives the idea its definitive expression in the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 2:

> 19 Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the house-hold of God;
> 20 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;
> 21 In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:
> 22 In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

[16] Elizabeth McLaughlin and Gail Thomas, "Communion in *The Temple*," *SEL* 15 (1975), 111-124.

[17] Quoted by John S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford, 1970), p. 95.

[18] Opinion is divided as to whether Paul or one of his followers actually wrote the epistle, but in any case, it is squarely within the early Pauline tradition. See C. Milo Connick, *The New Testament: An Introduction to Its History, Literature, and Thought*, 2nd ed. (Encino, 1978), pp. 332-333.

Both Paul and Saltmarsh make the same indissoluble connection between the universal (invisible) and the particular (visible) churches that Herbert makes in "The Church Militant" by speaking of the church militant from the triumphant position. They make no distinction between the inherent natures of the "two churches" because the only thing that differentiates them is the external manifestation that constitutes the church militant. This makes possible a sense of integration for every particular church, since each belongs to the entire "holy temple" and possesses all its invisible, but powerfully dynamic, virtues. Every church has its own plot of ground where it inherits all the validity of the cosmic church for as long as it can maintain the covenant, and where it becomes in effect the local executor of the New Testament. Covenant theology as expressed by Paul and understood in the Reformation is thus at the heart of the temple symbolism inherited by Herbert, just as the law of the old covenant was in the holiest place of Solomon's temple.

This brings us back to *The Temple*'s spatial relationship to the Hebrew temple. Most critics have rejected John D. Walker's view in his "Architectonics" that there is a direct correspondence between the three sections of the Hebraic temple and the three sections of Herbert's *Temple* because "The Church Militant" just doesn't seem to fit the holy of holies as "The Church-Porch" does the court and "The Church," the holy place. And if we restrict our concept of the temple to the Old Testament one, then I must agree. But Herbert did not think of his *Temple* as being identical with the old Jewish temple. In the poem "Sion" Herbert first describes the temple of Solomon in glowing terms but afterward rejects it, "Yet all this glorie, all this pomp and state/Did not affect thee much, was not thy aim." Instead, he notes that God's new temple is in the heart, "And now thy Architecture meets with sinne; /For all thy frame and fabric is within."[19] As in "The Church-floor"–"Blest be the Architect, whose art/Could build so strong in a weak heart"–Herbert redefines the temple in spiritual terms; or in other words, he interiorizes it.

In *The Living Temple* Stanley Fish in fact uses "The Church-floor" as his model for explaining "The Rhetoric of Templehood." He says that the "poem is paradigmatic in several respects":

> 1. It presents an architectural metaphor that is subsequently internalized.

[19] See Walker, p. 299: "God's architecture is the individual who is in himself the 'frame and fabrick' of God's temple. By absorbing the archetypal Jewish temple, the individual Christian becomes its reality."

> 2. The metaphor has reference finally to the building of a structure in the heart, or to the building of the heart into a certain kind of structure.
> 3. Just such a structure is built up in the heart of the reader who enters the poem in search of significances (that is what a reader *does*) and finds in the end that he himself is their repository.

Fish's thesis for the book "stated simply" is that "the temple of Herbert's title is the 'spiritual Temple' that is built up by catechisms to be the dwelling place of God."[20] This catechismal argument becomes especially pertinent when we review Herbert's own assertion in *A Priest to the Temple* that the parson's purpose in catechizing is "to infuse a competent knowledge of salvation in every one of his flock" and "to multiply and build up this knowledge to a spiritual Temple."[21]

The idea of a "spiritual Temple" or the temple internalized did not, however, sufficiently impress Fish, as it should, with the necessity of a New Testament understanding of the holy of holies and its possible correspondence to "The Church Militant." He unfortunately confined his understanding of the holy of holies to the Old Testament temple, even though he saw the temple in Herbert's *Temple* as a thoroughly New Testament habitation. He forgot to reconsider Walker's thesis in the light of his own contribution to our knowledge of *The Living Temple*. If the temple itself is interiorized in the New Testament catechistical rhetoric, as Fish has amply documented, hasn't the holy of holies also undergone some sort of alteration in the process? It certainly has, and it is that very change of status which constitutes the origin of the New Testament progress of the church militant in Herbert's "Church Militant."

In the Old Testament the holy of holies was an enclosed compartment within the temple into which no one but the high priest could enter—and he only once a year with the sacrificial blood of atonement:

> 6 . . . the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God.
> 7 But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people:

[20] Fish, pp. 54-55.
[21] Hutchinson, ed., pp. 255-257.

> 8 The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. (Heb. 9)

It was thus detached from any possible earthly defilement and wholly unavailable to the people of Israel (except for the fact that the names of the twelve tribes were carved on the jewels the high priest wore upon his garments so that they did make a yearly appearance there by proxy, Exodus 28.9-12, 15-21, 29). Like Endicott's and Fish's view of the church triumphant, it was perfect in itself and full of the Shekinah glory, and only through death could one enter into it. Their objection to "The Church Militant" as holy of holies comes from just this notion of perfection and completion, the lack of which, they say, disqualifies "The Church Militant." In their view only a completely triumphant church could be called the holy of holies;[22] in other words, the holy of holies, like the church triumphant, cannot exist in temporality.

But in the New Testament the holy of holies is unveiled and exteriorized or released from the templed confinement of eternity through the death of Jesus. Both the authors of the New Testament and of "The Church Militant" interpret that event as signaling the New Testament revelation of the *sanctum sanctorum*. Matthew gives this account of his death:

> 50 Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost.
> 51 And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent. (Matt. 27)

To the author of Hebrews, the death of Jesus and the rending of the veil have this revolutionary consequence regarding the sacrosanctity of the inner sanctum:

> 19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,
> 20 By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;
> 21 And having an high priest over the house of God;
> 22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith. (Heb. 10)

Since the veil, which in the Old Testament separated the holy of holies from

[22] Endicott, p. 236. Fish, p. 144.

the rest of the temple, is torn down in the New Testament–the symbolic rendering of Christ's flesh being torn on the cross–there is no longer any separation between what the holy of holies embodies–eternal justification, etc., before the ark of the testament–and the people of God. And Herbert relievedly concurs in "Justice II": "But now that Christ's pure vail presents the sight,/I see no fears."

In the New Testament revelation–"the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament" (Rev. 11.19)–the ark becomes wholly accessible to the faithful; and Herbert, eager to dramatize its instant availability upon Christ's crucifixion, quaintly personifies it in "The Church Militant" as "Religion," which has now "like a pilgrime, westward bent" her journey (grammatically, "bent" here is a verb, though the adjective "bent" punningly resonates):

> Where th' Ark [Noah's] did rest, there Abraham began
> To bring the other Ark from Canaan.
> Moses pursu'd this; but 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.
> But to the Gentiles he bore crosse and all,
> Rending with earthquakes the partition-wall:
> Onely whereas the Ark in glorie shone,
> Now with the crosse, as with a staffe, alone,
> Religion, like a pilgrime, westward bent,
> Knocking at all doores, ever as she went. (ll. 19-30)

Looking at the first two couplets, we can see how Herbert traces the "Ark" in its different forms as what we might call an archetypal symbol of the "old religion," which is finally "fixt" by Solomon in the temple. Switching immediately and significantly to the scene of the crucifixion in the next two couplets, Herbert alludes transparently to Matthew 27.51 with the earthquake and the rending of the veil, "Rending with earthquakes the partition-wall." Then referring to the ark again in the final two couplets, "Onely whereas the Ark in glorie shone," he indicates by the nominative displacement of "Ark" by "Religion" that in his typology the liberated ark signifies a *new* religion, which begins its westward pilgrimmage with the symbolic cross for a staff "Knocking at all doors" or making itself universally acessible along the way.

So although Herbert does not straightly identify the church militant with the old temple holy of holies, he does imply that the church militant of the

new religion follows the ark of the New Testament, *which in effect is the new temple holy of holies*, throughout its earthly journeys. It is thus analogous to the "unfixd" ark in the time of Moses leading the armies of Israel—the so-called "church in the wilderness"[23]—in a 39 year trek toward the promised land. As a matter of fact, Barbara Lewalski has already suggested that "the wandering Ark is the nearest type for the corporate body of the church" and hence for the church militant, but she didn't seem to see the connection between the wandering ark and the holy of holies—its singular resting place without Procrustean bed. By categorically asserting that "Herbert's 'Church Militant' cannot be made to relate to the Holy of Holies in the Old Testament Temple," she has belied the truth of her own cogent observation that "'The Church Militant' is . . . concerned with an external dimension, the constant tribulations of the visible church in this world, typified by the wandering ark which is itself a foreshadowing of the more permanent Temple."[24] Here, she herself has rather neatly established the "impossible" connection between "The Church Militant" and the "Holy of Holies in the Old Testament Temple" by noting that the ark both typifies the church visible and foreshadows the temple. In what part of the foreshadowed, permanent temple does this ark typifying the church militant reside if not in the holiest? The fact that the wandering ark was merely en route to its destination did not disqualify it from being the sole content of the tabernacled holy of holies in the "old religion" prior to its "fixing" in the temple.[25] Neither should readers of "The Church Militant" refuse to recognize *its* association with the ecclesiastical holy of holies in the new religion simply because the process of perfection in the poem is not complete or "fixt" as it would be in a "Church Triumphant."

I realize that my conclusion here resembles that of Fish's analysis in *The Living Temple* in that we both appreciate the appropriateness of an imperfect "Church Militant" as conclusion to *The Temple*. My critical contribution consists in recognizing that the holy of holies functions in "The Church

[23] Acts 7.38. See Num. 10:

> 35 And it came to pass, when the ark set forward, that Moses said, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered; and let them that hate thee flee before thee.
>
> 36 And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel.

[24] Lewalski, pp. 288-289.

[25] The altar of incense served the holy of holies, but wasn't actually within the veil. Cf., Heb. 9.4 and Lev. 31.1, 6-8.

Militant" as the oracle and articulator of both the process and the perfection, of both the building "Work To Be Done" and that which is "Already Done." "The Aesthetic of the Unfinished," as Fish calls it,[26] actually materializes itself for us in the figure of the "pilgrime, westward bent," whose journey toward the "fixt" judgment day is still a long way from completion; but that "pilgrime" being no other than the displaced ark as the new and mobile sanctum sanctorum, does indeed militarize and aestheticize her slow and roundabout, but inevitable, progress toward the perfection of final judgment:

> That as before Empire and Arts made way,
> (For no less Harbingers would serve then they)
> So they might still, and point us out the place
> Where first the Church should raise her down-cast face.
> Strength levels grounds, Art makes a garden there;
> Then showres Religion, and makes all to bear. (ll. 83-88)

> And where of old the Empire and the Arts
> Usher'd the Gospel ever in mens hearts,
> Spain hath done one [to America]; when Arts perform
> the other,
> The Church shall come, & Sinne the Church shall smother:
> That when they have accomplished the round,
> And met in th' east their first and ancient sound,
> Judgement may meet them both & search them round.
> (ll. 263-269)

Then, at the last line before the final refrain of the poem proper, the traveling ark completes the circle back to line one both by the implication of the term "judgement" and according to the solar-revolution trope:

> But as the Sunne still goes both west and east;
> So also did the Church by going west
> Still eastward go; because it drew more neare
> To time and place, where judgement shall appeare.
> (ll. 274-277)

When or where else could judgment appear except in eternity and before the "glorious throne" of the "Almightie Lord" in line one as in Revelation 20:

> 11 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it,
> from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there

[26] These three phrases compose the titles of chapter 2 and section 2 of chapter 4 in *The Living Temple*.

was found no place for them.

12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works?

And where, ultimately, is that throne located if not in the temple holy of holies, whether in heaven or on earth, where the ark does double-service, providing both the repository of the law in its box below and the footstool for the throne of God formed by the wings of the covering cherubim above?[27]

When Herbert employs the phrase "throne of grace" in "Discipline,"

Though I fail, I weep:
Though I halt in pace,
Yet I creep
To the throne of grace,

he may be intimating his espousal of an ark-throne concatenation. For he would expect his readers to recognize here an allusion to the sole biblical appearance of "the throne of grace" in Hebrews 4.16 (where in contrast one ought to "come *boldly* unto" it). Because the Hebrews' context clearly places the throne of grace in the holy of holies with the ark,[28] might not one

[27] See Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 251-259. Cf., Isa. 66.1: "Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?"

[28] 14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession.

15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. (Heb. 4)

19 Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil;

20 Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec [who is also *king* of Salem]. (Heb. 6)

assume that Herbert does so too (or would at least approve of doing so), given his devotion to scripture expressed in the immediately preceding stanza:

> Not a word or look
> I affect to own,
> But by book,
> And thy book alone?

When, therefore, the "glorious throne" appears at the opening of "The Church Militant" and is quickly followed after the significant marital link of lines 9-16 by the Protean manifestations of the ark beginning in line 19, the genesis of the ark becomes apparent. Proceeding from the throne with all the authority of the "Almightie Lord" upon it, it travels its military and priestly round of redemptive ministration (cf., Eph. 5.16, "Redeeming the time, because the days are evil") before finally returning to take its rightful place beneath the irrevocable doom of regal justice.

In order to pursue the idea of the indomitable, wandering ark a little further, let us go back to "The Priesthood," where Herbert mentions it with extreme reverence:

> Wherefore I dare not, I, put forth my hand
> To hold the Ark, although it seem to shake
> Through the' old sinnes and new doctrines of our land.
> Onely, since God doth often vessels make
> Of lowly matter for high uses meet,
> I throw me at his feet.

The poet is recalling here the impertinence of Uzzah, who without being a Levite attempted to steady the ark with his hand when the oxen lugging it stumbled in II Samuel 6. In I Chronicles 15 we learn from King David that the entire incident occurred because they "sought him not after the due order"; i.e., the Levites should have been carrying the ark on their shoulders, instead of the oxen pulling it in a cart. By echoing the terror of David, who

---

> 2 For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.
> 3 And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all;
> 4 Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant.... (Heb. 9)

See also Heb. 10.19-22, quoted on p. 27 of this paper.

"was afraid of the Lord that day, and said, How shall the ark of the Lord come to me" (II Sam. 6.9), Herbert accentuates the terrible absoluteness of God's will, embodied in the ark. The use which the Lord might or might not make of the poet as a vessel of ministry is left totally to the arbitrariness of divine discretion. In other words, if God is to be served, it must be done in His way and no other.

In "Justice I" the poet complains as though to say, "But what am I supposed to do when I can't even understand what the Lord wants with me?"

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

His *way* here seems to be so self-contradictory and capricious that it might truly be said to wander aimlessly as in a wilderness. But the poet's answer in the second and final stanza "turns the tables" upon author and reader in the most significant sense of that cliche:

> But when I mark my life and praise,
> Thy justice me most fitly payes:
> For, I do praise thee, yet I praise thee not:
> My prayers mean thee, yet my prayers stray:
> I would do well, yet sinne the hand hath got:
> My soul doth love thee, yet it loves delay.
> I cannot skill of these my wayes.

"Justice I" thus represents the triumph of God's double-tableted law reflecting and condemning man's sin with a mirror image of his own confusion.

In its companion piece, "Justice II," "the fright and terrour" (l. 1) of the old law or the divine accusation–"Thy hand above did burn and glow,/ Danting the stoutest hearts, the proudest wits" (ll. 11-12)–all this is dispensed with: "But now that Christ's pure vail presents the sight,/ I see no fears" (ll. 13-14). The new justice, given by revelation or the unveiling of the new law from the holy of holies, actually justifies; it does not condemn:

> For where before thou still didst call on me,
> Now I still touch
> And harp on thee.
> Gods promises have made thee mine;
> Why should I justice now decline?
> Against me there is none, but for me much. (ll. 19-24)

These two poems, then, are indicative of the two laws: "Justice I" is the old law of works, "Justice II," the new law of faith: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith" (Rom 3.27).

Wandering back to "The Church Militant," I can now point out that in fact these two laws are crucial to Herbert's temple symbolism in the poem, just as the two tables of the law contained in the ark were central to Solomon's temple (I Kings 8.5-13). After setting up the tension between the religion-sun and sin-darkness figures, Herbert claims that the two Babylons as the old and new manifestations of sin have made it their business to oppose "the law and grace" in their respective testaments: the old eastern Babylon vs. the Old Testament law, and the new western Babylon vs. New Testament grace. While Annabel Endicott and L. A. Johnson have complained that the ark is never mentioned again after line thirty,[29] we can see here that its contents are not dropped, but rather given primary significance in the controversy between light and darkness:

> Thus Sinne triumphs in Western Babylon;
> Yet not as Sinne, but as Religion.
> Of his two thrones he made the latter best,
> And to defray his journey from the east.
> Old and new Babylon are to hell and night.
> As is the moon and sunne to heav'n and light.
> When th' one did set, the other did take place,
> Confronting equally the law and grace. (ll. 211-218)

Herbert further complicates this already confusing (Babylonish) homology by arguing that as the temple of Solomon, after it was destroyed by the old Babylon, could not be rebuilt on the same scale, so the church, after it was corrupted by the new Babylon, Rome, has not been restored by the Reformation to its original purity:

> But as in vice the copie still exceeds
> The pattern, but not so in vertuous deeds;
> So though Sinne made his latter seat the better,
> The latter Church is to the first a debter,
> The second Temple could not reach the first:
> And the late reformation never durst

[29] Endicott, p. 235. Johnson, p. 20.

> Compare with ancient times and purer yeares;
> But in the Jews and us deserveth tears. (ll. 221-228)[30]

The interface between law and grace, temple and church is particularly puzzling because the standard reader expectations from the Christian Herbert demand an assertion that New Testament grace is superior to Old Testament law and the church superior to the temple, just as the new Babylon exceeds the old. But Herbert refrains here from explicit statement in order to preserve the elasticity of the analogy between law and grace, temple and church, by leaving their relationship undefined, or in other words, by re-erecting analytically the "partition-wall" whose "rending with earthquakes" he has already reported in line twenty-six.

I say only "analytically" because, as Endicott has pointed out and Lewalski has confirmed, the veil no longer separates the holy of holies from the holy place; and, therefore, the Christian Herbert certainly would not go to the other extreme and dogmatically re-impose the partition-walls' prohibitive demarcation, which would be tantamount to preferring the promises of Israel contained in the law while withdrawing the blessing of the Gentiles through grace. Accordingly, he expresses his more regular attitude toward any exclusive discrimination favoring the Old Testament in the Latin poem "Velum Scissum":

> In vain you swell with pride, O circumcised, huckster of ritual, parasite of the Temple; for the cloven veil reveals the hidden God, and the boundaries and the sacred limits. He does not merely unify a city, but the whole world: and numbers his altars according to human hearts.[31]

But when Lewalski concluded from the resultant fusion of the holiest with the holy place that "There is not, then, and ought not to be, an 'architectural' counterpoint in Herbert's scheme to the Temple Holy of Holies," she lamentably ignored this attempt by Herbert in "The Church Militant" to include on an equal basis the adherents of the Old Testament law with the New Testament partakers of grace–"confronting *equally* the law and grace." While Herbert usually speakes as a Renaissance Christian critical of Old Testament limitations (as in "Sion"), here is an instance where he sees himself as part of a theologic design that is vaster even than Christianity; and to incorporate the non-Christian Israelites, he must recreate poetically the age in

[30] Cf., Ezra 3.10-13; Haggai 2.3.

[31] Endicott, pp. 230, 236. Lewalski, pp. 288-289. Translation of the poem from Endicott, p. 236.

which grace did *not* operate and when there *was* a veil guarding the secret of faith.

Herbert therefore reconstitutes the veil in line twenty-six by conflating Matthew 27.51 with Ephesians 2.14, noted by Hutchinson as the source for "partition-wall":

> 14 For he [Christ] is our peace, who had made both [Jew and Gentile] one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;
> 15 Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.

By fusing this "partition-wall" from Ephesians with the veil of the temple torn down at the crucifixion in Matthew, Herbert strengthens the temple symbolism in its unifying function (that is what the temple *does*) because Matthew's veil-rending now concomitantly involves the Ephesian synthesis of Jew and Gentile by grace, rather than a mere preference of New Testament over Old. Consequently, Herbert's reading of these scriptures interprets the peaceful fusion of these disparate peoples as a necessary growth or enlargement of the holy temple–something indeed that Paul himself must have had in mind, considering his "growing temple" in verse twenty-one.

For Herbert, then, as for Paul before him, the living temple with its new law of justification abides as a symbol of unity on a grandly historical scale, while in the artistic or aesthetic dimension it provides the poet with a three-part architectural pattern that operates as a super-conceit, successfully unifying the body of his poetry.[32] For although the individual poems are often intensely personal in their devotion, Herbert is constantly aware of the readers "in search of significance" and hopes that their eavesdropping responses will be transcribed in the eternal edifice.[33] Consequently, even in

[32] The integration of these two unities of religious content and artistic form might indeed approximate the transcendent and ineffable "higher unity" that John Crowe Ransom mentions without either grasping or denying it in "Criticism as Pure Speculation," *The Intent of the Critic*, ed. Donald A. Stauffer (Princeton, 1941), pp. 109-110. Cf., Carnes, p. 507: "Throughout 'The Church,' then, we have seen that the poet strives continually and with varying degrees of success to unite, through artistic re-expression of God's symbolic method, form and content," etc. See also Carnes, p. 507: "the analogy between man's religious and aesthetic activity emerges as a predominant theme in *The Temple*."

[33] See his "private ejaculation" in "Obedience":

those poems which seem to have nothing to do either with the temple or the church, Herbert's *Temple* imitates, perhaps even continues, that of Paul by building each of his readers into the overall structure:

> 21 In whom [Christ] all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:
> 22 In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

Some readings are "gold, silver, precious stones" while others are "wood, hay, stubble," but *The Temple* builds them all together in anticipation of the fire of criticism, after which test they remain permanently co-extensive–extending over the same time and space–with the text. Compare I Corinthians 3:

> 9 For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building.
> 10 According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.
> 11 For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.
> 12 Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;
> 13 Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try ever man's work of what sort it is.
> 14 If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.
> 15 If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.
> 16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

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

And compare Henry Vaughan's response in "The Match" to these "holy, ever-living lines": "Here I joyn hands, and thrust my stubborn heart/Into thy Deed" (ll. 1, 7-8).

R. Grant Garber received his B.A. (1979) and M.A. (1980) in English literature at CSU Fresno where he is currently working on a Ph.D. in English. He has recently completed an apocalyptic novel which is an imaginative and satiric treatment of biblical Revelation, called *The Sabbbath Chapter* (sic). Like the present article, it is his first in print, and revolves around the biblical Temple.