When man's creative imagination works in harmony with God's creative design, both the creators, God and man, join hands in shaping and beautifying the world and the human life in it. But to avoid confusion, instead of using the same term 'creator' for both of them, I use the term 'maker' for man and reserve the word 'creator' for God. Their work is in the same direction but they stand on two different levels. Herbert, who writes poems, is a maker of poetry and God, who has created Herbert himself, is the creator. The difference in the level is indicated, but both of them have acted creatively by "bringing into existence of that which did not ever exist previously" (Spearman I).

The identical nature of the creative act both of God and of man is so commonly acknowledged that poets and critics freely interchange the terms "creator" and "maker" between God and artist. Sometimes man is called a creator and is elevated to the position of God, and sometimes God is presented as an artist or a craftsman making things like man. For example, Vicente Huidobro, a
Chilean poet who founded the post war school of "Creationism" and is said to have brought "a sense of godification to the written word" says that as a creator of poetry "the poet is a small God" (Preminger 158). On the other hand, Herbert himself, referring to his own creation by God, calls God his "maker" not "creator". In his poem "The Priesthood" he says that he is "mean stuff", earth and clay, and God is like a potter working with his cunning hand and force of fire.

But Thou art fire, sacred and hallowd fire;
And I but earth and clay ....
Yet have I often seen, by cunning hand
And force of fire, what curious things are made
of wretched earth ... (7-8, 13-15)

So with all humility he throws himself at the feet of God and says:

There will I lie until my maker seek
For some mean stuffe whereon to show his skill.(37-38)

Thus Herbert may talk of God as "my maker" and Huidobro may call the poet "a small God", but I have planned to distinguish between "God, the creator" and "man, the maker" not because they are different and are to be separated, but because they are related and their relation is to be discussed. This relation is the basic subject of this chapter. The relation between the "creator" and the "maker" is significant because, unless it is one of co-operation and harmony the mind or the
imagination of the artist or the maker can hardly qualify to be called CREATIVE.

Etymological analysis shows that the difference between the terms "poet" and the "creator" is only a difference of Greek and Latin. Spearman points out that "the very word 'poet' expresses in Greek what 'creator' does in Latin; that is to say 'he who makes'" (2). For the Homeric and Hesiodic Greeks who had a remarkably developed artistic sensibility "the root 'poieo' or 'to make' was the common word for all sorts of making without distinguishing a figure-maker from a poem-maker or a weaver from a potter. All of them were makers for the Greeks" (Sukla 16). Homer and Hesiod both have used this root to indicate Hephaestus' representation of figures on the shields of Achilles and Herakles (Iliad XVIII.560).

The scope of the term "maker" can also be extended to music. We can call Beethoven a "maker" of music. The music that man makes is in fact the microcosmic representation of the macrocosmic harmony. The latter belongs to God whom we call the "creator", and the former to man whom we may call the "maker".

The scope of the word "maker" can also be extended still further to include crafts and technological devices such as plough, yoke, horse bridle etc. Of course the
Greek had for it one root word "Technazo" as they had the root word "Poieo" for poetry and other fine arts. From "Technazo", which means to contrive cunningly, is derived the word "Technai". It can be called "skilful making". Here, man's effort to contrive cunningly in order to produce tools reminds us of Herbert's lines in the "Priesthood" where he talks of God as a craftsman making "curious things" by his "cunning hands" and "force of fire". In the same poem Herbert addressed God as "my maker". So a craftsman who contrives tools and technological devices with his cunnings hands can also be called "a maker".

Thus a poet or a painter a musician or a craftsman can be called a maker. But, what about Newton, the scientist, whom for some significant reason we have grouped with Herbert. Can Newton be called a "maker" of the law of gravitation? In that act of scientific discovery do we find the bringing into existence of that which did not ever exist previously? Certainly not. Newton discovered a thing which already existed, but was not known. He did not create or make anything new. Nevertheless, it was an act of creative imagination. Describing the function of the creative imagination in discovering scientific laws and inventing new things, Alex Osborn says that the functions of the truly creative
imagination are mainly two fold: "to hunt" and "to change" (50). When the creative imagination hunts, it discovers and when it changes things, it invents or creates. Explaining the function of hunting Osborn says that the creative imagination, like "Aladin's lamp can serve us as a search light with which we can find that which is not really new, but is new to us" (50). Thus, men like Newton lighted up unknown but existent truths such as the law of gravity. This is discovery, rather than invention. We may not like to call this the making of a new thing and Newton a maker. But this discovery leads to invention. Because, to quote Osborn again:

    Just as our Aladin's lamp can be used for light, so it can also be used for heat. As a cooker, imagination can bring together those things or thoughts which are not new of themselves, but can be cooked up into that which is new. In this way, we can do more than discover -- we can invent. (51)

Here, we can say that the scientist has cooked something new and he can be called a "creator" or a "maker" of something that did not exist before. Thus, we see that the artist, the craftsman and also the scientist, all can be called "makers". But generally these activities are called creative and Spearman also uses the term "creative" when he discusses the range of creative imagination in his book Creative Mind. But in his book there is no chance of confusing the man with God. Where
the term "creative" is used only for artists, poets, scientists, philosophers, and statesman. At the very outset he declares that he has excluded the divine world which is vast and intractable and keeps himself strictly confined to the human world which, as he says, is itself in no way less vast. He writes:

We shall venture no Icarus like soaring upto the dizzy heights of the divine. Our topic--through perhaps not without eventual bearing on sublimer regions also -- will for the present run its course on the lower plane of humanity. Not to the supreme being will we dare to raise our eyes, but only to man made in the likeness thereof. (Spearman 1)

But, in case of Herbert when we are to deal with both divine and human regions we will have to do something to distinguish and locate their position and range. We can use terms like the first creator and the second creator or we can refer to them as "God, the creator" and "man, the maker". Mark Akinside discusses and compares the creative power of man and God and explains the relationship between the creation of the artist, whom he calls "the second maker", and the original and ongoing creation of God. He, in fact, to quote Engell "elaborates the renaissance concept of man as the second maker" (Engell 44). Describing the relationship between the
creative artist and the creator of the cosmos, which is one of co-operation and participation, Engell says that it is "joining of the world of spirit with the world of the matter" where the "poets' imagination mediates between ethereal spirit and earthly life" (45). In the case of a poet like George Herbert the poetic imagination mediates between the earthy life of suffering Herbert and the divine world of the benevolent creator. Therefore, while discussing the range of Herbert's poetic or creative imagination, we will not be able to accept Spearman who says "not to the Supreme being will we dare to raise our eyes". Because Herbert is a poet whose creative imagination starts its function, as we know, by imagining that he owes his being and all the qualities that he has, to God. His heart, his mind, his life, and his entire being were such that he not only makes us, but makes everything around us, look up at the creator. We can not but raise our eyes to the supreme being. In his poem "Man's medley" Herbert speaks about the charm and cheer of both the worlds, the world here and the world hereafter and referring to a particular behaviour of birds he writes:

Not that he may not here
Taste of the cheer;
But as birds drink and lift up their head
So must he sip and think
Of better drink. (19-23)
How tender, touching, poetic and elevating is the picture of the birds, jumping to the streams, drinking its water and lifting their eyes up, as if to remember the creator and thank Him for all that He has given them. It reveals with what sort of mind and heart Herbert looks at the natural phenomena. This simple natural scene, besides being highly poetic, has its immense moral appeal. It almost injects into our blood a feeling that we will be very lowly and small if we do not "raise our eyes" to the supreme being. It is a beautiful example of artistic pleasure and spiritual joy working together. Seeing a bird drinking is a common sight. But how beautifully Herbert's imagination works on it: Here, the poet's mind mediates between the phenomenal world and the divine world and produces an idea that did not exist previously. This is creation and the imagination that creates this way deserves to be called creative. In the making of such pleasing poems we find the miracle of the second maker's creative imagination lifting up our minds to the first creator. Here, the creative imagination acts like a flash of communication between God and man, and enables man to transcend the sense, the visible common place reality to go to the ultimate reality, to see God and to enter into Him. Charles Morgan, while discussing the creative imagination of totally different artists like Racine, Shakespeare and Dostoevsky rightly asserts that unless
this ultimate reality or the word "God" has some meaning for the reader, "art can have no meaning, creation no meaning, and imagination no range" (69). Morgan has picked up three artists or writers belonging to different ages and countries and writing in different forms of literature only to demonstrate that in judging the greatness of any work of art we are not to see whether the artist is ancient or modern, classical or romantic, symbolist or naturalist, we are rather to ask whether his work contains the seed of the creative imagination, or not. Because this seed recreates things in the heart of the readers and lifts them up as they originally lifted the writer, to something that is, to quote Logninus, "great and diviner than ourselves" (qtd. in Scott-James 83). So in the poem discussed above Herbert recreates his feelings in our hearts and alongwith birds makes us lift up our heads to God. Here, the word "God" has a great significance or meaning. Therefore, judged by the standard of Morgan's concept of creative imagination, Herbert's art has meaning, his creation has meaning and his creative imagination has range. But how often is this poem discussed? In how many anthologies do such poems figure? Eliot rightly feels that "we can't judge Herbert, or savour fully his genius and his art by any selection to be found in any anthology" (Eliot, 15).
Always a few dull and devotional poems are anthologised and the general impression gains ground that Herbert is a pious soul and a poor artist. But in the poem cited above ("Man's Medley") we find the sensitive artist who opens our eyes and ears to all the aesthetic joys of this visible world and says:

Hark how the birds do sing
And woods do ring. (1-2)

But at the same time he has thus to say of man:

In soul he mounts and flies
In flesh he dies. (13-14)

This poem is both pious and poetic and the creative imagination that has created it, is vast in its range. It not only takes us to the creator but also speaks about God's creative design and scheme behind the creation of the universe and what position he has given to man in comparison with other creatures. Commenting on this poem Hutchinson writes:

Men alone has both joys, those of earth and heaven, where mere sentient creatures (things of sense) have earth only and angels heaven only. (523)

Thus, the rangy creative imagination of George Herbert gives us the understanding of the divine cosmic design behind the creation of man. It shows where man stands in the great chain of creation.
Now, it becomes obvious how much we will lose in understanding and enjoying Herbert if we follow Spearman's advice "we shall venture no Icarus-like soaring up to the dizzy heights of the divine" (1) in the discussion of the range of Herbert's creative imagination. It connects our mind with the creator and views nature, man and his affairs in the perspective of God's cosmic design. Here, we find Herbert's completeness of perception and the wholeness of his creative vision. Now, how did creation take place? Who is the creator? Where did he come from? Did he complete his creation leaving to man only the role of an imitator or did he leave it incomplete to be completed by man, making man's creative act complementary to God's? These are questions that can never be answered by man. They evoke mystic and subjective imaginings that only go to add to the existing confusion about it. Alex Osborn is right when he says:

Although we can understand much of how imagination works, and how to work it better the mysticism of the creative spark can not help but grow on any one who contemplates imagination year after year, as I have done in preparation for this book. (52)

It is for this reason that all rational and scientific thinkers both of the ancient and the modern world prefer to avoid the "dizzy heights of the divine". As in the modern age, Spearman avoids "soaring up to the dizzy
heights of the divine, "so in ancient Greece, Protogoras, the sophistic philosopher said: "About the Gods I am not able to know whether they exist or do not exist, nor what they are like in form" (Sukla 45). But as we have mentioned earlier, in the case of Herbert we cannot afford to avoid that world altogether.

So, our problem is how to soar to these dizzy heights without indulging in personal subjectivity and mystic speculation. All such intellectual and spiritual enquiries having universal significance, should be broad based and as impersonal and objective as possible. Important writers and critics always emphasize that the knowledge of the best that is known and thought in the world is necessary for producing any work of lasting value, either critical or creative. T.S. Eliot, for example, suggests wide reading of books and world history to bring into the individual something "more than the individual" or to extend the sheer "Personal" to the wider "impersonal". Similarly, describing the required mental range of a sound critic, Arnold says that one must go beyond the personal and the national. One must know not only about England but also about the whole of Europe. He goes further and demands that one must also have for one's proper outfit, "a knowledge of Greek, Roman and Eastern antiquity" (115). This will ensure a
'disinterested endeavour' to know the best that is known and thought in the world regarding any matter. Therefore, our present pursuit to know about God's creation and man's creation should be as broad based as possible. In other words we should try to be objective and scientific in dealing with the subject of God's creative design behind the creation of the universe and of man in that universe. This will be quite enlightening and helpful in locating the place, the position and the creative imagination of a poet like George Herbert.

Therefore, instead of indulging in any subjective speculation about God and his creation I shall endeavour, in an impersonal and detached way, to collect and examine all information about the creator and his creation that has accumulated and has come down to us through the ages from three important sources: (a) human imagination, (b) human reason, and (c) God's revelation. I shall also simultaneously examine what relation Herbert and his art have to each of them.

First, let the Greek mythical concept of creation which gives the basic indication of the flight of human imagination in this matter, be examined. The pre-Hellenic myth about the creation of the universe, which is called the Pelasgian creation myth, talks of a goddess creating all things. According to it, creation, as in the case of
human procreation, is not possible by a single being. It must be the result of the union of two separate beings. About the beginning of the creation it says:

In the beginning Euryhome, the goddess of all things, rose naked from the chaos but found nothing substantial for her feet to rest upon and therefore divided the sea from the sky ... dancing lonely upon its waves. She danced towards the South, and the wind, set in motion behind her, seemed something new and apart with which to begin a work of creation. Wheeling about she caught hold of this north wind, rubbed it between her hands, and beheld the great serpent Ophion. Eurynome danced to warm herself, wildly and more wildly, until Ophion grew lustful, coiled about those divine limbs and was moved to couple with her. Now, the North wind, who is called Boreas, fertilizes. (Graves 1)

This imagination appears to be the projection of man's own idea about his own procreation through sexual congress of male and female. There is also the Orphic creation myth. According to this Orphic myth, the black winged Night, a goddess of whom even Zeus stands in awe, was courted by the wind and laid silver eggs in the womb of darkness (Graves 30).

But in all these myths a mature Greek conception of creation is absent. Referring to the mature Greek myth of creation, the Olympian myth, Herodotus writes:

Whence the gods severally sprang, whether or not
they had all existed from eternity, what form they bore--these are questions of which the Greeks knew nothing until the other day". (qtd. in Sukla 7)

"The other day" of Herodotus is the period when the Olympian myth came into vogue. According to this myth

At the beginning of all things Mother Earth emerged from chaos and bore her son Uranus. As she slept, gazing down fondly at her from the mountains, he showered fertile rain upon her secret cleft and she bore grass, flowers, trees with the beasts and birds proper to each .... (Graves 31)

then Uranus fathered the Titans upon her. From the Titan Cronus came Zeus and from him Olympian gods and goddesses were born. They were in human form and they created man after that model. How the Titans and the Olympian gods decided to create man is described by Apollodorus in Bibliotheca (III, IV). Zeus asked Prometheus the Titan to mould men out of earth and water after the images of gods into which Athene (daughter of Zeus) breathed life.

Thus, in the creation of man, according to the Greek Olympian myth, Prometheus is the divine agent. Man and the universe (including the sun, the moon, the stars, the animals, the plants and other things in nature taken together) can be called the work of the divine hand or the art of the first maker. When man, the second maker, makes things for his own comfort, happiness, and
prosperity, he follows the first maker, the Olympian gods, and makes their art the model of his own art. Thus, according to the cosmic conception of Greek mythical imagination, human art is a mimicry of the divine art. All the glories of the human body, beauty, and workmanship that Sophocles sings of are possessed in perfect degree by the gods and are manifested in nature which is the creation of gods. They are mercifully contributed to human beings by the gods and are controlled and guided by them. Here we find what Greek imagination is to say about man's position as a second creator and the ability of man's creative imagination. According to the Greek Olympian myth, the Titans directly help the man. There are two particular divine agents, Athene and Hephaestus, to help mankind in the field of art and craft respectively (Graves 87). So, when man the second maker, makes things both in the field of "technazo" or "poieo" i.e. the useful technical craft and the beautiful objects of fine arts, he is directly helped by the gods who have created man. This is in accordance with Herbert's way of thinking who thinks everything comes to him through divine endowments. He, therefore, as we know, throws himself at the feet of God and says that he will lie there until God seeks "for some mean stuff" whereon to show His skill. Herbert hopes that God will show His
great and grand skill through him who is otherwise only "mean stuff".

Man being the second maker, standing on a lower level will naturally be inferior to the first maker and his making or creation will be inferior to God's creation. This will be discussed elaborately in the next chapter which determines the range of man's creative imagination. Here, we see that the Greek divinities or the Titans who played the role of original artists or the first makers, moulded human form, imitating the forms of gods, but could not provide immortality or eternal life to men. So, the first creator went a step down in his first imitation. When man, the second maker, created a statute or painted a bird he could not give even temporary life to it. So the making or the creation of the second maker can only aspire to be like the creation of the first maker. It can never reach the same level of perfection. Plutarch goes further to show that the second maker or man can not claim superiority to even inferior creatures like spiders, swallows, and nightingales in so far as they represent the first making of the first maker i.e. the creation of the creator. Plutarch, in fact, cites the view of Democritus and writes:

It is ridiculous that we should pride ourselves on powers of learning superior to those of lower creatures since Democritus proves that in the most
important matters we are the pupils imitating the spider in weaving and the swallow in building and melodious birds like swans and nightingales in song. (qtd. in Sukla 21)

The Greeks were, of course, conscious of the narrow and mechanical implication of human art being an imitation of an imitation. Some tried to show that man is more than a mere imitator. He is also creative and his creative imagination is displayed when he makes new things by selection and combination. Some belittle fine arts such as painting and sculpture where man is mere imitator and on the other hand refer to his craftsmanship as creative, because in that field man divises something which he needs and which was previously absent. They are things like a glass to drink water from or a plough to plough the land with. However, we find that according to Greek imagination or Greek myth, God, the first creator, becomes the model for man, the second creator or maker; and all the makings of mankind, that way, become sheer imitation. This is true when God's creation is imagined to be a complete thing and nothing is left to be done by man as something fresh and new. But on the other hand, if we imagine that creation is not a complete act of the divinity but a continuing process which still continues, then some room is left for man to be a maker of new things. In that case, man will also be creative in his
activities and the making of the second maker will be complementary to the original creation of the creator.

This sort of imagination or myth about creation is to be found in Indian myth also. In the Hindu cosmogony as a whole, there is a theory that the creator has not completed his creation and man is not a mere imitator. Something is left for man to carry on the process of creation by applying his creative imagination. It is in the direction of continuing the divine process by working in harmony with God's creative design. A.K.Kumarswamy in his Gradation and Evolution, refers to the Rig Veda and says that "creation is not a single definite act. It is regarded as ever proceeding" (qtd. in Dandekar 152). So here man the second maker gets sufficient room to act creatively and make fresh and new things.

But a Vedic poet also asserts that every thing has been created but once (RigVeda VI, 48-22). Such different and contradictory views thrive simultaneously in mythological imagination. It is a liberal world free from any dogmatic faith in any single idea and allows the human mind to imagine the creator and his creation in any way it likes. Therefore, while discussing Indian cosmogonical speculation Dandekar writes:

Naturally enough we cannot speak of any single uniform cosmogonical theory of RigVeda as such.
It would seem that various explanations about the origin and nature of the universe were put forth, though none of them have been finally confirmed. (151)

This confusion arises owing to two contradictory approaches to the idea of creation. The cosmogonical theme tells of one thing (creation without a personal God) and the mythical legends about gods suggest something else (a personal God creating everything).

According to the general cosmogonical theme there is no such creator creating the universe with a plan and design. Vedic cosmogony, therefore, does not have any "teleological significance". It is perhaps on account of this that the creator as such does not play any prominent role in Hindu religious thought which rarely concern itself with the design, object, or purpose of the world (Dandekar 151). But our poet George Herbert believes in a creation where a personal creator is there who created everything, including Herbert himself, with a conscious creative design and purpose. Herbert has nothing to do with a conception of creation which is without God and without any divine cosmic design. But according to the Vedic cosmogony hinted above, creation usually implies the transformation of the potential into the actual or the establishment of cosmos in the place of chaos. It is in this sense that the principle of "Rta" is often characterised
as the source of the phenomena (RigVeda x,12,l). But at the same time Indian mythical legends about the gods suggest that there is a god, a creator, who has created the universe. It is well known that in RigVeda the creation of the universe is ascribed to various divinities. Reflecting on this contradictory position Dandekar writes: "It must be emphasised at this stage that broadly speaking, in Vedic mythology the cosmogonical themes and the legends of gods do not show any organic unity" (153).

Though the Indian cosmogonical thoughts and creation myths are various, contradictory and confusing and though they overlap all classification, yet the general impression that they leave, enables us to see that, broadly speaking, there are three trends (a) creation beginning with a mythological figure, (b) creation beginning with some material principle such as water, fire, air etc., and (c) creation beginning with some abstract principle such as Rta. In all the stories of creation these three principles are basic. They are either separately emphasized or mixed up and confused. This happens in almost all the ancient cosmogonies such as the Greek, the Egyptian, the Babylonian and the Scandinavian. Though a general awareness about them may provide a useful background for understanding and
enjoying Herbert whose poetry always takes us to the Creator and his creation, with the limited space available and having a specific purpose in hand, I shall not attempt to examine them all. We shall confine ourselves to those aspects of these mythical imaginings that have some bearing on Herbert's way of thinking and creativity.

Out of the three basic principles of creation, the first principle, the principle of a personal God creating the universe, is acceptable to Herbert. The other two principles: the material principle and the abstract principle are atheistic and pantheistic respectively, with which Herbert has nothing to do. But they are important in the world of science and literature, because most of the scientific writers and imaginative poets are either atheistic like Darwin or pantheistic like Wordsworth. But Herbert's poetry, as we shall examine it afterwards, clearly stands apart from pantheism and atheism. His major poems are based on God, the Creator, and on the separation between the Creator and the creation. They are thus different from atheism which denies the creator and pantheism which confuses the creator with His creation. His poem "The Pulley" emphasizes that the Creator must not be confused with the created things. In other words, objects of nature are never to be worshipped as God or as parts of God.
In Herbert's system of the chain of being nature stands below man. It is to serve man and both man and nature are to serve God. In his poem "Man" he says:

That as the world serve us
we may serve thee
And both thy servant be (52-54)

Thus, we see that in the study of Herbert's creative imagination, the atheistic and pantheistic aspect of mythical imagination is to be set aside. The one that remains is theistic i.e. the concept of creation beginning with some mythical figure as creator. In this field if we examine the pre-Olympian and Olympian as well as pre-Vedic and Vedic mythologies, we find that myths and legends are vast, various, contradictory and confusing. But if we pass from Vedic to post-Vedic Brahmana text, we find it more theistic because the other two principles regarding the creation the material principle and the abstract principle, are subdued, and there is a greater emphasis on a single mythological figure "a more patently anthropomorphic all God, namely Prajapati" (Dandekar 162). Of course, here also the cosmogony does not have any teleological significance because there is no suggestion of the creator having any motive or design for creation. However, it emphasizes the presence of a creator, a personal God. Another notable difference in the post Vedic Brahmana text is that all
sorts of legends and myths are given ritualistic orientation. Herbert was temperamentally inclined to this sort of theistic and ritualistic mysticism and most of his poems are based on rituals; of course his God is a Christian God and his rituals are Christian rituals. His imagination was much affected by Christian tradition and its traditional rituals. Though he belonged to an age of developing interest and vital achievements in Science, yet like most of the religious people who have, to quote Newton, "the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind in matters of religion" (qtd. in More 637) Herbert was inclined towards myth, mysticism and rituals. Such religious minded people may belong to the Greek antiquity, to Vedic India or to the modern world. Their conception of the creator may differ. For some, Prajapati may be the creator, for others Brahman may be the first cause, the cause of all causes whom Gita calls the beginningless Supreme (XIII, 12-17). For some, the creator may be Lord Shiva who with his rhythmic dance and music tuned the vast limitless chaos into this ordered cosmos and gave us the phenomenal world. For some, Jesus may be God, the son, the redeemer of mankind. But their theism, their belief in a creator is firm and strong, the link between the first creator (God) and the second creator (man) is well established. The devotional
attachment is genuine, the emotion is sincere, their imagination is found to be intensely active in probing the mysteries of creation till they enjoy a sense of participation with the process of divine creation and themselves become creative. In Hindu mythical speculation: The wise yogies constantly meditate on the all pervading perennial cosmic sound 'OM' and thereby tune their own inner being to the universal consciousness and then realise their oneness with it. Similarly, it is said that the great creative genius, Panini, heard the sound of Shiva's damaruk, tuned his inner being and was, therefore, able to frame the rules of sanskrit grammar. This way, after getting inspiration from and by establishing contact with the divine rhythm and order, Panini could give a perfect order and harmony to the Sanskrit language. Likewise, George Herbert sought or tried to find order, harmony and peace in his own life, which was full of pain and suffering. This is the base from which spring all the activities of his creative imagination and the range of his imagination widens till it reaches the divine. The imagination thus mediates between a suffering man and a benevolent God. When Herbert felt his own affair to be out of tune, his creative imagination worked till he discovered the tune, composed his poetry and gave us the divine music, "the music for a king'. The tune or the relation of accord and
harmony which his creative imagination discovered, is explained in the poem "The Temper". In this poem he imagines that God puts strain on him as a musician strains the musical cords only to produce some fine and fresh music out of him. So, here in this case the poet, a maker of poetic music is assisted by God, the creator of cosmic music:

Yet take thy way; for sure thy way is best
Stretch or contract me thy poor debtor
This is but tuning of my breast,
To make the music better. (21-24)

This sort of creative achievement out of the harmonious link between man, the maker, and God, the Creator is also there in scientific discoveries and inventions. According to Taimini:

When the observing human mind becomes attuned to universal mind a flash of underlying truth can illumine the whole inquiry. Such an intuitive perception may well up slowly as integrated knowledge. (qtd. in Report 80)

The statement that the intuitive perception may come slowly as integrated knowledge reminds us of the two processes of action of the creative imagination discussed in the first chapter, one being intuitional and the other psychological.

The above examples of the sages, the divinely xx inspired Panini and xxx creatively imaginative and
pious Herbert show that in those cases the process of the creative action is intuitional. Here the creative imagination is seen in the perspective of personal faith, devotion and mystic or mythical imagination. It is aroused, coloured and directed by their subjective mood or state of mind which is already formed and is not in the process of formation. For example, in the case of the sages it is the sound 'OM' that echoes in their subjective imagination and tunes their inner being. In the case of Panini, a devotee of Lord Shiva, it is the rhythmic dance of Shiva with the damaruk that tunes the mental action of the great grammarian. In the case of a sincere, sensitive and pious Christian like George Herbert it was the image of Jesu which is associated with crucifixion. It is a very natural and common feeling of Christians that Jesus Christ sacrificed himself on the cross for the redemption of mankind. Herbert connected this idea with the new idea that his Jesu, in full sympathy broke himself into I es U (I ease you) to join, integrate and give comfort to the broken hearted and agonised poet. This way the creative imagination creates or invents new ideas, images or things that are in tune with and are, therefore, complementary to the divine creative scheme.

We have so far discussed imagination, the first source of accumulated human wisdom regarding the creation
of the universe. When we pass to reason, the second source of man's accumulated wisdom, we find that the opinion about creation and the creator is quite different. But the desire to establish a link and achieve co-operation between man, the maker, and God, the creator is also there in order to make man's action truly creative. This examination will enable us to know how far Herbert was reasonable and creative in the exercise of his imagination.

First, it is necessary to understand what reason means. It means, to quote Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary, "the mind's power of drawing conclusions and determining right and truth". According to the Dictionary of Philosophy, "reasoning ability is characterised by the fact that notion enters the process of transformation. Aims and values are seen in the process of their change and the theoretical process is directed to a specific ideal leading to the development of the subject of knowledge of values etc. (Porlov Dictionary 1984). In other words, it is the power of the mind, to understand, to see, to see what is right and practicable, and to form an opinion. It means anything sensible, reasonable and a matter of common sense. According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English to lose reason means becoming...
illogical and irrational". When the imagination presents the mythical image of God having four heads, a hundred hands and double sex, it becomes unacceptable to reason and common sense. So it is rejected by it as unreasonable. This is the difference between reason and imagination. When Dryden says "imagination must have clogs tied to it, lest it outrun judgement" by "judgement" he means reason (qtd. in Engell 35).

Thus human "reason" has produced a considerable mass of rational thinking about the creation of the universe. It can be called philosophical, rational or scientific thinking based on the common foundation of reason and common sense.

This reason or rationalism may stray or degenerate into atheism when it is sceptically philosophical or materialistically scientific. This becomes the case when there is too much of intellectualism. This situation points out the difference between reason and intellect. Forlov explains this subtle difference between reason and intellect in these words: "If scientific research based on intellectual ability alone is contrary to morality and art reason creates the atmosphere of their communion" (Forlov. Dictionary 1984) this problem of difference between reason and intellect is well known and present in all
European History of philosophy, passing from Plato and Aristotle to Spinoza and Leibniz. But here our concern is only reason, which, as we know, rejects fantastic mythological imagination on the one hand, and corrects the atheism of sheer intellect on the other. The atheism of sheer intellect moves in two directions. (a) sceptical philosophy, and (b) materialistic science. So to be reasonable means to be philosophical or scientific. But to be sceptical in philosophy and to be merely materialistic in science could lead to an unreasonable view of things.

Now, let us have a bird's eye view of the role of reason and rationalism in understanding the Creator and His creation in the history of human civilisation in order to know how much civilised and reasonable Herbert was in his emotional and imaginative qualities. In other words how far there was proper unification of sensibility in him and in his creative poetry.

The first stage of Greek rationalism and reason takes us to the pre-socratic Ionian Philosophers of the 6th century B.C. They repudiated the mythical imagination or the mythical concept of the universe and tried to substitute a rational and scientific explanation for it. Till then the highly imaginative works of Homer and Hesiod had been read as the source books of knowledge,
not as works of art having aesthetic interest. When the Ionian rational thinkers (whom Plato was to follow afterwards) challenged their imaginary and fictitious conceptions about the gods and creation, these thinkers were mistaken for such rationalists who were against religion and poetry. But religion and poetry, in fact, were not their main target.

The first thing that they attacked is the understanding of the universe in the light of human activities, that it is created by the gods in a process similar to either sexual generation or artistic creation, such as a potter designing pots out of clay, water and fire. Xenophane criticised these "anthropomorphic" views about gods and declared that gods have no resemblance to man (Sukla 32). We find the echo of this ancient rationalism in the modern thinker, George Bernard Shaw. In his essay "Future Religion" Shaw criticises the evangelical concept of God as "an old man having white beard" (107). These are all projections of sheer personal and subjective speculation or imagination having no reason or rationality behind it. We can not challenge a man who thinks that God is not an old man having white beard, but a very young man having no beard. Xenophane's observation in this context, is quite interesting. He writes:
The Ethiopians make their gods black and snub-nosed; The Thracians say theirs have blue eyes and red hair: Yes, and if oxen and lions and horses had hands and could paint with their hands, and produced works of art as men do, horses would paint the forms of gods like horses and oxen like oxen and make their bodies in the image of their several kinds. (qtd. in Russell 119)

But it will be wrong to think that the rational thinkers of the 6th century B.C. were atheists. They acknowledged that the ultimate reality is all powerful, ever existing and omnipresent which would be self-sufficient to bring an order in the diversities. It would have no death, no suffering, nor any of the human passions. According to Xenophane "There is one God, among gods and men the greatest, not at all like mortals in body or in mind" (qtd. in Sukla 32).

So far as the conception of the creator and the creation is concerned they had their rational and logical approach to it. They argued that the effect with all its visible sensuous detail is not anticipated by its cause. God has no shape because a sensuous shape is fluctuating and changing. God must be a changeless cause to retain order among the changing effects (Sukla 32-33). In this matter they always appealed to reason and wanted to correct the current belief regarding the ultimate reality.
and its relation with the commonplace reality of the phenomenal world. If we examine their views we find that the creative process moves from the ultimate reality to the phenomenal world of commonplace reality; and again from the phenomenal world of commonplace reality to the world of human art and science. In the first case the creative role is played by God and in the second case by Man.

Thus, these rationalists did not reject God. They believed in a creator who was created the universe. But they rejected the mythical gods of Homer as they were the products of human imagination as opposed to human reason and rationalism. Otherwise they were not against God, religion and poetry. A parallel situation is noticeable in the 17th century between Isaac Newton and George Herbert. Newton with his highly rational and scientific mind rejects Herbert's God, Jesus Christ. But he was never against God, nor poetry. So, when the Ionian rationalists rejected Homer's gods it would be wrong to infer that they were against religion and poetry. They were as religious as Newton who rejected Herbert's Jesus. Now, we come to the conclusion that in the reasonable world of science and rationalism thinkers and scientists are of the opinion that there is a God and when this visible phenomenal world of commonplace reality was created the creative role was played by God. When art or
science is created out of this phenomenal world of commonplace reality, man plays the creative role. The relation between these two creators is naturally one of participation and harmony that carries on the music of creation.

As the first creator who was self sufficient, good, and well ordered put limits and gave form, proportion and harmony to primeval matter while creating this phenomenal world, so the second creator puts limits and gives order to unlimited facts and matters of this phenomenal world when his mind acts creatively producing art and science. The demand for human initiative and human freedom in matters of creative activity advanced with the advancement of rational philosophy among the ancient Ionian philosophers. For example, Xenophane, the Ionian, held that it is man who takes the initiative, seeks, and finds. He may not create entirely new things, but can at least improve upon God's creation. This humanism developed till it reached its apex in Socrates. Socrates drew attention to the practical interest of man. He was not a metaphysician running after the knowledge of ultimate reality which was Herbert's sole aim. However, on the mundane plane both Socrates and Herbert wanted the same thing - goodness of character and conduct in day to day affairs. Socrates was so pragmatic, calculative and
utilitarian that he did not praise or support fine arts, because he found them useless and sheer imitation. For him art or craft like making a glass to drink water or a plough to cultivate land are useful and creative. If he had love for any art it was the art of knowing how to live well which was also one of the basic aims of George Herbert. It is to be accepted that shaping of human conduct or building up good character is a great art that needs creative imagination. In the case of George Herbert the role of this creative imagination is so significant that it is discussed in a separate chapter in this dissertation entitled "Man the maker and Man the Doer".

Now going back to the history of rational thinking we find that from the utilitarian and practical outlook of Socrates sprang the sophistic philosophy that came to prevail after the Ionian thinkers and that was mainly concerned with man and his society and was sceptical about God.

But the Ionian thinkers, who were there before the sophists, were not atheists, Plato and Aristotle who came after the Sophists, were also not atheists. They liked much of the rationalism and practicality of the sophists; particularly their assessment of fine arts as sheer imitation which is deceptive and useless and exaltation of productive and creative craft. Therefore,
they separated fine arts from crafts. A successful painting of a bird of a bunch of grapes or a beautiful statute allures the observer who identifies it with the reality only to be deceived at the end, whereas a plough or a bridle is useful and productive. This was the impressive rationalism of the sophists quite acceptable to Plato, but their atheism surprised him. This atheism was the result of too much of intellect and utilitarianism. As we know when sheer intellect "is contrary to morality and art, reason creates the atmosphere of their communion" (Forlov. Dictionary, 1984). Here, Plato, who was the champion of reason, plays the role of creating that atmosphere. An examination of Plato's role, so far as his relation with Socrates is concerned, will help us in locating the range of Herbert's creative imagination in the perspective of the entire philosophical or rational thinking.

Here, we are confronted with the problem of differentiating reason from intellect with reference to personalitis like Socrates and Plato. Our purpose, here, is not to criticise intellect and deify reason, but to see how reason creates the atmosphere of compromise when sheer intellectualism and utilitarianism go against religion and art. In case of Plato and Socrates, Plato reacts against the intellectual atheism of Socrates.
Before Socrates met Plato he had a beautiful dream. He dreamt a cygnet on his knees which flew away with a sweet voice. On the next day Plato was introduced to him. Plato sang the song of reason. For him knowledge of truth is possible only through reason and intelligence. According to Plato's reason and common sense, there are many physical objects but one truth, many phenomena but one idea. God is the efficient force who has impressed these ideas (that exist independent of him and are external to him) upon the unlimited mass of matters and that way the physical or the phenomenal world assumed its form and visibility. To the question "What motive had God in the creation of this world?" Plato answers: "God is good and self ordered. So he brought order by creating this sensible world out of the visible mass of matter moving in a disorderly fashion, by impressing on them ideas and forms, existing independent of Him" (Sukla 58). Thus, here the role of creator or God is emphasized and at the same time the creator is not confused with the creation, because God's ideas have separate and independent existence. They are not gods or parts of God. This way Plato's reason corrects the pantheism of the mythical imagination and at the same time the atheism of the sceptical and purely intellectual sophists. George Herbert enjoys the same position where both pantheism and atheism are avoided.
Thus, according to Plato and other theistic thinkers, God stands at the centre as the supreme artist with His ideas. The vast and unlimited mass of matter is at His disposal. Standing apart He impresses His ideas upon matter, puts limit, order and proportion to it and creates the physical and phenomenal universe. Similarly, man, as the second artist, stands below God with his ideas. The vast unlimited mass of experience, facts, matter and substance are around him. He impresses his ideas upon these matters. He selects, combines, puts limit, order and proportion to them to give us arts and science. These are the fields where the creative power of God and man operates. In this conception of creation a creative artist or scientist of this world follows the supreme creator in applying his creative skill which is itself given to him by the creator. Here man's role is acknowledged and at the same time the divine link is maintained; a very important point to be noted. But in the case of the sophists the emphasis on the human aspect reached its apex. Man, his life, the society in which he lived, and the real visible world around him became so important that God was set at naught. George Herbert, like the Ionians and also like Plato, can never think of this creation without a creator or God. He can accept Socrates quite happily when Socrates says that of all art the royal art is to know how to live well (Sukla 49) because
Hertert, almost consciously, employed his creative imagination in shaping his life, conduct and character as he employed it in creating his beautiful poetry. But unlike the sophists he believed that his creative ability itself was God's gift to him. He feels that, left to himself, he has no worth; he is "some mean stuff". He not only praises God's skill in creating him, but in his own skill as a poet he feels the presence of and always seeks for divine assistance. In his poem "The Elixir" he writes:

Teach me, my God and King
In all things Thee to see,
And what I do in any thing
To do it as for Thee. (1-4)

Thus, Herbert's creative imagination has in it the grace of the Ionian and Platonic divinity as well as the goodness of the Socratian humanity along with his personal poetic quality. In other words, the wide range of Herbert's creative imagination takes in its sweep religion, art and science where they lie well protected from the external onslaught of mystic pantheism and intellectual atheism which make philosophy sceptical and science materialistic and finally leads them to the rejection of God. Thus, Herbert stands as a cultured, reasonable and civilised man having proper unification of sensibility where there is communion between reason and
intellect. In him art, religion and science constitute a single harmonious whole. Generally, what happens or what is likely to happen is that once religion, art and science are secured from the external dangers of confusing mystic imagination and misleading intellectual atheism there begins the infighting between them. The conflict between science and religion, between science and art and between art and religion is well known. But if there is proper unification of sensibility in us, if our personality is well integrated and our imagination truly creative, we can place religion, science and art in such clear perspective that they will become integrated parts of a single whole. George Herbert had that sort of personality. Therefore, his imagination was truly creative and with such creative imagination he held together God the creator (with all his creation and creative designs), Man the maker (with all his makings, such as science and art), and Man the doer (with all his personal, moral conduct) in perfect harmony.

We have discussed the achievements of reason and rationalism by examining the pre-Ionian thinkers, Ionian thinkers, post-Ionian sophists and finally Plato and Aristotle. We have seen the position of Herbert's creative mind against the background of ancient thinking and philosophy. If we put him in the perspective of the
modern world, we find the same thing prevailing of course in different forms and names and we find Herbert enjoying the same position and belonging to the group of those modern thinkers, artists and scientists who are truly "reasonable" or "rational". While passing from the ancient world to the modern, we see that the post-Ionian sophistic intellectualism and practicality is found in the utilitarianism or in the economic realism of the communistic philosophy. And the doctrine of the pre-Ionian thinkers that the universe assumed its shape automatically through natural process is found in the materialistic science of Darwinism. We know what relation Darwinism and Communism have with God, religion and art. Therefore, they (Darwinism and Communism) have no place in the world of Herbert's art and religion. Herbert belongs to that group which is against Darwinism and communism. The severe and atheistic intellectualism of thinkers like Karl Marx and scientists like Darwin is checked and balanced by rational thinkers and scientists like Samuel Butler, Bernard Shaw, George Orwell, Bertrand Russell, E.M. Forster and Einstein. In the field of philosophy thinkers like George Orwell and E.M. Forster condemned the totalitarianism of the communistic states that suppress art and dethrone religion and God in the name of social welfare. In the field of science, Samuel
Butler criticised Darwin's doctrine as one which banishes mind from the universe. He says:

It presents you with a universe which no man with any capacity for real thought dare face for a moment. It takes all designs, all conscience and all thought out of it and the whole thing becomes a senseless accident and nothing else. (qtd. in Shaw III)

Bernard Shaw also condemned Darwinism as "soulless" and "goodless". Einstein also had an intuitive conviction about the Super power. As Karplus writes:

He had a Spinoza like belief in a cosmic religious force. He regarded this as an eternal spiritual being that communicates small details of itself to our weak and inadequate mind". (30)

These lines about Einstein remind us of Herbert's conviction that God reveals His skill and His secrets to the man who has in him some longing for it. With this conviction Herbert declares his intention to lie at His feet and says:

There will I lie untill my maker seeks For some mean staffe whereon to show His skill. ("The Priesthood" 37-38)

Thus, we see what mature reason on the one hand and sheer intellect on the other, have given to human wisdom both in the ancient and the modern world.
Such harmonious linkinng of religion, science and arts is not only due to the well integrated personality or properly unified sensibility of Herbert and Newton; it was also due to the age in which they lived. It is to be noted that both philosophy and science are the products of human reason, and till the 17th century they were together, bearing the single title "philosophy". In the 17th century, highly rational thinkers like Newton and Galileo reasonably demanded verification of ideas by observation and experiment and became the first important scientists of the world. Speculations and ideas that were verified by observation and experiment became science and those that were not verifiable remained as philosophy or speculative hypothesis. This trend of reason, rationalism and science had its peculiar impact on the learned, logical and argumentative poetry of the 17th century metaphysical poets. Of them all, quite paradoxically, Herbert's religious poetry was the most scientific in spirit.

At this juncture in the history of growing human wisdom and knowledge when modern science branched itself out and separated itself from philosophy all the metaphysical poets who belonged to this century stood exposed to three distinct, important and very powerful influences. The first was the influence of Christianity
which had its dominance during the medieval ages; the second influence was that of the Renaissance that revived the classical learning of Greek antiquity as opposed to medieval theology; and the third influence was that of modern science where the search for truth was based on observation and experiment. The metaphysical poets were Christian in their themes, classical in matters of astronomy and cosmography and quite modern and scientific in their attitude, temperament, style and images. This is the position of the poets of this age on the surface of the things. But when we think of the creative imagination and about a poet like George Herbert, we shall have to examine some deeper and more fundamental things pertaining to man's creation and his creative power.

The starting and the central point in the particular context of the metaphysical poetry is the creation of the universe and of man in it. These two things (the universe and the man) are the first creations of the first creator. The subsequent creations of the second creator only follow it. First, let the different prevailing attitudes, during the period towards these two basic things be examined and after that Herbert's attitude in particular.

In the 17th century the new science, based on observation and experiment, gave impersonal, objective
and universally acceptable truth. It was, therefore, strong enough to challenge, on the one hand, the speculative classical learning revived by the Renaissance scholasticism where Aristotle was the dominant figure, and on the other hand, the medieval Christianity with the holy Bible as its scriptural authority. Of course Newton's stand was that if the Bible was the revelation of God it would never contradict the experimented discovery of science. But the classical learning of Aristotle and his group (though belonging to the rational group of the antiquity) with its emphasis on the "final cause" as opposed to the "efficient cause", was found to be entirely hostile to new science and was openly repudiated by it. This was the relation between the Renaissance which revived classical learning, and the new science of Newton and Galileo which raised its head in the 17th century. Thus, we see that the age of the metaphysical poets was a highly significant period when human knowledge and wisdom received a serious shock because it experienced the clash of modern science with medieval religion and classical learning. The first and the most prominent clash is about a thing which is very important and is frequently found in metaphysical poets. It is about the law of motion both in heaven and on the earth. Describing the sudden and surprising advance of
modern science Bertrand Russell in his essay "Ideas that Have Helped Mankind" refers to the dynamics or law of motion given by Newton & Galileo of the 17th Century. According to Russell "modern technique in industry and war with the sole exception of the atomic bomb is, still wholly based upon a type of dynamics developed out of the principles of Galileo and Newton" (120). Dealing with it elaborately he writes:

The importance of this principle is only evident when it is contrasted with the principles that the scholastics had evolved out of Aristotle. Before Galileo it was held that there was a radical difference between regions below the moon and regions from the moon upward. (120).

According to it below the moon the motion was rectilinear and above the moon the motion was circular, or compounded of circular motions. But galileo based his findings on observation and experiment and changed this theory of motion. Continuing the point of difference Russell writes:

Galileo unified the principles governing the earth and the heavens by his single law of inertia . . . . This principle made it possible to develop a science of motions of matter, without taking account of any supposed influence of mind or spirit and thus laid the foundation of the purely materialistic physics in which men of science, however pious, have ever since believed. (121)
All the poets of the metaphysical age, were attracted not towards the mythical and imaginative Homer, but towards the rational classical philosophy of Aristotle and Plato which belonged to the world of reason, not myth. They were influenced by the principles which the Renaissance scholars had evolved out of Aristotle. Though the new science had started, the new principles of Galileo and Newton had not yet entered into the poetic world.

The old scholastic philosophy, astronomy and cosmography had still its sway in the poetic world of important poets like Donne, Marvell, Cowley and others. John Donne, for example, regards his love to be heavenly belonging to the sphere above the moon and distinguishes it from earthly love which belongs to the world below the moon and is called "sublunary". He writes:

Dull sublunary lover's love
(Whose soul is sense) can not admit
Absence, because it doth remove
Those things which elemented it.

("Vale diction" 13-16)

The group of the metaphysical poets mentioned above does not include Herbert. Herbert is excluded because there is some difference in him. Herbert seems to be more inclined towards the new science of Galileo and Newton than
towards the scholastic philosophy derived from Aristotle's school. In his well known and highly significant poem "Man", we notice the spirit of the new science and we can say that here creative imagination is scientific and in perfect tune with the creative design of the ultimate creator. It is for this reason that this poem is highly praised and is quoted as an authority both by the supporters of materialistic Newtonianism and spiritualistic transcendentalism. This poem is indeed a precious master-piece which enlightened and enriched the human civilisation when it was taking a very serious turn in the 17th century. It clearly shows that Herbert's religious poetry was as scientific as Newton's materialistic science was religious. Here he writes:

Oh mightie love; Man is one world, and hath Another to attend him. ("Man" 47-48)

This points out that the objects of nature such as the sun, the moon, the river, and the thunder are servants to mankind. They are to attend him and are not to be worshipped by him as God. In other words nature is to be understood, conquered, controlled and harnessed to the service of mankind. This is the basic spirit of science. Here the mythical imagination that gives us the idea of the sun-god or the moon-god/godess has no place. This analysis shows how the human mind has moved from the
mythical world of Homer to the more reasonable world of Plato and Aristotle, and again from the scholastic philosophy of revived Aristotle to the still more rational and scientific world of Newton and Galileo. In this perspective we clearly see where Herbert stands. He belongs to the world of modern science having greater affinity towards Newton and Galileo. Thus, here also Herbert stands apart from other well known poets of his age. We know how in the world of moral and spiritual values his mind and soul were much above the minds and souls of the sensuous and amorous poets like Donne, Marvell and Cowley who were inspired by women's beauty and charm. In other words, both from the moral point of view and from the scientific point of view he was much ahead of, or at least far different from, his contemporaries. If they employed scholastic or classical cosmography, astronomy and metaphysics in bewitching the fair sex and winning their hearts, Herbert employed modern physics and mechanics in winning God's heart and in tossing man to his master's breast. Heat, light and motion of physics formed the trinity through which Herbert went up to God.

Then with our trinity of light,
Motion, and heat; let's take our flight
unto the place where thou
Before did'st bow.

( "The Star" 17-20 )
In the mechanical and creating rotation of an object like pulley he heard God saying:

If goodnesse leade him not, yet wearinesse
May tosse him to my breast. ("The Pulley" 19-20)

This is a matter of such profound significance that a comparison between Herbert and Newton is not only advisable, but also necessary, because it shows how to be more rational and scientific means to be more perfect in religion and have a creative imagination quite wide in its range. As the Ionian rational thinkers rejected Homer's goods but were not atheistic, so Newton, who rejected Herbert's God, was as religious as Herbert.

Newton was in fact much against that materialistic tradition which thrrove under the title of Newtonianism. He does not seem to have anticipated his mechanistic natural philosophy to have any effect on religion other than to strengthen our belief in the Christian faith. "He was, therefore, taken entirely by surprise when Leibniz in a letter to princess Caroline expressed his disapproval of the *Principia* on the ground that its philosophy was materialistic and subversive of the Christian religion" (More 645). Newton's estimate of the comparative values of science and religion is best shown by the fact that he considered his *Principia* and *Optics* to be useful, since they had helped to make manifest the law of God and had revealed His nature. According to his
biographer L.T. More "the chief value of his scientific work lay in its support of revealed religion" (612). But Newton's God, the creator of the universe, was a God of the world of "reason". The traditional Christian notion about God was not to be accepted if anything unreasonable was there about it. In this respect Isaac Newton and George Herbert stand quite apart. As we know Herbert quietly accepted the prevailing notions of the Church with all its traditional rituals. Almost all his poems are based on Christian rituals and the central figure is Jesus the Christ. Like an ordinary, simple pious Christian, Herbert took it for granted that Jesus who lived like a man on this earth was no mere mortal, but the Christ who continues to exist as "God the Son", a part of an indivisible three fold god-head. Newton on the other hand with all his reason and scientific rationalism was not to accept that Jesus who lived and moved on this earth as a mortal was also an immortal God. Thus, when we examine that branch of accumulated human knowledge whose source is reason, we find that traditional notions and values are questioned or challenged and not accepted unless approved by reason. Therefore, the Dictionary of Philosophy states that "reasoning ability is characterised by the fact that notions enter the process of transformation. Aims and values are seen in the process of their change" (Forlov. Dictionary 1984).
Though Newton and Herbert belonged to the same century and were both religious and truly Christian, yet human knowledge or understanding took two different directions in their cases. For Newton it was a matter of simple reason and common sense that Jesus was a man and not God. But for a devotional Herbert who had the intelligence of an average Christian, the religious mysticism of holy trinity was quite acceptable. Newton could not accept it. It was from Bishop Horsley's edition of Newton's work that the world could know how Newton explains and rejects the prevailing fondness for the religious mysticism of Traditional Christian Trinity. He criticises the interpolation of the two verses (V.7 and V.8) of the First Epistle of John, which elevates Jesus the man, the son of God, to "God the Son". He writes:

It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries and for that reason to like best what they understand least (qtd. in More 637).

This shift in the portrayal of Jesus from "son of God" an essentially Jewish and totally human figure, to "God the Son" an image drawn from pagan polytheism is presented and assessed in a broader perspective by Michael Arnheim. He calls it" pagan polytheism" because he examines the other two revealed religions belonging to the pre-Christian and post-Christian periods (Judaism and Islam)
and finds that they are free from the imaginative warmth of polytheistic mysticism. About these two revealed religions he writes:

As for Judaism, it rests on no one figure not even Moses, who can lay claim to no more elevated a title than that of prophet, an appellation which he shares with a score of other Jewish leaders and teachers. What is more, neither Moses nor any of the other Jewish biblical figures -- including the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob -- is ever portrayed as any thing but fallible, frail and highly imperfect. (5)

Referring to the other revealed religion Arnheim writes:

Islam certainly revers Muhammad but at no time has any claim been advanced for him beyond that of prophet, a title which however defined, stops well short of imbuing its holder with divine status. (1)

Therefore, the tendency to mystify the image of Jesus and to elevate it to the status of divinity which is very much there in George Herbert, has been called a pagan tendency. It is due to the action or predominance of a particular temperament present in all human beings. Newton called it "the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind in matters of religion." He, who keenly observed the human history or the spread of mankind over the earth from the deluge of Noah, traces the interference of this "hot and superstitious part" of human mind with Christian revelation, to the long and bitter
controversy at the council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. raged on the doctrine of Trinity. With the exactness of a great scientist he pinpointed the corrupting interpolation and accused Jerome of having deliberately inserted it (Verse 7 and Verse 8 of the First Epistle of John) in the vulgate, when he translated the then existing Greek version into Latin in 385 A.D. (More 634).

Here, we clearly see that George Herbert had neither the sharp perception of a highly rational and scientific mind nor the vast range and erudition of a great historian to reach such a level of knowledge and wisdom in matters of theology. A devotional man by nature having the intelligence of an average Christian, Herbert took for granted the traditional notion about Jesus Christ. He comfortably basked in the warmth of religious mysticisms that believed in the transformation of Jesus into a divine figure. We can say that almost all his poems based on traditional ritualistic Christianity spring from "the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind." Therefore, in connection with his poetic creation when we examine the range of his creative imagination, we find that it falls short of one or two steps in touching the ultimate height, the first creator. It stops at Jesus and very rarely goes beyond. In his poem "Aaron" he writes:
Christ is my only head,
My alone onely heart and breast,
My only musick, striking me ev'\'n dead; (16-18)

All his writings and thinkings are shaped by the traditional notion about Christ and by the superstitious rituals that surround the mystified figure of Jesus Christ. In the concluding lines of "Aaron" he declares:

My doctrine tun'd by Christ, (who is not dead,
But lives in me while I do rest)
Come people; aaron's drest. (23-25)

We can not say that the time ws like that and the pressure of tradition was too heavy, because Newton also belonged to the same period. But we know how strong was the "reason" in Newton that made the traditional notions to quote the language of the Dictionary of Philosophy, "enter the process of transformation." Of course the pressure was there. Even Newton was pressed hard by it, because he did not dare to publish his papers in England. As his letter to John Locke dated 14 Nov. 1690 reveals, he wanted to publish it in Holland through John Locke. Locke was to translate it into French and publish it anonymously. Their plan was to watch the reaction in Holland and then to publish it in England. But Locke's trip to Holland was cancelled and they remained unpublished (More 632). Even those who were close to Newton and knew his papers wanted to keep them suppressed
because by that time Newton had become a hero of the Christian world universally accepted and honoured. Publishing his convincing papers and divesting Jesus Christ of all divinity would have meant a rude and unbearable shock to the Christian world. Therefore, Newton's biographer L.T. More rightly says:

Newton had thought out his religious belief with sufficient clearness and there would not have been a long controversy about them, if those who had access to his papers had not tried to make him appear orthodox. (643)

But George Herbert was not compelled to be orthodox. The tradition might have worked on him imperceptibly and unconsciously. But it is also a fact that his "reason" or mind was not strong enough to wipe off the confusion of the trinity and his creative imagination was not forceful and clear-sighted enough to touch the ultimate height. Speaking about this weakness in Christian character E.M. Forster in his essay "Notes on English Character" uses the phrase "spiritually incomplete" and sympathising with this state of mind says that it is a "confusion of thought" and not a "conscious deceit" (31). Forster says that "the average orthodox English man" regards the trinity as a mystery that it is not his place to solve. He says "I find difficulties enough in daily life" and carries on his life, quietly accepting what his
forefathers have handed on to him (Forster 20-35). Issac Newton may be an exception, but George Herbert was an "average orthodox Englishman" who almost unconsciously allowed the "confusion of thought" to persist. But actually there was no "conscious deceit" in him. Conscious deceit means hypocrisy and hypocrisy is absence of sincerity. Herbert may be accused of lacking in many things but never in sincerity as mentioned earlier. Even Grierson who calls him small, narrow and limited acknowledges him to be a "sincere and sensitive poet" (XLIV). His thoughts, emotions, and religious feelings, whatever they may be, are perfectly genuine and famous for their "absolute sincerity". It is a very important thing in Herbert's poetic creation which provides life to his art and poetry. In "True Hymne" Herbert says:

The fineness which a hymne or Psalm affords
Is, when the soul unto the lines accords. (9-10)

The poetry that springs directly from his soul throbs with life and overcomes all other deficiencies. There can never be any trace of hypocrisy or conscious deceit in him. His attachment to Jesus Christ is sincere and he has moments when he feels that he receives divine help when he is helpless in matters of creating or composing his poems. Therefore, when Herbert says "my doctrine is tuned by Christ" we are reminded of the Indian sages who think
that they tune their inner being to the sound "Om" and also of a creative genius like Panini who tuned his inner being to the dance of Shiva and to the sound of his damaruka while composing his works. Whatever may be the theological implication or limitation of one's belief or faith, if one's feelings are genuine and sincere one gets the life blood of powerful poetry or any other artistic creation. Of course the better the spiritual contact with the ultimate spirit of the first creator, the more precious and sublime will be the artistic or scientific creation of the second creator, meaning man.

Though Herbert's range of creative imagination falls short of a step in touching the ultimate creator which Newton's creative imagination seems to have achieved, yet in all other matters it is as wide as that of Newton. Herbert's polytheism is extended only upto Jesus and Gabriel, the holy ghost. The "confusion of thought" is not carried any further. It is certainly different from the extensive paganism of pantheistic faith. It is not exactly, as Arnheim says "a pagan polytheism" (1-5). But to use the milder term of E.M. Forster it is a "compromise between polytheism and monotheism (30)". Herbert's trinity goes only so far as to confuse Jesus and the holy ghost with God, but no further. It does not identify nature with God. Therefore, it is clearly different from pantheism and polytheism. Though Herbert's
creative imagination in its flight towards the creator almost always pauses at Jesus, at God the Son, yet it is aware of the presence of God the Father and keeps its flight upward. It is a high and soaring imagination that flies above and beyond everything that is there in the visible creation till it reaches the ultimate creator. Because ultimately when he is received by God in his poem "Love III" God is presented as an abstracted concept as Love and is not so much the person or the body of Jesus. His vision passes beyond and goes above the visible objects. In his poem "Elixir" he writes:

A man that looks on glass
On it may stay his eye:
Or if he pleaseth, through it pass
And then the heaven spy. (5-8)

This way Herbert's imagination does not rest in nature to adore it ignoring its creator. In his famous poem "The Pully" he explains that man will be a great loser if he gets himself entangled in adoring nature and forgets God, the creator of nature. He makes God speak about the possibility of this mistake in man in these words:

He would adore my gifts instead of me
And rest in nature, not the God of nature
So both should loser be. (13-15)

Here, he is like a modern scientist who does not want to adore or worship nature as God. According to him nature itself follows certain divine laws. Those laws are to be
understood and nature is to be mastered and harnessed to man's service. While employing them in our service we must be reasonable enough to remember and thank God, instead of forgetting or ignoring Him. Therefore, in the concluding lines of "Man" he prays to God.

... Afford us so much wit
That as the world serve us we may serve thee
And both thy servant be.(52-54)

Thus, we see that in the broad based and reasonable creative imagination of George Herbert the creator with his vast creation and man with his smaller creation of art and science enjoy a harmonious and well tuned existence undisturbed by that cynical and materialistic intellectualism which becomes unreasonable and goes against God and art. George Herbert, inspite of the limitation discussed above, was a poet whose creative mind had much similarity with the creative mind of those philosophers and scientists whose sound reason saved them from being ungodly and atheist. It had the same root and range, the same centre and the same circumstance ever widening and ever trying to embrace the entire creation of the creator. Einstein calls God's creation the "inscrutable universe", human mind as "weak and inadequate" and God "the eternal spiritual being communicating to man's mind only some small details of itself (Karplus 30). When we get a glimpse of the smallest detail of God's creation, we are in raptures,
what to speak of his vast creation? Referring to it, Herbert, in his poem "providence" writes:

... If we could hear
Thy skill and art, what music would it be? (39-40)

This communication of the "small details" by the first creator to the "weak and inadequate mind" of the second creator is the product of the dynamic balance between human effort and divine assistance, and can be called the achievement of the creative mind. Such a creative mind may be found in highly reasonable and rational scientists like Einstein or Newton or in poets like Herbert or Milton. It involves conscious or unconscious, direct or indirect acknowledgement of some very important matters like the presence of a creator, the first creator; His vast creation, His eagerness to communicate small details to man the second creator; and finally man's longing and persistent efforts to know something about the vast creation around him. Herbert's sincere longing was to know more and more about the secret of God's creative design. The mission of his life and art was to understand and adore God's art and according to him, God's art, the whole creation, is for the good of man.

For us the winds do blow
The earth doth rest, heaven move and fountains flow.
("Man" 25-26)

The more man understands nature and its law, the closer
he moves to God. It is through the rays of the sun that he climbs to God. So Herbert's way to God was not only through Christianity but also through the physical science of the phenomenal world. If we have discussed his limitations, his unconscious slip in accepting or taking for granted the mystifications of traditional Christian Trinity, we must also be aware of his merit, his faith in modern science. Because, the trinity that takes Herbert to God is not only the prevailing Trinity of Christianity but also the trinity of the growing and developing physics which means light motion and heat and which he presents in his poem "The Star".

Then with our trinity of light,
Motion, and heat; let us take our flight,
Upto the place where thou,
Before didst bow. (17-20)

This significant poem is rarely anthologised. It is a beautiful demonstration of the scientific spirit of a highly religious poet. In Herbert's poetry there may be casual references to the prevailing astronomy or cosmology of the renaissance scholastics that belonged to the classical Aristotelian tradition and there may be ritualistic touches of medieval Christian superstitions, but when he comes to write highly important or serious poems like "Providence" and "Man" we find that his mental range had much in common with the great, reasonable thinkers and scientists like Newton, Galileo and Descartes.
of his age. His mind and his creative imagination, in spite of all its limitations belongs to this world of reasonable thinkers and scientists. In other words science became the religion of this religious poet. There might be some "confusion of thought " in the understanding of the mystified Jesus, but he had the right understanding of the physical world around him. He also understood the position of man, his potentialities and all his possibilities. In his poem "The Pearl" he says:

I know all these, and have them in my hand
Therefore not sealed, but with open eyes
I fly to thee and fully understand
Both the main sail and the commodities;(31-34)

But Herbert is not proud of this range of his understanding. He does not think highly of his knowledge or wit, for he says:

Not my groveling wit
But thy silk twist let down from heaven to me,
Did both conduct and teach me, how by it
To climb to thee. (The Pearl 37-40)

Now with the "silk twist" of divine assistance in our hand, let us turn from human reason to divine revelation and see what it says about the creator, the creation and the creative imagination of man and where Herbert stands in this world. If the application of human reason can take us to the truth and we can understand
everything correctly, what is the necessity of divine revelation, the third source of man's accumulated knowledge and wisdom? The necessity of divine revelation arises when we find that human reason somewhere gets adulterated by the personality of the man involved, as a result of which the truth arrived at varies from person to person. Thus, it becomes various and relative instead of being one and absolute—what to speak of the "reasons" of thinkers and philosophers. Even among the scientists there are differences; some are godless and materialistic whereas some become more convinced about God after examining the secret of God's creation as scientists. Why does this happen? It is because of the human personality involved. Each person has his own temperament, taste, emotions, instincts, leanings and biases. He has his weaknesses and shortcomings. How this personality of a person affects the pure "reason" and its findings, is well explained by Bertrand Russell. In his Essay "Philosopher's Ulterior Motives" Russell writes:

The typical philosopher finds certain beliefs emotionally indispensable but intellectually difficult. He therefore goes through long chains of reasoning, in the course of which sooner or later, a momentary lack of vigilance allows a fallacy undetected. After the one false step his mental agility quickly takes him far into the quagmire of falsehood. (48-49)

This perhaps explains the adulteration of "reason" by the
personality of a person for which the absolute truth remains beyond the reach of human beings. All sane and reasonable Philosophers also admits that their minds can not reach the absolute truth. Therefore they decide to hold their opinions "tentatively" not "dogmatically" and for them the best discipline is the "learning of suspended judgement". As they cannot reach the absolute, they avoid to say "I know this" and prefer to say "I more or less know something more or less like this" (Russell 33). Thus, "to dissipate certainty" is the discipline of all reasonable thinkers and even of all reasonable scientists. Dr. Steven Weinberg, the Nobel prize winning physicist, for example, says that his own "standard Model Theory" which purports to supplant all other theories including the "steady state theory" of creation "may be overthrown any time by some new discovery or replaced with some new discovery or replaced with some other cosmogony" (qtd. in Report 64). So man can never be sure about reaching the absolute truth in any matter. Man's mind is too weak to climb to such a height. Therefore, according to Einstein "the enternal spiritual being" feels the need for communicating "some small details of itself" to the "weak and inadequate mind" of man (Karplus 30). George Herbert also realises the weakness and limitation of his mind and wit. He speaks of it as 'groveling wit' and seeks God's "silk twist let down from heaven" to conduct him to higher
truths. ('The Pearl' 40). As revelation is divine, it is impersonal and enjoys full immunity from the adulterating influence of the human personality discussed above. Therefore, the truth it points out is one and absolute. It is not relative and various, varying from person to person. As it is absolute in nature it is to be held dogmatically — the truth is this and anything, other than this can not be the truth. In such a case, what will the rational philosophers and reasoning scientists do if divine revelation is found clashing with their findings and discoveries? The natural position is that revelation, if truly divine and purely impersonal, will not clash with reason. It may make some improvements upon them and may correct them by purging them of the impurities of human personality. It will never openly clash with them. Therefore, while discussing the term revelation the Dictionary of Philosophy points out that contemporary theory endeavours to modernize the idea of revelation by maintaining that it is not contradictory to reason. Explaining the meaning of the term revelation the Dictionary Says:

It is fundamental concept of theology and idealist religious philosophy expressing supersensible perception of supernatural reality in the act of mystic enlightenment. (Forlov. Dictionary 1984)

The Dictionary further states that in religion revelation is mainly represented by the holy write (the Bible of the Jews, the Christian Bible and the Koran).
Thus, three main things are known about divine revelation. First, it is not contradictory to reason. Second, it is supersensible perception of supernatural reality. Third, it is found in the Bible of the Jews (the Old Testament), in the Christian Bible (The New Testament) and the Koran (the Islamic Scripture). These three books are connected with three prophets who had, to use the terms of the Dictionary "mystic enlightenment" or God's revelation. Viewed from the human point of view, this revelation is supersensible perception of the ultimate truth and reality which God alone can give to mankind. Man's imagination and reason, the two major sources of our accumulated knowledge and wisdom, are too weak to do that. Man must depend on God and His revelations to mankind. In Herbert's poetic terminology, we will have to take the help of the "silk twist" let down from heaven in order to climb up and reach the ultimate truth.

Now it is to be seen what this revelation says about the creator and the creation, how far God has created and what creative role man is to play as a second creator standing below the first creator. Explaining the basic truth common to these three revealed books Hugh Schonfield in his book A Popular Dictionary of Judaism writes:

They know God because He had made himself known to
them and continues to do so. What they know teaches them that God is pure and eternal being without form or substance, the creator of all things. They see man as God's children whom he loves and cares for and who therefore are brethren. This teaching has come from Judaism and has communicated itself to Christianity and Islam.(10)

Though it is said that there are as many varieties of Judaism as there are Jews, they have in common one fundamental acknowledgement of one God and the holy Torah.

This one and invisible God, "the pure and eternal being without form and substance" is the creator of everything. The growth of Trinity in Christianity gave shape and form to God by granting divinity to Jesus and by transforming the son of God to God the Son. But basically they have the original concept of God the Father who is supreme and "without form and substance". As we know, Sir Isaac Newton, for example, questioned the Trinity, rejected the Godhood of Jesus and thought of God the Father as the only ultimate reality.

From creator let us pass to creation. This one supreme invisible God of the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran at first created heaven and earth. The Frist Book of Moses (Genesis) declares

In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth, (Gen.1:1.)
In the world of mythological imagination also both the Greek and the Vedic poet express the idea of the whole universe through the mention of the "Heaven" and the "earth." But they, however, express it, as Prof. Dandekar says, in contradictory terms "such as that the heaven and earth are the parents of Gods and that they are generated by Gods" (162). Thus, in the world of mythical imagination the gods may be the creators of the heaven and the earth or the heaven and the earth may be the creators of gods. This liberalism is allowed in the world of human imagination because any particular imagination may be right or it may be wrong. But in the world of divine revelation which is certainly different from human imagination, one idea or one truth is stated in simple, clear and unambiguous terms and is held dogmatically. As God's opinions or views can not be wrong, the liberalism of accepting different views or opinions is unthinkable here. This explains the dogmatism in the world of divine revelation. However, according to all the three so-called revealed religious books "God, the supreme, pure, eternal and invisible creator" started his creation with the heaven and the earth. Then he created water. The earth was "waste and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep". To dispel this darkness God created light. From light we know another important thing, that is the method of God's creation.
And God said, let there be light
And there was light (Gen. 1.3)

Here the method of creation is simple divine order. The first creator simply wished a thing to be created and the creation followed immediately. Of course George Herbert presents God as a potter who collects earth and water and mixes them together and then designs pots. This method is also there in the case of the first creator when creation proceeds further and reaches Man. After creating water and light God proceeded further to create living creatures that are brought forth by water.

And God said, let the waters
Bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath life, and let fowl fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven (Gen.1.20)

After creating fish moving in water and fowl flying in the air God created cattle and creeping things and the beasts of the earth. When the creation of plants and animals living in water, air, and earth was over, God thought of creating man.

And God said, let us make man in our image after our likeness and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and over the cattle and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. (Gen.1.26)
After completing his creation on the surface of the earth he turned towards the sky.

He created for you all that the earth contains. Then ascending to the sky fashioned it into seven heavens. He has knowledge of all things. (Koran 2:29)

He then designed the sun and the moon, the day and the night.

From the night we lift the day and they are plunged in darkness. The sun hastens to its resting place, its course is laid for it by the mighty one, the all knowing.

We have ordained phases for the moon, which daily wanes and in the end appears like a bent withered thing.

The sun is not allowed to overtake the moon, nor does the night outpace the day each in its own orbit runs. (Koran 32:37-40)

In this concept of creation we find that the creation is based neither on the material principle of evolution nor on the abstract principle such as "Rta" which automatically transforms the indefinite chaos into definite cosmos. It is based on the principle of a personal God, creating the universe with a conscious design. It is also to be noted here that he is not that mythological god-head out of whose various limbs, issued forth various parts of the universe, which makes the universe an expansion of the divinity and not a creation. So the god of revealed scripture is that single supreme creator who stands apart and creates this universe as
something separate. The creation may reveal the creative skill and the greatness of the creator, but it cannot be identified with Him. This is something clearly different from mythical or mystic pantheism and is closer to Ionian rationalism and Platonic reason. George Herbert also emphasizes the same thing when he distinguishes "Nature" from "God of Nature" ("Pulley" 14) which, as we have seen, is in accordance with the spirit of modern science. Another significant point is the clear and unambiguous statement about the dominant or the supreme role assigned to man. In the following revealed lines of the Koran God is reported to have declared:

When your Lord said to the angels:
I am placing on the earth one that shall rule as my deputy. (Koran 2 : 30)

Everything in creation is to serve man. He is to understand, control and employ them to his service. All are his servants and, as Herbert says, "are to attend him". Herbert's important poem "Man" accords well with this concept of man and his creation.

Thus, a close examination of the revealed scripture regarding the story of man's creation in detail reveals that God designed him in such a way that he would rule as his deputy on earth and while mastering, understanding and controlling all the things in God's creation he would also create, as a second creator, certain things that
would go to enhance the beauty and greatness of God's creation, for man is ordered to 'be fruitful' to multiply and replenish the earth. Herein lies the room for man's creative role and a correct realisation of this fact is to be the source of man's creative imagination. George Herbert seems to have the realisation of this potentiality of man as God's deputy on earth and his rangy creative imagination appears to have sprung from this realisation. Herbert's poetry in general and his poem on man in particular makes a probe into God's supreme and secret creative design and shows where man stands in God's creation and what role he is to play as second creator in furthering the beauty and the greatness of God's creation. According to Herbert, nothing in this universe is as great as man.

What house more stately hath there been,
Or can be, than is man, to whose creation
All things are in decay. ("Man" 4-6)

Herbert assigns greater role to man than do the following lines of the Bible where man is ordained to "have domain over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." (Gen.1.26) Here the range is water, air, and earth and all the things that swim, fly and creep in them. Herbert's creative imagination widens the circle further and embraces the heavenly bodies, reminding us
of Galileo who was his contemporary and who turned his telescope towards the sky to know the secret of God's heavenly design. Herbert writes:

Nothing hath got so farre,
But man hath caught and kept it as his prey:
His eyes dismount the highest starre;
He is in little all the sphere. ("Man" 19-22)

With the help of his powerful creative mind man catches and keeps, everything in nature, as his prey and makes a feast out of it for himself and for mankind at large. Out of the flowing wind man designs the wind mill and from the flowing fountain he has extracted hydro-electricity. Herbert's creative imagination seems to foresee such possibilities when it composed the poetic, musical and potentially powerful lines like:

For us the winds do blow,
The earth doth rest, heav'n move, and fountain flow. ("Man" 25-26)

Here we see how man creates depending on God's creation. Overemphasizing the creative role of man, the second creator, some call him a "small God". As we know Vicentre Huidobro, the Chilean poet, and founder of the post-war theory of creationism has written the following lines about the creative poets.

Only for you live all things under the sky.
The poet is a small God. (qtd. in Preminger 158)

Thus man with his creative power becomes a small creator,
a small master. All other things in the entire universe attend on him as his servants. Herbert writes:

More servants wait on man
Than he will take notice of: ("Man" 43-44)

This is a very significant point which the revealed scriptures emphasize by calling man as "God's deputy on earth" and which is so clearly stated by Herbert.

Thus, according to revelation (or revealed scriptures) as opposed to imagination, God is not identified with nature, and man is never to worship nature as God or as part of God. A carpenter designs a table. The table displays the skill of the carpenter, but it cannot be the carpenter himself. Similarly God has created nature which may reveal God's greatness, but can not be God himself.

This idea of man as a second master, mastering nature as far as he can and acknowledging the greatness of the first master or the first creator who has created nature, is a sound idea, a healthy attitude which is at once scientific and religious. Here science is not confused by the impudence of materialistic atheism.

Thus, the science in Herbert shows man as the master of nature and the religion in Herbert shows man as the servant of God. this way Herbert's religion is purged of mythical pantheistic paganism and his science is
protected and saved from materialistic and intellectual atheism.

It is seen that revelation accords well with Herbert's important poem on "Man" which can be called the creative centre of Herbert's poetic world and which communicates the whole music of God's creative design in which man reigns supreme as God's deputy and his religion, science and art enjoy a natural harmony.

Herbert's way to God through the trinity of traditional Christianity is found defective, but his way to God through the trinity of physical science (light, motion and heat) is highly reasonable and scientific. Herbert seems to have realised it slowly. Because, in the beginning, in his flight towards God, he seems to prefer the traditional Christianity & its scripture (the holy Bible) to scientific knowledge. In his poem he says:

Stars are poor books and often times do miss
This book of stars lights to eternal bliss.
("The Holy Scripture" 13-14)

Yet the growth of new science and the perfection and exactness of its observation and experiment perhaps made him realise that the work can show the workman most effectively. In other words a close, keen and scientific observation of the creation can take us to the creator in a more effective and scientific way. Therefore, he hopes:

That this new light which now I see,
May both the work and workman show:
Then by a sune-beam I will cimb to thee.
("Mattens" 18-20)

In "The Star" he finally writes:

Then with our trinity of light,
Motion and heat, let us take our flight. (17-18)

The right position, in fact, is that both the natural science and the revealed scripture, "the Star" and "the Book of Star" are to act in co-operation with each other in this matter. Let it now be examined what this "Book of star" (The revealed scriptures) which is presumed to be not contradictory to "the star" (the natural science), says about man's position in this universe.

We have seen how after the creation of the universe God thought of creating man. He has adopted two methods in the creation of man. The first man "Adam" was created out of "Clay" and subsequently he is created by "Semen". The first creation is described in detail in the following lines:

When your Lord said to the Angels:
"I am placing on earth one that shall rule as my deputy". They replied "will you put there one that will do evil and shed blood, when we have for so long sung your praises and sanctified your name?" He said "I know what you know not". He taught Adam the names of all things and then set them before the Angels, saying "tell me the name of these, if what you say be true".
"Glory to you", they replied "we have no knowledge except that which you have given us, you alone are wise and all knowing".

Then said He to Adam : "tell them their names". When Adam had named them He said "did I not tell you that I know the secret of heaven and earth and all that you hide and all that you reveal?"

And when we (God) said to Angels "prostrate yourself before Adam, they all prostrated themselves except Satan who, in his pride, refused and became an unbeliever.

To Adam we (God) said : "dwell with your wife in paradise and eat of its fruit to your heart's content whenever you will. But never approach this tree, or you shall both become transgressors".

But Satan made them fall from paradise and brought about their banishment...

"Go down hence", all we said "when our guidance is revealed, those that accept it shall have nothing to fear or regret, but those that deny or reject our revelation shall be the heirs of hell". (Koran 2 : 30-38)

These passages that are claimed to be divine revelation give us a kind of information which can be called "the supersensible perception of the supernatural reality". From these revealed passages cited above we get three significant things. First, God created man after creating the universe and placed him on the earth to rule as His deputy. Second, God has taught Adam, the name and nature
of all things that are there in this material universe which implies that human mind potentially knows everything. Here Aristotle's speculation that man's passive mind potentially knows everything and the creative mind only actualises the potential, agrees well with this revelation. Third, man lost paradise and was banished down to this earth because he disobeyed God under the instigation of Satan, and he can regain the paradise if he accepts God's revelation which God has conveyed to mankind through his prophets and if he shapes his conduct and character accordingly. In that case, as the revelation declares, man "shall have nothing to fear or to regret". This way man is to be redeemed or taken back to paradise.

These three important points clearly show that man can be creative in the field of art, science, religion and moral-character and can rule as God's deputy on earth as the second master or the second creator and also can ensure his place in the paradise after death.

This is all about God's original plan behind his creation and about the first creation of man. The subsequent creation of man that shows God's second method of creation belongs to the natural world, the world of phenomena, where man plays certain creative role. But the role is very minor. The major role is played by God
"the noblest of creators". The revelation reminds and warns:

We (God) created you: will you not believe then in our power? Behold the semen you discharge: did you create it or we? (Koran 56: 57-59)

We (God) first created man from an essence of clay. Then placed him a living germ, in a safe enclosure. The germ we made a clot of blood, and the clot, a lump of flesh. This we fashioned into bones, then clothed the bones with flesh, thus bringing forth another creation. Blessed be the Lord the noblest of creators. (Koran 23:12-15)

The last phrase "the noblest of creators" suggests that there are some other creators. Man is also to play his part as a creator. But God is the greatest and the noblest of all the creators. In the above description regarding the second method of man's creation we find the description of the evolution of life in the mother's womb. Here is a creation where both God and man participate. This evolution of man's life in the womb is totally different from the Godless evolution of Darwin where everything happens by chance or by accident; where God's presence and His role is not acknowledged. Criticising the Godlessness of Darwin's evolution G.B. Shaw writes:

If the amoeba does split itself in to two and from that you have a continual pushing forward to a higher and higher organisation, the differentiation of sex, the introduction of the back bone, the
invention of eyes, the invention of the system of 
digestion, you have a continual steady growth, 
evolution of life going on. There is some force you 
can not explain and this particular force is always 
organising, organising, organising. (107-116)

For this, in His revealed lines cited above God asks :
"Behold the Semen you discharge : did you create it or 
we " ? (Koran 56: 57-59)

Similarly we find that in many other fields man also 
acts in participation with God and depends on Him both 
for his creation and existence in this physical world. 
Another revealed chapter says :

Consider the seeds you grow. Is it you that give 
them growth or we ? If we pleased we could turn 
your harvest into chaff.

Consider the water you drink. Was it you that 
poured if from the cloud or we ? If we pleased we 
could turn it bitter. Why then do you not give 
thanks ?

Observe the fire which you light. Is it you that 
create its wood or we ? We have made it a reminder 
for man and for traveller a comfort.

(Koran 56 : 63-73)

Here it is to be kept in mind that the use of the 
word "we" for God in the above cited lines does not mean 
the plurality of God. It is, in Arabic an emphatic 
assertion of "I" or of one God, when God describes His 
basic or major role as a creator, He asserts it with a 
sense of pride and for extra emphasis the word "I" is
translated into something for which the English equivalent is thought to be the royal "we". By the side of God man also has his role as a creator. But it is the role of a second creator which is a minor role.

So when man ploughs and grows corn, when he lights fire and cooks his food, when he makes pots and glasses to eat his food and drink water from, he creates or makes something, but for that creation or making he depends much on God. Whatever may be his dependence on God, his creation or making reveal his creative faculty and our concern here is the range and role of this creative faculty in man in general and in Herbert in particular. This creative faculty may be minor when compared with God but in the human and mundane perspective any creative act of man is the most important of all human activities. Man exercises his creative imagination in actualising the vast potentialities of his passive mind and character and can create nobler and higher things in the field of science, art and religion. This creative role of the man that depends much on God will naturally be in perfect harmony with God's creative design, because God has put into the mind of Adam, the first man, the name and knowledge of all the things that are there in his creation in order to make man His deputy on this earth and in order to enable him to be the second master over everything here.
This is the relation between "God the creator" and "man the maker", so far as the information of the revealed scripture is concerned. We have already examined this relation between God and man in the light of human imagination and human reason. The world of imagination, as we know it very well, is a liberal world, as a result of which opinions in these matters are various and even contradictory. Human reason (though not so various, so contradictory and confusing as human imagination) also does not give us a single definite truth about the creator and the creation. Here also opinions are held tentatively and not with certainty. Reason fails to be purely impersonal and varies from person to person. In other words opinions and ideas are relative, not absolute. Only in the world of revelation we have a clear statement of a single absolute truth which is to be held with certainty. It is, therefore, a dogmatic world. The absolute truth according to it, is that in God's vast creation man is placed to rule as His deputy. He is to understand and master God's nature as well as his own nature in a creative way. For that, man must have the right sort of creative imagination. A scientist like Isaac Newton and a poet like George Herbert, who happened to be contemporary figures, seem to have the right sort of creative imagination.
Whatever may be Herbert's confusion about the traditional Christian Trinity which Newton corrected, Herbert has moments when he transcends God the Son and goes to God the Father. For both (Newton and Herbert), the central point is the acknowledgement of the greatness of God, the first creator. The creative imagination starts with faith in and dependence on God and then it is extended to God's creation with the plan to understand and master it. This is in keeping with the spirit of both the revealed scripture and the modern science. In the case of Herbert the "Book of Star" may be misleading, but "the star" does not. In other words Herbert's knowledge of the Bible may not be very scientific in the matter of the traditional Christian Trinity, but his scientific trinity, the trinity of Heat, light and motion is quite modern and scientific. When Herbert humbly kneels down before the creator for prayer he says:

My knees pierce the earth, mine eies the skie
And yet the sphere
And centre, both to me denie
That thou art there. ("The Search" 5-8)

In these lines he says that the point where his knees pierce the ground is the 'centre' and the vast area that his eyes survey including the sky constitute the "sphere".

Thus in these lines one can find the centre and the
circumference of Herbert's creative imagination. Human nature is also within the fold of this circumference like the vast nature around us. Human nature is also to be understood, mastered, shaped and beautified by the use of creative imagination. Therefore, in the case of George Herbert there is no separation between man the maker and man the doer, which means Herbert the artist with all his poetic works and Herbert the man with his moral conduct and character. This is going to be the subject matter of the subsequent chapters. Herbert's creative imagination thus embraces religion, science, art and personal moral life. It provides a well-integrated, harmonious vision of the whole which was enriched by a very valuable and rare thing "the completeness of perception". It was for this that Eliot called Herbert's work a finished good. A closer and proper study of The Temple as a whole shows that it was the product of a joint effort. "God the creator" supplied the raw material, and "man the maker" shaped the "finished good".