Man, as the "doer", does deeds and shapes his life; man as the "maker" makes things and shapes his art. His activities in the first case belong to the world of ethics and in the second case belong to the world of aesthetics. This chapter views and places these two things, ethics and aesthetics, in a wider perspective where they stand together enjoying full autonomy, yet accepting some extrinsic and indirect subordination and adjustment in order to be integrated into a single and harmonious whole. Instead of emphasising their duality or suggesting any rupture, instead of erecting any wall of separation between them as is usually done, the attempt is made here to present them as two autonomous worlds held together by a common human element. Trying to trace the balance which, despite the tension involved, exists between art and morality, Jacques Maritain says: "No questions are more intricate than those which relate neither to art alone nor to ethics alone, but to art and ethics at the same time" (15).

The same intricacy is involved in the serious examination of the greatness of Herbert's poetry and
the goodness of his soul. As in the previous chapter the discussion of the range of Herbert's creative imagination necessitated the consideration of the creation by the creator (God), so in this chapter discussion of the greatness of Herbert's poetry necessitates the consideration of the goodness of Herbert's soul. It cannot simply be said that Herbert was a great poet and at the same time a good man. It is to be shown whether these two things stand apart or are intimately related to each other. In the case of George Herbert they are inextricably interrelated. His poetry springs from his soul and the very goodness of his soul gives greatness to his poetry. This shows that the goodness of the soul is transmitted into the greatness of his poetry. It has been possible because in the process of transmission the dignity and autonomy of both the realms of ethics and aesthetics are not affected or distorted by any "direct or intrinsic subordination". Subordination is there (because without it there cannot be a harmonious blending of the two) but it is indirect and extrinsic, only as far as it is necessary for their mutual elevation through harmonious integration. A careful examination of and a profound insight into the subtle and delicate relationship between ethics and aesthetics in the case of George Herbert amply disproves the superficial remark of John Wesley that George Herbert was "a pious soul and a poor artist" (qtd. in J.H. Summer 19).
Before examining the aesthetical and ethical beauties in Herbert's poetry it is advisable to cast a glance at the major theories pertaining to art and morality. In this connection there are two well known theories that swing to the opposite extremes. The theory of Art for Art's sake which does not accept any kind of subordination of art, moral or political and the theory of totalitarianism and religious dogmatism which grants no autonomy to art and demands its total subordination either to state or to God. All other theories range between these two age-old extremes. Actually art and morality are no doubt two different things, but within a man or "within the unity of human subject" (Maritain 22) they cannot be completely separated. Therefore, it is preferred to mention them by using the terms "man the maker" and "man the doer". If we use the term art and morality or ethics and aesthetics, they appear to be abstracted and separated. But if we say "Man the maker" and "man the doer", it becomes obvious that man is the common factor and 'manking' and 'doing' are two functions of the same man. Further the faculty which man employs in making art and in doing deeds is also the same. It is the creative imagination or creative intuition. So in the discussion of art and morality the role and range of creative imagination is also involved. If the creative imagination achieves success both in 'making' and 'doing',
then its range of operation is wide and complete, because it gives us a good artist and also a good man. When human civilisation gets both the things, its gain is greater than when it gets a good artist but a bad man. The goodness of man or the goodness of human life is more inclusive and more comprehensive. As Henry Austin Dobson says: "Greatness without goodness is no better than badness" (qtd. in Drinkwater 319). The artist is first a man and then an artist or anything else. In comparison with the wholeness of human life or humanity, art is a part of it, a smaller or a lesser thing. In his own characteristic way Andre Gide says: "The artist is expected to appear after dinner, his function is not provide food, but intoxication (qtd. in Maritain 21). Making things and shaping art supplies intoxication after dinner, but doing deeds and shaping conduct and character is the dinner itself. It provides the very food to life and humanity. If a good artist fails in being a good man also, it shows that the creative imagination in his case succeeded in one field and failed in another. It could select, collect, arrange and shape art, but it could not judge, choose and act in shaping conduct and character. Therefore, according to Socrates "Among all arts, the royal one was how to live well" (Sukla 49). So if a good artist is also a good man, he is a royal artist or his art is royal. He is like a full grown tree having two
prosperous branches, one bearing the flowers and fruits of fine arts and the other bearing the flower and fruits of fine deeds. Andre Gide also uses the term "branch" when he discusses art and morality. In a dialogue between himself and an imaginary interlocutor he gives the following answer:

The interlocutor:
Are you interested in moral question?
Andre Gide: What, the very stuff of our books?
The interlocutor: But what is the morality according to you? Gide: A branch of aesthetics. (Qtd. in Maritain 21)

So ethics and aesthetics are branches and the main trunk is man with his creative imagination. But Maritain instead of calling it creative imagination calls it the "practical activity of the reason", while discussing art and morality:

No longer with the realm of art but with the realm of morality. No longer with the order of making but with the order of doing. No longer with the practical activity of the reason as directed towards the good of the work to be made, but with the practical activity of the reason as directed towards the good of human life to be reached through the exercise of freedom. (Maritain 26)

Thus we see that the "practical activity of the reason" is the common faculty that operates behind both making
and doing or art and morality. Actually the term "practical activity of the reason" is the more mundane version of the "creative intuition", which comes from the creator to man or as Maritain himself says, it is "a bit of heaven which (man) obscurely shelters in his mind"(24). When it is manifested in the action of the man, who lives and moves in this phenomenal world, it works in collaboration with human reason. Therefore, for common understanding and convenience one can call it "practical activity of the reason", otherwise it is the creative imagination having its root in the creator. Thus, we find that the bit of heaven in us or the creative intuition working in consonance with human reason gives us good conduct or good art. How can it admit division or rupture between two of its own actions? Another thing that becomes obvious is that when we make a new thing or a fine piece of art or do a good deed, we think that it redounds to our credit because our aim, intention and reason have some role in it. But in the ultimate analysis it is the creative intuition the "bit of heaven" or the "silk twist let down from heaven" that conducts and is the main guiding force. George Herbert seems to have realised it deep in his heart. If he does a good deed or composes a good poem he is not proud of it. He does not consider it to be his own achievement. He knows and feels God's hand in all these things. His poems, as we shall
see afterwards, give evidence of direct divine touches. He is very much conscious of it. This gives a ring of sincerity to his humility. In order to be a good maker and good doer, he longs for the fuller development and expresson of his soul through action and art. He sincerely wants to follow with enthusiasm and determination all the aesthetic and ethical and, therefore, divine decrees. His longing is intense and absolutely sincere. First, let us see how he describes his noble aspirations both as a "doer" and as a "maker". The lines written above the portals of the Church. The Superliminare, suggest his aspiration as a "doer".

Nothing but holy pure and clear
Or that which groaneth to be so
May at his peril further go. ("Church Porch" 6-8)

Herbert aspires to be "holy, pure and clear", but he is not that. He is "that which groaneth to be so". Therefore, he plans with all the determination of will and strength of soul at his command to follow the divine decree. But he finds that he cannot do it unless God's grace is there. In the "Hold Fast" he writes:

I threatened to observe the strict decree
Of my dear God with all my power and might
But I was told by one, it could not be
Yet I might trust in God to be my light.
("The Holdfast" 1-4).

Here is the recognition of the limitation of man the
"doer" and his dependence on God in perfecting his conduct and life. Similarly as "maker" he has higher aspiration for fuller expression of his soul.

The fineness which hymne or psalm affords,
Is, when the soul unto the lines accords.
("True Hymne" 9-10)

But as in the world of ethics and morality he is not holy, pure and clean, so in the world of art, he is not able to give full expression to his soul. Instead he is like one

... who craves all the minde,
And all the soul and strength, and time,
If the words onel'y ryme,
Justly complains that some what is behinde
("True Hymne" 11-14)

It is a well known complaint in the world of poetic art that words like nature half reveal and half conceal the soul within. It never gets full expression. Here, we notice a parallel between man's effort as a "maker" and as a "doer". As a doer he "groaneth" and as a maker he "craves" for perfection in life and in art. But he finds that he "groans" and "craves" for something which he can not attain without divine grace. This limitation of "man the maker" and "man the doer" is more intensely felt by persons and poets who are "sincere and sensitive", the two adjectives, which even Grierson willingly concedes to Herbert (Grierson X/IV). To overcome this deficiency is a hard task for man. Here man needs the help of his creator.
Herbert also feels that in this manner "God doth supply the want". This is the basic factor of his ethics and aesthetics. But God comes to help those who "groan" or "crave" for it or whose heart is "moved". For Herbert writes:

Whereas if the heart be moved,
Although the verse be somewhat scant
God doth supply the want
As when the heart says sighing to be approved.
O could I love! and stop. God writeth loved.

("True Hymne" 16-20)

Commenting on this poem Arnold Stein writes:

"In life if not in art the somewhat scant expression of the sincere heart may be amended or completed by God"(8). Stein's remark that "in life if not in art" suggests that both as a man and as an artist Herbert deserved and could claim divine attention. His longing is so sincere and intense that if not as a maker at least as a doer, he is sure to be rewarded and helped by God. The last line of the verse cited above sounds like the Muse visiting the poet who longs or waits for it. It is an instance of the dynamic balance between the ascending human mind and the descending divine grace, which is discussed in detail in the first chapter devoted to the range and role of the creative imagination. The balance is dynamic because
there is action on both the sides. But Herbert's sense of humility does not seem to take any credit. He does not want even to mention that he has a sensitive heart and his longing or "craving" is very sincere. He does not call it the act of his creative imagination. It is not even a "bit of heaven" obscurely sheltered in him. It is sheer divine favour. Herbert does not claim any credit for himself. God wrote for him, because he says, "God writeth loved". Therefore, Arnold Stein says that "if we look at the poem from one point of view a miracle has taken place" (8). Commenting on this poem B.K.Lewalski writes: "Such divine perfecting of human art is the goal of Herbert's aesthetics" (300). Therefore, the faith "God doth supply the want" is the basic factor of his ethics and aesthetics. And God comes forward to "supply the want" only when man deserves it. Thus, it was for the goodness of his sensitive and sincere soul that the human art could merit divine perfection. How can his art be anything outside his character or spiritual existence and experience? It is rather the product of his longing soul, and noble personality. Emphasising the point that art cannot be separated from the character and personality of the artist Maritain says that the artist is not "an impersonation of art come down from some Platonic separate heaven, but a man, the artist is a man using art" (24). Again, he emphasises the same point
while discussing the theory of art for art's sake and writes: "Art is not an abstract entity without flesh and bones, a separate Platonic idea supposedly come down on earth and acting among us as the angel of making or a metaphysical dragon let loose. Art is a virtue of the practical intellect and the intellect itself does not stand alone, but is a power of man"(49). In the case of George Herbert as we have seen the man and the artist are so intimately and vitally connected that separating his poetry from his life would mean cutting it off from its source of supplies and from all the food, fuel and energy it receives from the life and spiritual experiences of a highly sensitive man. A study of his biography reveals that his art and his spiritual experiences are not only related, they are almost identical. According to his biographer Izaak Walton, when George Herbert handed over his little book to Mr.Edmund Duncon, he bowed down to him and with a thoughtful and contented look said to him:

Sir, I pray deliver the little book to my dear brother Farrer and tell him he shall find in it a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have passed betwixt God and my soul before I could subject mine to the will of Jesus my master in whose service I have now found perfect freedom. Desire him to read it, and then if he can think, it may turn to the advantage of any dejected poor soul, let it be made public, if not let him burn it(99).
This shows that Herbert's poetry is his direct spiritual experience in life. It will be unwise to separate his poetry from his life for condemning such separation in general, Jacques Maritain calls it more than unwise: "It is nonsense to believe that the genuineness or the purity of a work of art depends upon a rupture with, a moving away from the living forces which animate and move the human being" (49). But unfortunately this belief exists. Those who hold this belief generally think that they serve art but in most cases and, particularly in regard to poets like George Herbert, commit grave errors of judgement and do serious injustice to the poet. B.K. Lewalski's views on Herbert's poem, "The Holdfast", is a classic case in point. He says that the poem is the expression of the Calvinistic theory of predestination, and an absolute rejection of human merit (286). When it is declared to be an expression of Christian Doctrine, it becomes impersonal and formal having nothing to do with the lived experience of the person involved. What a grave injustice it is to the spiritual and poetic personality of George Herbert or to a sincere and sensitive heart that was "moved". The result of this wrong superficial approach is that the subject is taken to be a dry impersonal Christian doctrine and the poetry is taken to be a mechanical exercise in the art of rhetoric. Hence the impression that he was a pious man
but a poor artist. But this is not true. As a man Herbert had a very sensitive heart and mind and his thoughts and feelings were basically the outcome of his sincere personal experiences and he sincerely wanted their fuller expression both through eloquent actions and eloquent utterances, which means both through his life and his poetry. But he painfully realised the human limitation in these two important matters, longed for divine assistance, and then came the descending divine grace. This final divine touch makes up for all human deficiency and gives us a finished good. Herbert's intense longing (for the "groaneth" to perfect his life and "craves" to perfect his art) deserved and therefore 'could get such divine attention. If Arnold Stein's remarks: "In life if not in art the somewhat scant expression of the sincere heart may be amended or completed by God", (8) is connected with Lewalski's remark "such divine perfecting of human art is the goal of Herbert's aesthetics" (300), the matter becomes clear. All these things in the case of George Herbert, clearly reveal that his feelings and imagination sprang from a soul that throbbed with the sensation of some real and lived experience. When such an imagination sincerely "groaneth" and "craves" for fuller expression through eloquent action and eloquent poetry, it soars higher and higher till it reaches the ultimate
source, gets the necessary divine touch and becomes truly creative. To see and to show Herbert in this dimension is the aim of this thesis. Here, the basis is "reality and sincerity" which is rightly emphasized by F.R. Leavis in his article bearing the same title for distinguishing a higher type of poetry (145). Herbert has rarely received such attention. When we compare this sort of assessment of Herbert's soaring creative imagination and his poetic creation with the long-held superficial view that his poems contain formal and impersonal Christian doctrines and have nothing to do with the actual living experience of his life and that his poetry is a mechanical exercise in the art of classical rhetoric, it becomes clear why Herbert has been relegated to the position of a minor poet for centuries. His poems, though praised in his own time and resurrected in the 19th century after a general neglect in the 18th century were valued during these three centuries for their piety which was a public good and an example for the common man. This sort of piety was taken to be necessarily unremarkable in thought and sentiment, however finely structured and however charming or precise in phrasing. So, Herbert as a "doer" was a pious Christian whose subject matter was Calvinistic Protestant philosophy. As a "maker" his object was to preach to the common rustic masses in plain, persuasive and pleasing prose or poetry. Therefore, critics were
either interested in his Christian resources as his subject and theme or in his debt to classical form or style, his inventiveness, fertile variation on known themes and his pattern poems. This way matter was separated from manner and both were separated from the man and his private feelings and experiences. Every thing about him was common place traditional and simple. Even in the 20th century his position has been found shrinking, because in the early part of the 20th century, enthusiasm for Donne worked to Herbert's disadvantage. For example, Paul Elmer More writing in 1906 presented Herbert as the humble imitator of Donne. He said: "There is nothing of the eagle in Herbert, nothing of the soaring quality which lifted Donne out of the common sphere" (74). Even Grierson who revived the interest in the metaphysical poets in the 20th century by writing his important book in 1921, presented Herbert as a minor poet belonging to the "School of Donne". Herbert was assessed as a poet of "smaller character" and narrower experience, lacking in intellectual sophistication and complex moods. In Herbert's poetry, as hinted earlier, Grierson also could not hear the voice of a highly sensitive soul; instead he heard the voice of an impersonal institution, the English Church. In his introduction he says: "The poet in whom the English church of Hooker and Laud, the church of via media in doctrine and ritual, found a voice
of its own was George Herbert" (xi-xii). Obviously it was a wrong assessment, but when the century advanced Herbert began to invite deeper attention: and speaking about him T.S. Eliot wrote: "To think of Herbert as the poet of a placid and comfortable easy piety is to misunderstand utterly the man and his poems" (14). Afterwards Helen Vendler also showed how readers and critics are misled to think that Herbert was simple, not complex. She says that Herbert's apparent simplicity is deceptive. According to her, "Herbert's poems, even those which seem most serene, often do not proceed tranquilly on their way, but suffer abrupt changes of direction, changes differing from similar ones in other poets by being relatively invisible since they bear no signals like nevertheless or but or yet, which usually mark an alteration in perspective" (2).

T.S. Eliot complains against the way Herbert was compared with his contemporaries. He goes to explain why Herbert was not properly assessed: "We cannot judge Herbert or savour fully his genius and his art by any selection to be found in any anthology" (15). He cites the example of Arthur Quiller Couche's Oxford Book of English verse, which was for many years unchallenged in its representative character. In this anthology, Herbert was allotted only five pages. A sufficient number of good and significant poems do not come to the common sight. Therefore, Eliot suggests that we should study The Temple
as a whole to know the greatness of Herbert's poetry where there is to be found the "divine perfecting of human art" and human life. After Eliot's famous remark that "Herbert's poetry is definitely an oeuvre to be studied entire" (Eliot, Spectator, 360) more and deeper attention has been paid to Herbert. Though Herbert has too often been read superficially, it is now found that those most attached to his poetry have been protesting against this superficiality in concert. The entire critical effort devoted to Herbert's work in the last two decades may seem to be a "co-operative venture in learning to read him with greater attention". Directing the attention in the right direction, Vendler in the introduction to her book The Poetry of George Herbert points out that in spite of their separate restoration of value, the recent studies of J.H.Summers, Rosemond Tuve, Richey, Fish, and Arnold Stein, discuss relatively few poems in aesthetic as well as moral terms. So in tracing the greatness of Herbert both aesthetics and ethics are to be taken together. J.H.Summers also in his book George Herbert: His Religion And Art emphasises this point. He argues that if we attempt to see his poetry today, we must keep before our mind all the past images of it formed by Laudians, Puritans, neo-classicists, and the modern apostles of John Donne. He feels that they all bring "partial if valuable illumination." (1-11).
He shows that all his critics belong to two groups: religious readers who love his piety and literary men who praise his unity or ingenuity of form or language. In either process both the poetry and the religion suffered, for they are intimately and inextricably inter-related in The Temple (Summers 10). This approach to Herbert brings full illumination to the matter. The greatness of his art was due to the goodness of his soul. This is what the chapter "man the maker and man the doer", attempts to show. His poetry and his religion were inter-related and the subject of his poetry was not the impersonal doctrine of the English Church, but the direct spiritual experience of a living soul. It is true that Herbert was a student of classical languages and rhetoric. He probably had a consciousness of his own desired effects. Many, therefore, think that an expressive theory of poetry suits The Temple best. But that is actually misleading. Helen Vendler takes the right position when she, in the introduction to her book cited above says that in examining Herbert's art she will refrain from taking poetry as the equivalent of life, but she does not think that there is a significant help to be had in understanding Herbert by invoking theories of poetry that detach artefact from lived experience. She is of the view that no matter how exquisitely written, a poem by Herbert, is in its final form, it seems, usually to have begun in experience and aims at recreating or recalling
that experience. Gardner also in his introduction to the book *The Poems of George Herbert*. Points out that Herbert's thoughts and feelings, before receiving the discipline of poetic expression, were "strengthened" and 'purified' by being brought to "the test of their conformity with the truth by which Herbert lived" (Gardner XIX). Herbert neither aims at poetic extravagance nor at speculative abstraction but at a fidelity to actual living experience. He always talks of God as some one having the touch stone to know the authentic gold. He himself also applies to his work, again and again, the single, and the most dependable touch stone of his own actual experience. He examines his work by raising questions: is that what I feel? Is that what I mean or am I permitting illusion? It is really 'nonsense' to separate such a poetry from the life or the actual experience of the poet. As Walton says, in his poetry Herbert wanted to give a picture of "many a spiritual conflict". This was Herbert's essential intent. The Notion of a dejected poor soul deriving comfort from the poem arose only subsequent to composition. Thus, first comes man's life and experience, after that comes the art or the artist. As weighed in the balance of Andre Gide, Herbert the "doer" gives us food or supplies the dinner, and Herbert the "maker" comes after the dinner to provide us with intoxication. In other words the story of Herbert's life and art is basically one thing, the manifestation of a disturbed or complex soul which experienced...
conflicts, which complains and praises, which revolts and submits, which doubts and believes and which loves and loves not. This soul manifests itself in two ways: through action and through speech. It is possible that one may act like a saint and remain silent. But Herbert's affairs were so complex that he had to break his silence and put questions to God Himself. Consequently, he became as eloquent in his speech as he was in action. So intense was his experience and so compelling was its urge that he was almost helpless. His soul was moved to search and find out God, to ask Him questions. In his poem "The Search" he says:

I sent a sigh to seek thee out
Deep drawn in pain,
Winged like an arrow; But my scout
returns in vain,
I tuned another
into a grone
Because the search was dumbe before
But all was one. (17-24)

So his was not a dumb search. It was an eloquent search, a poetic search of a heart that was moved, of a conscience that was throbbing and was vigorous and powerful enough to mount an assault on the door of the Almighty.

"A throbbing conscience spurred
by remorse,
Hath a strong force,
It quits the earth and mounting more
and more,
Dares to assault thee and besiege thy door.
("The Storm" 9-12)

Here the vigour and vitality is both moral and poetic. The art of living well and and the art of writing powerful poetry are combined. This elevates Herbert's art and, to quote Socrates, makes it a music for the king of kings, the Almighty, a "royal art" which deserves both the applause of man and the approval of God. For he says:

"All Solomon's sea of brass and world
of stone,
Is not so dear to thee as one good groan.
("Conscience" 17-18)

Emphasizing the poetic and musical aspect of it he says:

But groans are quick and full of wings
And all their motions upward be
And ever as they mount like lark they sing
The note is sad, yet music for a king.
( "Conscience" 21-24 )

Here we get good poetry that comes out of good soul and is music for a king, a royal art.

Another important reason for not remaining silent besides the necessity of finding out God and asking him questions is the fact that the pain is relieved when it is expressed. This is a universal, psychological truth. Herbert says that if he had not expressed his grief, he would have died. In "Joseph's Coat" he writes:

Wounded I sing, tormented I indite
Thrown down I fall into a bed and rest
Sorrow hath changed its note, such is his will
Who changeth all thing as him pleaseth best. 
For well he knows if but one grief and smart 
Among my many had his full career. 
Sure it would carry with it even my heart, 
And both would runne untill they found a biere 
To fetch the bodie, both being due to grief. 
But he hath spoiled the race, and given to anguish 
One of joye's coats, ticing it with relief 
To linger in me, and together languish. 
I live to show his power who once did bring 
My joyes to weep, and now my griefs to sing. 

(1-14)

Commenting on this poem Hutchinson writes:

"Like the coat of many colours "(Genesis xxxVII.3)
life is variegated by joy and pain and by different forms 
of pain. The poet gets relief by making music of all his 
chequered experiences, for if he were to allow a single 
grief to absorb him, it would claim both heart and body 
as its prey (533).

Thus, both the considerations (a) the necessity of 
searching for and questioning God carrying all the pain 
and agony of his spiritual conflicts, and (b) the 
necessity of expressing his pain in order to get some 
relief, clearly show that this is not poetry for the sake 
of poetry. His poetry was not at all an end in itself, it 
was a means to communicate something that was important 
and that compelled Herbert to expression and helped him 
in seeking out the appropriate form. This is the story of
all genuine art and poetry. The true poet moved by his sensitive receptivity becomes restless to communicate what has been communicated to him through experience.

So in Herbert's poetry we are to enjoy the truth the words and metaphors convey, but not the words and metaphors themselves. We are to distinguish ourselves as readers of Herbert's poetry by following St. Paul's standard according to which "it is a mark of good and distinguished minds to love the truth within words and not the words" (Qtd. in Stein XX). But St. Paul's emphasis may suggest a breach between the beauty in speech and the beauty in knowledge. For he goes further to say: "Though I be rude in speech yet not in knowledge". But in case of Herbert the truth is beautiful and it beautifies the language that conveys it. He is of the opinion that:

True beauty dwells on high. Ours is a flame
But borrowed thence to light us thither
Beauty and beauteous words should go together.

(Forerunners 28-30)

An examination of classical and Christian aesthetics shows that if the poet is truly inspired, his language is also inspiring and powerful. However, if at any moment it is found that the requirement of the beauty of poetic artifice stands in the way of the expression of truth, all genuine poets devoted to the truth of their experience prefer plain statement of truth (Stein XIV).
Examples for this are also to be found in Herbert and will be examined afterwards. But these are exceptional moments, otherwise his general principle seems to be that wisdom and eloquence go together. Let this matter be scrutinised first from the point of view of the classical tradition. In the classical tradition of style the initial commitment was "clarity" or clear statement of truth. This we get from Socratic teaching and in "dialectic". For Plato "the discovery of truth was the acknowledged thing and not persuasion, the approval of Gods not the applause of man" (Qtd. in Stein XIV). But the problem of mixed audience of both gods and men was hard to ignore. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* distinguished between "the discourse addressed to a subject and the discourse addressed to a hearer" (Stein XV). Stiffer Stoics refused to make any distinction between the subject and the hearer and "identified speaking well with speaking the truth (Stein XV), which means a combination of wisdom and eloquence. This was also the general practice of George Herbert that suggests no breach between the beauty of matter and the beauty of manner. But if on any special occasion truth of experience demands breach of poetic rule or beauty for its undistorted clear and plain statement, Herbert takes the side of truth and ignores poetic beauty. Take for example the poem entitled "Conscience".
My flesh and bones and joints do pray
   even my verse
By the rhyme and reason
The word is stay, says ever, come.(64-67)

While his flesh, bones and joints pray, he wants that his verse should also pray to God and invite him saying "come". Though the word rhyming with "pray" should have been "stay", the use of the word "come" may not be beautiful according to the traditional standard of poetry or poetic diction, firstly because it gives an unrhyming line and secondly because it does not sound poetic. But it is enjoyable because the truth it expresses is actually beautiful and assertive. We can call this poem a remarkable and beautiful poem. It takes us to the beautiful experience of a beautiful character who is brilliantly original in giving us a well suited unrhyming word amidst all rhyming words. It looks like a mole in a fair face, -- a beauty spot. The anti-traditional attitude in this poem has fascinated modern critics who discuss this poem while emphasising the ethics and the aesthetics in Herbert. Not only traditional poetic rules, but traditional religious rules are set aside if they conflict with his sincere feeling and the truth of his experience. Religion demands that man should love God, but if Herbert finds that his heart does not love God, he
does not allow his verse to say that he loved God. For he writes: "Let me not love thee, If I love thee not."
("Affliction" 66).

Thus Herbert's religious poetry is subordinated neither to religion nor to poetry. It is a poetic rendering of his personal spiritual experience with absolute sincerity. But in most cases wisdom and eloquence go together. If upper hand is at all to be granted, it is granted to wisdom and truth.

Let this situation be viewed in the perspective of Christian aesthetics also. St. Augustine's Book *De Doctrina Christiana* accepts the best tradition of classical rhetoric. He also assigns each typical style, its regular function, the function of teaching, pleasing and moving. But in Christian aesthetics the middle style (pleasing) is carefully examined and its function of giving pleasure is transferred to most trust worthy purpose of "persuasion". (Stein X). Commenting on this function of pleasing or persuading Arnold Stein says:

In the winning of soul "pleasure" or "persuasion" is a half way station only: the goal is to move and the right style called for is not an elaborate one deliberately removed from every day. Instead its elevation is primarily derived from the personal fervour with which the saving truth is expressed and if the beauties of eloquence, occur, they are caught up by the force of the
things discussed and not deliberately assumed for decoration. (XVIII)

Such things are said that the words in which they are said, seem not to have been sought by the speaker, but to have been joined to the things spoken about spontaneously "like wisdom coming from her house (i.e. from the breast of the wiseman) followed by eloquence as if she were an inseparable servant who was not called". (Stein XIX)

Thus, it is found that both the classical doctrine and that part of the Christian doctrine which accepts the best of the classical aesthetics, point out that the elevation of style is chiefly derived from the personal fervour of the inspired poet and from the force of the thing discussed. If one goes to that part of the Christian aesthetics which is directly derived from Christian scripture, the Bible, one finds that the two Pauline verses urge a poetics for the religious lyrics in which "artfulness of expression is not pursued for its own sake but in which the goodness of the biblical matter and of the speaker's heart give rise to appropriate forms of expression" (Lewalski 38).

Thus, we see that in classical rhetoric as well as in Christian rhetoric it is the inspired poet and his subject matter that give rise to appropriate forms and bring about, the elevation of style. That is also the
basic factor in Herbert. Even those who give importance to Herbert's craftsmanship recognise it to be only the second stage of inspiration.

In the case of The Temple the personal fervour is of the inspired Herbert. Herbert is searching for God to know from him the mystery of His art with man. His search is not a dumb search but an eloquent one. So he is under the spell of poetic inspiration and the force of the things discussed come from his spiritual experiences. This is what we infer about Herbert's art and religion in the perspective of classical and Christian aesthetics.

Now it is advisable to examine what Herbert himself says firstly about poetry in general and secondly about his own poetry in particular. It is found that poetry itself is one of Herbert's major themes.

The two sonnets that were addressed to Herbert's mother and the pair of sonnets entitled "Love" all express a vehement disapproval of contemporary secular Love poetry. One can use these four poems, a little perversely no doubt, as a basis for establishing Herbert's poetics. Taken piecemeal and both supplemented and contrasted, many of his characteristic attitudes, themes, and stylistic features are cramped together here without much literary distinction. But "in his personal lyrics which respond to many themes, moments, and
feelings Herbert does not give us a single, consistent attitude toward expression" (Stein 19). His art does not bear a single stamp and his arguments with God are conducted with great freedom and inventiveness. Arnold Stein says: "Whenever as a critic we take a single example as our model, we become aware of statements on the otherside of stylistic demonstration that force us to widen our definition" (19). In his "Fore-runners", for example, the art of poetry is condemned and is referred to as an art of embellishment having garments and veils of inexact and ornamental language.

Farewell sweet phrases, lovely metaphors
And will ye leave me thus? When ye before
Of stews and brothels onely knew the dooress,
Then did I wash you with my tears, and more
Brought you to church well drest and clad,
My God must have my best, ev'n all I had.(13-18)

But Herbert himself is a poet; he does not practice the art of silence nor does he confine himself only to those essential expression which he can merely mutter. He writes full artistic poems even when their aim is to express the inadequacy of the poetic expression. The scientific and rational age of the 17th century was sceptical about the importance of poetry. B.K.Lewalski in his Foreword points out that the prominent strain of poetic theory during the period present a poet as a "maker of fictions, which allegorically conceal or reveal
the profoundest philosophical truth" (3). George Herbert like Bacon did not like fiction and its concealment. They all were for the triumph of clear and distinct expression. In his *Advancement of Learning* Bacon writes:

"The scholastic custodians of unwholesome learning do not advance knowledge but are instead fierce with dark keeping "(Qtd. in Stein XXXVIII). What was hidden was, by incapacity or design, vague, unformed, erroneous, pretending to mean more than was understood and seeking to escape the inspection of clear reason newly emancipated and looking about for exercise" (XXXIX). Herbert, therefore, eschewed the fiction and the shadowy revelation and was for truth. In "Jordan-I" he writes:

Who says that fiction only and false hair
Become a verse? Is there in truth no beautye?
Is all good structure in a winding stair?
May no line passe, except they do their duties
Not to a True, but painted chair. (1-5)

Concluding the poem he writes:

I envie no man's nightingale or spring
Nor let them punish me with losse of ryme
Who plainly say my God, My kind. (13-15)

The poetics implied in the last lines proposes direct recourse to the Bible as the repository of truth. His effort in his poetry was to get the truth out plainly and to express the beauty that is there in truth. He associates himself with the psalmist in heartfelt and
uncontrived plain utterance.

But at the same time in some places we find him working like a conscious artist, contriving, designing and inventing. But it can also be argued that it is for a more effective expression. We find him trimming stanzas, cutting sentences, lopping rhyming words letter by letter with some plan and design. His poem "Easterwings", for example, is so designed that it achieves the visible unity of external shape and the soul of internal meaning. The lines are so composed and printed that they represent the shape of wings with which he wants to rise harmoniously with his Lord.

Lord, who created man in wealth and store
    Though foolishly he lost the same,
    Decaying more and more
    Till he became
    most poor
    with thee
    o let me rise
    As larks, harmoniously,
    And sing this day thy victories
    Then shall the fall, further the flight in me.

(1-10)

In ancient Egyptian picture-writing this is called "hiperoglyph". Herbert as a scholar of classical rhetoric is aware of this. When he experienced some thing in life, that moved his heart and his mind, and compelled him to
express them in poetry. All these rhetorical devices came into play spontaneously and evocatively and the poem took its birth. If so, it seems to have grown from within. It is not implanted from above. It is not a mere illustration of a rhetorical device. To many readers it may appear to be a deliberately devised artifice. But for a learned and well informed poet with a wide range of study and awareness this may be an easy, natural, and spontaneous creation.

Similarly in "Denial" when his heart breaks he also breaks the form of the poem. It is an external indication of the internal condition. It is an attempt to give the appropriate body to a particular afflicted soul. To some extent it also accords well with the classical and the Christian aesthetics that the nature of the subject matter and the mental condition of the speaker will automatically give rise to the appropriate manner or forms of expression.

The poem begins like this:

When my devotion could not pierce
Thy silent ears;
Then was my heart broken, as was my verse
my breast was full of fears,
And disorder. ("Denial" 1-5)

It concludes with these lines:
O cheer and tune my heartless breast
   Deferre no time
That so thy favours granting my request
They and my mind may chime
   And mend my rhyme. ("Denial" 26-30)

The poem contains six stanzas. In each of the first five stanzas, the fifth line continues to stand apart, a dangling trochaic (as the other lines are not) unrhymed and foreboding. This way we get a broken poem of a broken hearted poet. How many poets have given us such a beautiful example? In the last stanza, the poet is cheered, his breast is tuned, the unrhymed trochaic is removed, the poem is mended and formally completed by these lines "They and my mind may chime,/ and mend my rhyme". What a unique example of wholeness and harmony.

A greater sort of artistic effect is achieved when not the whole poem but a single word is broken and joined as we know, in the poem, "Jesu". The afflicted and agonised poet says:

That to my broken heart he was I ease you
   And to my whole is Jesu. (9-10)

The breaking of "Jesu" into "I esu" to mean "I ease you" is no doubt an Artistic invention of a conscious artist. But they are at the opposite extreme and are to be contrasted with his sincere, serious, spontaneous and powerful poems like "A Tru Hymne "Love-III", "Grief", "Love-III" the...
"Temper" and "Pearl", where the inspired poet is assisted either by the truth that inspires him and takes him up or by the divine grace that descends on him from above. So such pattern poems and other elaborately contrived works are branded to be the sheer artifice of a conscious artist. This appears to be correct because Herbert himself also thinks of it in the same light and now in this section of the chapter it is planned to see what Herbert himself says about his own works. Though in "Jordan-I" Herbert advocates the cause of plain saying as opposed to poetic garments, ornaments and veil.

But in "Jordan-II", he acknowledges that he himself has done that and mocks at the long pretence of his own self conscious art. He is sorry for the fact that he was curling with metaphors a plain intention, decking the sense as if it were to sell. (5-6). For a pure and sincere poet like Herbert all these things were unnecessary and avoidable. Therefore, concluding the poem he writes:

But while I bustled, I might hear a friend
Whisper, how wide is all this long pretence ;
There is in love a sweetness readie penn'd
Coplecut only that, and save expense. (15-18).

This charge of "Long pretence", "writing with metaphor" "decking the sense" and "making the bustle" that Herbert himself makes against some of his own works may
be for other artificial poems, but not for "Denial" or "Jesu" discussed above. Conscious art is there in them, but there is no "long pretence", no curling with metaphor, and no decking its sense. The idea of breaking and joining of the word "Jesu" does not veil or curl the plain intention, but quickly or almost suddenly takes us to it with starting pleasure. This device of giving startling pleasure is one of the characteristics of metaphysical poets which is usually criticised as an external thing. It is said that it does not originate in the soul of the poet and is imported from outside by the "Wit" a lesser faculty of the human mind. This attitude of the 18th century towards the metaphysical wit has been corrected by the modern critics and poets. The charge has the element of truth in it, but it should not be thoughtlessly applied to all cases and to all poets. At least in this case, the idea is deeply and intimately connected with the experience of the poet's agrieved soul. As he was brooding over his own afflictions, and was longing to know the reason, the thought of the torture inflicted on Jesus might have comforted him. Jesus suffered for others and redeemed them. When Herbert's heart is broken Jesus will break himself to restore Herbert. Viewed this way, we find it directly linked with Herbert's personal, spiritual, experience. The verse also clearly says "to my broken heart". Viewed superficially it appears to be the witty artifice of a
conscious artist which it is not. Hellen Gardner provides the necessary corrective to such superficial interpretation when she emphasises that however exquisitely a poem may be written by Herbert, "his thoughts and feelings before receiving the discipline of any poetic expression are strengthened and purified by being brought to the test of their conformity with his actual living experience". (XIX).

It has been mentioned earlier that Herbert's critics stray away towards superficiality when they begin to think that Herbert's subject matter is impersonal Christian doctrine and his style or manner belongs to a separate and independent world of rhetoric and prosody. On the other hand critics take the right course when they emphasize matter over manner and begin to think that the subject matter of Herbert's poetry is his personal spiritual experience and the elevation of his manner or style comes from the personal fervour of the poet who is inspired.

Therefore, when we see an exquisitely designed poem of Herbert, it is not advisable to jump to the conclusion that it is the technical triumph of a conscious artist. It is a mistake for which Herbert has suffered for centurises. We must be very cautious and careful while detaching the artifact from the lived experience, the art
from the man, the maker from the doer. Both the things the art and the man, the maker and the doer, have an indispensable mutuality and in the concluding part of this chapter reference is made to a poem which shows the consummation of the process that combines poetic artifice with the truth of experience, art with life, and aesthetics with ethics, which is the central theme of this chapter.

After knowing Herbert's attitude towards poetry in general and towards his own poetry in particular, it is advisable to examine the subject matter of his poetry or what sort of personal experience is at the creative centre of *The Temple* and what Herbert himself says about it. It is already mentioned that Herbert has written poems on the theme of his poetry, in particular the four poems -- two sonnets addressed to his mother and the pair of sonnets entitled "Love".

From these poems we know a lot about the nature of his experiences that are recreated in his poem. Besides these poems, we have the valuable biography of Izaak Walton in which Herbert is reported to have clarified the matter about the experiences that are recalled or recreated in his poetry. We know that while sending his little book to Mr. Farrer through Mr. Duncon, he said that the experiences recorded in the book present "a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have passed betwixt
God and myself" (Walton 99). This way from the very authentic source (his own poetry and his biography) we come to know that his main and valuable experiences contain 'many spiritual conflicts' between his soul and God, although about the conflict some misunderstanding may be there.

All his biographers including Walton describe how aristocratic, well dressed, sophisticated and fastidious in taste he was and how he moved in higher circles and how close he was to the king and to his court. The post that was offered to him in the university had been a ladder to higher and important posts in the king's court. Therefore, it was natural on his part to have court ambition and all his friends also advised and encouraged him that way. But his noble nature, his religious disposition and his mother's intention were to serve the divine cause and to join the church. Both the things had equal attraction and he was torn between the two. Therefore, one is likely to think that the spiritual conflict in his life refers to this conflict of worldly ambitions and religious aspiration. But Rosmond Tuve who, like other recent critics (J.H.Summers, Hellen Vendlers and Arnold Stein) proves that Herbert was not a simple and placid poet but a complex and sophisticated personality, clarifies the matter saying that "by conflict of the will it is usually assumed that these
concern renunciation made with difficulty when he decided to give up court hopes" (Tuve 167). But he argues that freedom from such simple conflicts characterises the majority of Herbert's poems. According to Tuve the conflict refers to "the paradoxical free subjection" (167).

Though he has many conflicts with Jesus whom he calls his master, he says that in His service he has found perfect freedom. This is "the paradox of free subjection". In his poems we have such paradoxes, subtle modulations, delicate changes of mood and undertones. It is difficult to trace all those things for common readers, because his apparently serene and deceptively tranquil poems, bear no signals like 'nevertheless' or 'but' or 'yet' which usually mark an alteration in perspective. If we make ourselves sensitively responsive to such spiritual complexity and difficult theological wrestlings in Herbert's poetry, we can discover that the very moment when the bold rebellion in him denies and fights is also the moment, when he longs for humble submission.

Full of rebellion I would die
or fight, or travel, or deny. "(Nature" 1-2)

In no time the tone is changed and he writes:

Wherefore I cry, and cry again
And in no quiet canst thou be
Till I a thankful heart obtain
of thee:
Not thankful, when it pleaseth me;
As if thy blessings had spare dayes
But such a heart, whose pulse may be
Thy praise." (Greatfulness" 25-32)

This is the state of mind of a sensitive and sincere poet. He can not write poems of love and praise if there is no love for God in his heart. At the same time he can not live comfortably and quietly without loving God. This is the intimate and inextricable link between Herbert's living and Herbert's writing, between Herbert the "maker" and Herbert — the "doer". Therefore, a deeper insight into his poems will enable us to discover the paradox that his revolt is submission, his doubt is faith, his complaint praise, and his quarrel and conflict with God is his love for God. Rosmond Tuve emphasises this love in his essay on Herbert's poetry entitled "George Herbert and Caritas". Though Herbert himself says that his book contains the picture of many spiritual conflicts but his friend Mr. Farrer to whom the book was sent is reported to have said that "The whole book was such a harmony of holy passion as would enrich the world with pleasure and piety" (Walton 99). So, it can be concluded that though the central theme of The Temple appears to be the spiritual conflict" or quarrel with God, but actually it is "harmony of holy passion" and love for God', not for any woman.
Now, if one passes from what Herbert said to his friends about his own books to what he says about his poetry in his poems, the progress will be a well linked progress. Let us go back to those four poems which according to Arnold Stein establishes Herbert's poetics. These four poems - (two sonnets addressed to his mother and the pair of sonnets entitled "Love") express fervent disapproval of sexual love. Herbert says that poetry has gone wrong in wearing Venus's livery and praising the mortal beauty of woman. This disapproval of "mortal love" in a poet, in whose poetry lies "the divinest love", is quite understandable.

Herbert finds that poetry written on woman's love and beauty is more powerful and popular, because it has greater warmth that thrills and moves the heart whereas the hand that writes on God's love gets the warmth only of scarf or glove.

who sings thy praise? Only a scarf or glove
Doth warm our hands, and make them write of love.
("Love I" 13-14)

Whereas he who praises woman's beauty and love moves, warms, thrills the readers and "doth all the title gain". It is a shameful situation for mankind. Why is it so? The heart, the nature and the constitution of the poet is
to be questioned. The public which applauds this kind of poetry is to be questioned. If all are like that, the creator is to be questioned. Herbert feels the gravity of the situation and raises a question which is of fundamental significance in the world of ethics and aesthetics, a question which we all need to know and which God himself is called upon to answer.

The question is:

Can not thy Love
Heighten a spirit to sound out thy praise
As well as any she? Can not thy Dove
Outstrip their cupid easily in flight
Or since thy ways are deep and still the same
Will not a verse run smooth, that bears thy name.

("Love I" 6-11)

He then proceeds to explain how this happens.

Wit fancies beauty, beauty raiseth wit;
The world is theirs; they two play out the game
Thou stand by: ("Love II" 9-11)

Discussing the aesthetical aspect of these important lines Arnold Stein says: "These lines from "Love I" would seem at home in many of Herbert's best poems. They have the right kind of detached wit, a characteristic friction of word against word and the phrases move with deliberate grace posing together by turning towards and away from each other. But these effects are so much subdued by the dominant tone of the poem that they are as good as lost. We recognise them chiefly from our
acquaintance with his other poems" (Stein 2). This shows how automatically the matter dominates over the manner.

Here, one gets the basis for establishing Herbert's poetics. As we see, in such poems aesthetical aspects receive due attention and care, but the poetry here is not for poetry's sake. It is a means to convey a more important meaning. In the matter-and-manner-relationship the matter is emphasized over manner and manner owes its beauty to matter. If the matter is beautiful the manner will be beautified by it. Therefore, Herbert's question is "Is there in truth no beauty?" He does not ask "Is there no truth in beauty?" It means we are to see beauty in truth, instead of searching for truth vaguely in beauty. We must not allow ourselves to be attracted by beauty first and then start groping and seeking some truth in it. Rather, we will first find out the truth and discover the beauty in it later. Then only can we qualify to be the fit readers for Herbert's poetry. Cut to this proportion, aesthetics and ethics are harmoniously blended into a significant whole instead of standing separate and independent.

Herbert's aesthetics deserve special consideration in this context. He believes that when poetic lustre, trim invention and colourful metaphors curl the plain intention, when the winding flames of sensuous images burn the truth, when poetic ornament and garment veil or
conceal the truth, we need not run after such poetry however beautiful they may be. They do not give us the truth. They are enemies of the truth, because they conceal, confuse, and distort the truth. Therefore, Herbert rejects them saying:

"How wide is all this long pretence" ("Jordan-II"16)

This attitude of Herbert was also in accordance with the Christian notion of aesthetics. It reminds us of St. Augustine's critical remark on the art of concealment. His remarks on sensuous images and metaphors in expressing higher spiritual truths deserve attention. According to him "a thing which is understood figuratively is understood casually. There is a miserable servitude of spirit in this habit of taking signs for things, so that one is not able to raise, above things that are corporal or created, the eyes of the mind which is to drink in the eternal light" (qtd. in Stein XV).

Herbert aspires to strike an austere pose of Augustinian aesthetics. But he was after all a poet and it is hard for a poet to believe effectively in an absolute disjunction between the eye of the body and the eye of the mind. They will have to take the help of sensuous things for explaining and expressing even spiritual things. However sincere the feelings might be, they need art for their expression. Sincerity may give originality to a poem and may make it powerful and effective, but a
poem cannot be composed without art. Therefore, Herbert accepted the need of art for the effective expression of his sincere feelings. And we find that sensuous metaphors, even mechanical and scientific images, witty designs, contradictions and paradoxes "maintain unofficial residence" in Herbert's poetry. They are cautiously used as far as they help the expression of the sincere feeling of the poet. So, they are employed to serve the truth and to help the expression of truth. Here the art is not for the sake of Art but for the sake of truth that is revealed through art. It is so, because for Herbert beauty is in Truth, not in the fiction of artful art.

Who says that fictions only and false hair
Become a verse? Is there in truth no beauty?
Is all good structure in a winding stair?
May no line passe, except they do their dutie
Not to a True, but painted chair "(Jordan I" 1-5)

In these lines of "Jordan I" we find a baptised nurse who is baptised in the waters of Jordan, not in the spring of Helicon. The poem celebrates the beauty of simple, plain, natural Dove, not the mythical or fictitious Cupid.

As in the world of aesthetics the visible and carnal aspect of art is subdued, so in the world of ethics the physical and sensuous aspect is eschewed. If
a beautiful woman does not serve the truth and is morally filthy, she is to be rejected however impressive her beauty may be. Her beauty is not to be praised, her love is not to be exalted. In his Second Sonnet to his mother he writes:

Why should I Women's eyes for chrystal take
Such poor invention burns in their low minds?
Whose fire is wild, and doth not upward go
To praise, and on thee, Lord, some ink bestow?
Open the bones, and you shall nothing find
In the best face but filth, when, Lord, in thee
The beauty lies in the discovery. (Sonnet II 8-14)

But most of his contemporaries were sensual and physical in their treatment of love though they were called metaphysical. They had that wild fire which burns low and "doth not upward go".

Though Donne wrote about religion and divine love afterwards he acknowledges that in these poems his muse affected "chaste" fellowship becoming a nun only in her "third widowhood", otherwise his love is mortal love. When he says:

For God's sake hold your tongue, and let me love.
("The Canonization" 1)

he does not mean divine love. Andrew Marvel in his poem "The Garden" argues that the charm of the ideal love was in the original garden of Amad, meaning "Paradise", where-
My Soul into the boughs does glide;
There like a Birt it sits, and sings,
Then whets and combs its silver Wings;
And, till prepared for longer flight,
Waves in its plumes the various Light.

(52 - 56)

But this was possible in paradise when Adam lived alone and Eve was not born.

Such was that happy Garden-state,
While Man there walked without a Mate.

(57 - 58)

Now that we are on this earth with Eve by our side, our love is bound to be physical. He argues in favour of enjoying the body when it blooms with youth, because our life is brief and time is short. "Now, therefore, while the youthful hue", he says in "To his Coy Mistress", "sits on thy skin like morning dew", we should embrace each other and enjoy the physical pleasure. Similarly Abraham Cowley's love is also purely mortal, because referring to his mistress he writes:

Her body is my soul, laugh not at this
For by my life I swar it is. (Soul 13-14)

It was amidst these powerful and popular poets that Herbert raised his head and asked his readers to "discover" the beauty of divine love by looking beyond the beautiful woman.

He also directs us to look beyond the beauty of nature. He adores nature (both animate and inanimate), admires
He adores nature (both animate and inanimate), admires its proportion, order, and harmony and recognises in them the display of divine art. But he does not want to confine our attention to nature itself. We must look beyond to the creator of nature. In his "Pulley" he declares that God will not be happy if man would "adore" his "gifts", instead of adoring Him, and "rest in Nature", not in the "God of Nature". This appeal to lift our eyes from the beauty of a beautiful woman to the beauty of divine truth and from the beauty of nature to the beauty of the creator of nature is a leap of imagination in the right direction. It takes us from the creations to the creators and deserves to be called creative. It is the highest form of creative imagination, because by turning us away from the worship of the beauty of a beautiful woman, it saves us from idolatry and makes us true worshippers of God. Similarly, by turning us away from the worship of nature, it makes us truly scientific and enables us to understand and master nature. So, Herbert's creative poetry while directing us to the creator gives us true religion and true science. He has enriched himself with such wide-ranging creative imagination by sincere spiritual longing and by prayer to God whom he asks to afford us so much wit.

That as the world serve us
we may serve thee
And both thy servants be ("Man" 53-54)
This ability to discover beauty in Truth or in the ultimate reality by lifting our eyes above the visible reality is found in a soul that longs for it from within and gets divine assistance from without. This dynamic balance gives completeness of perception and sees everything well integrated in the creative design of the divine cosmos. Nothing is left out as disintegrated or unwholesome. True religion is harmoniously blended with science, and aesthetics is combined with ethics. With this dynamic balance of the creative imagination and the completeness of perception Herbert exercised a great influence upon his contemporary readers and writers. Though Herbert differed from popular and powerful poets like Donne, Marvell, Cowley and others he influenced and inspired many other notable poets of his age like Vaughan, Crashaw, Harvey, Herrick, Taylor and others. He became, in fact, the leader of a new school of poetry. The two celebrated English poets who were strongly influenced by Herbert and who did not belong to Herbert's age are Christiana Rossetti and G.M. Hopkins. For long George Herbert was superficially viewed, but in the second half of this century writers and critics have started viewing him as a major poet and a master of a very important school of poetry. In 1974 Barbara Kiefer Lewalski published a book entitled Protestant Poetics and the 17th Century Religious Lyrics in which she explains
the school of protestant poetics and presents Herbert as the master of this school. She argues: "Though Donne's sermon contributed vitally to the emerging Protestant poetics, not all of his Divine Poems are best explained in its terms" (253). According to her "Herbert's volume of religious verse. The Temple develops this aesthetics fully and harmoniously and uses it as the very foundation of his poetry" (283). She acknowledges that Donne had his influence on Herbert as an elderly poet of his time and also as a friend of his mother and that the poetics implicit in the sermon of so distinguished a preacher as Donne could hardly have failed to impress his younger contemporary. "But Herbert not Donne", she asserts, "was the poet praised and imitated by contemporaries as the creator of a new movement and new model, for religious poetry" (Lewalski 283).

Thus viewed in the perspective of wider humanity, Donne appears to be a man of divided mind and unrestrained animal nature, a "tortured individual" who is "more aware of disintegration than of comprehensive harmony" (Grierson XIV). Some times this divided mind, torn individuality, and Philosophical scepticism are held at a premium and are regarded as effective sources of powerful poetry. But this sort of dazzling poetry springing from a torn, divided or disintegrated soul is like a lightning that flashes, dazzles and impresses, but is soon
swallowed up by darkness and lost, leaving us groping in a greater darkness. In Herbert on the other hand, we have the enduring glow of permanent values, a soul that is not divided or disintegrated, but is well integrated and endowed with the complete perception of comprehensive harmony. It is not the product of an imagination which is imbalanced by personal whims, which is moved by a hot and misleading human passion responding to the visible sensuous reality, but is the outcome of a longing and groping human soul, balanced, perfected, and complemented by divine assistance. It is the product of a throbbing conscience spurred by remorse which with "strong force" quits the earth and rising higher and higher reaches the divine door. So at the creative centre of Herbert's poetry is his own personal spiritual experience which moves his heart and turns his noble soul into a longing soul that soars up groping and seeking and is assisted, balanced and perfected by divine mending. It is a state of dynamic balance between ascending human imagination and descending divine wisdom which we have preferred to call creative imagination. Such a creative imagination by being connected with the ultimate creator is so wide and all embracing that all that the creator has created is included in the creative design of the cosmos. Thus, the positively inspired creative imagination succeeds in tracing the links that bind everything in creation to God's creative purpose. Nothing is left out as
disintegrated or unwholesome. Such a creative imagination is at the root of Herbert's creative poetry.

Therefore, in the case of Herbert even those things, from which we are asked to lift up our eyes in order to make the required leap from the visible reality to the ultimate reality, such as the beauty of "woman" or the beauty of "nature", are not excluded or rejected. Though in his poems he suggests that we should not confine our attention to them and that we should not worship nature or woman instead of worshipping God, he does not say that they are to be ignored or rejected. Their position is to be properly located, they are to be understood, disciplined and employed in the proper service of mankind.

In his poem "Man" Herbert concludes that nature will serve man and man will serve God. Both will become god's servants. Here the word "Man" includes woman also. Therefore, including woman in the creative design of the creator it can be said that nature may serve man and woman and man and woman may serve God. All three shall become God's servants. God must be served or obeyed. Then only everything that God has created can be integrated into the cosmic whole. When Adam first disobeyed God and ate the forbidden fruit being under the spell of woman's charm and persuasion, it was the first sin of man for
which Adam was driven out of paradise. It is a warning, a lesson that teaches man and woman to obey God and regain paradise. Referring to this first sin of man Donne writes:

So did the world from the first hour decay
The evening was the beginning of the day.
('First Anniversarie' 11-12)'

But it does not mean that our life is doomed to be in a state of decay. The prospect of our redemption or the possibility of regaining paradise shows that Adam or man on this earth with Eve by his side can himself obey and can also make Eve obey the divine discipline and both can be obedient servants of God and regain Paradise. It may be difficult, some may fail, nay, many may fail, but all will not. It will be a matter of credit for those men and women who will win paradise this way by restraining themselves and resisting the temptations of sinful satanic instinct. The reward will be double pleasure, the charm of paradise along with the charm of a companion like Eve. Marvell is wrong in thinking that we can not think of a higher love or a higher happiness of "garden-state" as long as we are on this earth with Eve by our side and that man could enjoy the "garden-state" only when he was without a mate. Therefore, he writes:

Two paradise 'twere in one
To live in paradise alone ("Garden - 63-64)
But in Herbert's scheme which is creatively tuned to be in harmony with the cosmic design of the creator the pleasure of paradise does not necessitate the exclusion of Eve and the other charms of this earth. Herbert says:

Not that he may not here Taste of the cheer
But as birds drink and straight lift their head So must he sip and think
of better drink, ("Man's Medley" 19-23)

Therefore, when he says:
Why should I women's eyes for crystal take, he does not mean to say "why should I accept a woman". He simply suggests that we should not over estimate something far above its real worth.

Nothing in this universe can ever be more important than the creator Himself and his discipline. However beautiful a woman or a natural scene may be, it can not be more beautiful than divine love and divine order. We should rightly measure the relative importance of things. If Cowley's hot passion exaggerates the physical charms of his mistress and says "Her body is my soul". Herbert's creative imagination rightly measures the human pleasure and says why should I woman's body for my soul take. The same thing is echoed or implied when Herbert writes:

Why should I woman's eyes for Crystal take.

("Sonnet II" 8)
Here we see the difference between the poetry which is the product of "low mind" or born of "wild fire" and the poetry which is the product of a creative imagination where there is "unification of sensibility" and where human passion, human reason and the intuitive knowledge of God's cosmic design are dynamically balanced. Herbert as a fashionable young aristocrat had the passion for worldly pleasure in him. In his poem "The Pearl" he says that he is aware of all temptations and worldly pleasures.

I know the ways of pleasure, the sweet strains,
The lullings and the relishes of it;
The propositions of hot blood and brains (21-23)

His biographers may present him to be a saint, but his poetry clearly indicates the presence of youthful passion in him. Commenting on this fact M. Charles Amy, a recent biographer of George Herbert, writes: "All too often biographers caught up in the spell of Walton have merely acquiesced in the portrayal of Herbert as a forerunner of the type of 'gentle Jesus, meek and mild', despite the clear indication in his poems of his 'sudden soul' and his 'youth and fierceness' and despite his elder brother's comments on Herbert's 'passion and choler'. At the end of the reading of these many books of biography, accurately or inaccurately presented, the reader must return to the Herbert he first came to know through his writings". (209) His writings and his poems show his
awareness of hot passions. But he kept them at arm's length and subjected them to human reason and divine discipline. His awareness of passion seems to be so close, intimate and direct that when he describes the temptation and charm of the sensuous pleasures and the 'propositions of hot blood and brains in his poem 'The Pearl' he repeats the word "I know", which is not there in other stanzas where he describes other temptations of the world such as learning, honour and glory. Commenting on this stanza Arnold Stein writes: "What is most distinctive is the passionate immediacy, the full identification of the poet with the feelings expressed. The nonchalance of witty indifference abruptly disappears .... (35). We clearly see that the poet is personally touched, moved and involved. The amused detachment and the superiority of the speaker is lost. 'As for the temptation ifself', Arnold Stein further says, "it is not considered in a formal way, but its presence and force are amply represented by the language of the speaker" (35). Thus, here we clearly discover that so rare a character as Herbert is frankly responsive to the appeals of sensuous pleasure. Therefore, we can not say that he talked of divine love because he was not aware of the sensuous love. Donne is not right when he makes a sweeping generalisation like the following:
Love is not so pure and abstract as they use
To say, who have no mistress but their muse.
("Love's Growth" 11-12)

This is not applicable to Herbert who has his mistress. He is quite aware of all these things when he asks us to lift our eyes beyond the eyes of woman.

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 sale, and the commodities;
And at what rate and price I have thy love;
With all the circumstances that move:
("Pearl" 31-36)

But he evokes God's help in these matters for he feels that he badly needs it.

He seems to be keenly aware of man's weakness in resisting the temptation of lust. Therefore, in his sonnet ("Love" II) God is requested:

To kindle in our hearts such true desire
As may consume our lust and make thee way. (18-19)

What he suggests is the avoidance of excessive pursuit of sensual pleasures, not total rejection. Rejection of worldly pleasures, particularly woman, will mean rejection of a very important creation of God. The imagination that deserves to be called creative must not exclude such beautiful creations of the creator. In those four sonnets (two addressed to his mother and two entitled "Love I" and "Love II") that establish Herbert's
poetics, it is found that divine love and courtly love or wanton love are contrasted. But in other poems "human and divine love speak to each other in tones of complex emotion", and are "quietly assimilated by the representative of both human and divine love" (Walton 29). Man is to sip the earthly cheer and at the same time he is to look up and to think of the better drink. The charm of music, woman, natural scenery and other earthly pleasures are to be assimilated with the pleasure arising out of the contemplation of the creator of all these things. Justifying these pleasures Herbert would say: "Religion does not banish mirth, but only moderates and sets rule to it", (Walton 79).

Herbert demonstrated this assimilation in life by deciding to marry a lady who, as Walton reports, aspired for his hand. Herbert's decision both to enter into the sacred order of priesthood and to marry came at the same time when he was in the house of Lord Danver, and when his health improved to a good degree of strength and cheerfulness. But by this time his mother and the father of the lady were no more. Describing their meeting, mutual love and happy marriage Walton says:

Yet some friends to both parties procured their meeting, at which time a mutual affection entered into both their hearts, as a conqueror enters into a surprised city and love having got such possession, governed and made there such laws and resolutions
as neither party was able to resist, in so much that she changed her name into Herbert the third day after this first interview. (50)

Walton points out that this haste, in others might be thought a love-frenzy or worse, but it was not so. Walton states that parents, friends, and relatives had thought of their union or marriage, because their taste and temperament had many things in common. They so "well understood Mr. Herbert's and her temper of mind and also their estate, so well before this interview, that the suddenness was justifiable by the strictest rules of prudence, and the more, because it proved so happy to both parties for the eternal lover of mankind made them happy in each other's mutual and equal affections and compliance" (Walton 51). To make her obey divine discipline was not at all a problem for Herbert, because she willingly and quietly became a part of Herbert's pious and disciplined life, at Bemerton. Herbert's formula presented in "Man" worked well. She helped and served him as he served God and both were thus God's servants. Walton describes how husband and wife were humble and charitable towards the suffering and needy people. Even animals in trouble or ill-treated by their masters claimed attention. The whole family regularly prayed twice a day. Describing their mutual understanding and happy life Walton writes:
... there never was any opposition betwixt them, unless it was a contest which should most incline to a compliance with others desires. And though this begot, and continued in them such a mutual love and joy, and content as was no way defective; yet this mutual content and love and joy did receive a daily augmentation by such daily obligingness to each other as still added such new affluences to the former fullness of these divine souls, as was only improvable in heaven where they now enjoy it. (51)

Thus, here was noticeable a sublime harmony between the world here and the world hereafter. In his worldly love and heavenly love there is no agony of alienation or conflict, but the peace of higher harmony. In his poem entitled "Conscience" he writes :

My thoughts must work, but like a noiseless sphere; Harmonious peace must rock them all the day. No room for pratlers there (8-10)

The expression "noiseless sphere" suggests an order that is cosmic. Man is required to order and shape his life in such a way that it will be a part of the divine cosmos. Without rejecting any of the charm that God had created for him, man is to lead a life in such a way that the higher charm of the world hereafter must not be endangered. It is not an easy job. Herbert says that in order to entitle himself to this double charm man is to undertake double pain.

But as his joys are double
So is his trouble. ("Man's Medley" 25-26)
How can man "rightly measure" the human and divine pleasure and order his life in such a way that he can ensure the happiness of both the worlds. For that one should turn to The Temple of George Herbert. It is here that one can get the required learning and training for such a balanced and integrated life. At the very entrance of The Temple our eyes first meet the following lines:

Nothing but holy pure and clear
Or that which groaneth to be so
Must at his peril further go. ("Superliminare" 6-8)

In order to enter The Temple one must have at least the longing to become holy, pure and clear. In this Temple, the art of living, a pure and noble life is taught through the art of poetry.

In other words, in The Temple the main concern of "man the maker" is the improvement of "man the doer". But before entering The Temple one should pause a little, look around, and see what the modern world thinks about this three hundred year old temple. Commenting on Herbert's attitude towards life and poetry as presented in his collection of poems, Rosemond Tuve a modern critic, says:

Herbert's outlook on life and on poetry is greatly at variance with that which we often encounter in a western nation in the twentieth century, but not greatly at variance with that which most of the critics of our society (and all modern poets) have pointed to as an outlook we sadly need. (103)
Here Herbert's creative imagination, consciously or unconsciously, is based on and is assisted by the traditional Christian notions. But every thing is verified on his throbbing pulse and is experimented through his lived experience. Here, of course, Herbert is more a sensitive human being than an orthodox Christian. He is more practical and attentive to the particular than to the speculative and the general. Arnold Stein rightly thinks about him when he says:

One may perhaps note parallels between his admiration for Bacon and his aversion to speculative and controversial theology, his firm stress on the Parson's practical knowledge and piety and on the exact observation that assist the conduct of daily affairs. (23).

Herbert's own piety which cannot be said to minimise man's dependance on God, nevertheless, reflects "the general shift in the 17th century from speculative meditation of divine things to particular observation of human things" (Stein 23).

Another important touchstone in the matter of right ordering of knowledge and understanding life is the sermon of Ralph Cudworth (preached before the House of Commons on 31 March 1947) which points out that "we think it a gallant thing to be fluttering up to heaven with our wings of knowledge and speculation: whereas the highest
mystery of a divine life here and of perfect happiness there after consisteth in nothing but mere obedience to divine will "(Stein 24).

Herbert also does not want to clog and confuse his straight and plain relation with God and with God's love and order either by the vague speculation of philosophy or by the false fiction of poetry. In "Jordan" for example he says:

I envie no man's nightingale or spring,
Nor let them punish me with losse of ryme,
Who plainly say, my God, My king. (13-15)

In "Jordan II he corrects his artificiality by accepting the whispering advice of his friend who said:

How wide is all this long pretence
There is in love a sweetness readie penn'd;
Copy out only that, and save expense. (16-18)

Here is the fusion of Herbert's aesthetics and ethics. The famous classical aesthetic concept of "imitation" is replaced by "copy". The term "copy" embraces both imitation of divine art for shaping human art and following Jesus Christ in shaping human character and life. Commenting on the use of the term "copy" R.Tuve says "when he wrote "copy out" he surely meant something higher than "poetic imitation" (174) and according to Tuve "the poem turns out to be less about writing a poem than about living a life" (175).
To copy divinity, to follow God or to obey God's will is not easy without divine grace. This way, however practical his imagination may be, he always establishes its link with the creator and seeks his assistance. It is for this that his imagination gets qualified to be called creative. But the initial move must be from the side of man. In the field of poetry he must be "craving" for fuller expression and in the field of life he must be one who "groaneth" to be noble, pure and clear. Then only the balance between the human and divine effort will be dynamic having action in both. Donne has described the human role and effort in a beautiful way by using the symbol of the cross. He argues:

... in the spiritual order we should supply for ourselves spiritual crosses everywhere. On the analogy of their omnipresence in the material world, we should bear our crosses of tribulations and become other Christ crucified. We should cross our very joy in crosses, lest it breed pride. We should cross all our senses in their craving for pleasures. We should cross our hearts in their undue dejection and exaltation and we should cross our brain in its concupiscence of wit. (qtd. in Lewalski 225)

With this understanding one must enter The Temple of George Herbert. One may not be initially noble and pure but there must be a longing for these values.

On entering The Temple one finds that it is divided
into three main sections -- the prefatory poems entitled "The Church Porch", the central section named "The Church", and the epilogue called "The Church Militant". The first section explores the external behaviour proper for a Christian in his day to day interaction with the world around him. The central section shows the intimate spiritual relation with God and important spiritual experiences. The final epilogue represents the militant Church or the corporate body of the Church which has no security here and is in constant conflict with the world. It is symbolised by the Ark in the old Testament or by the flying woman in the New. It may also mean the heart of the elect or the spouse of the Christ moving like a pilgrim seeking individual salvation.

If the pilgrimage to *The Temple* is successful one will succeed in ordering one's day to day conduct and establish proper relations with (a) his fellow human beings including woman, with (b) the natural world, and finally with (c) God the creator. Of all the relations in life man's relation with God is the most important. Herbert has written on nature, man and the universe demonstrating God's art in them but his main theme is the mystery of God's art in His relations with man. Here unless the creative imagination of man succeeds in grasping creative design behind every thing, he is likely
to mistake God to be unjust or unkind. The next chapter entitled "The Just God and the Suffering Innocent" shows how Herbert's creative imagination tackles this problem. However, on the whole, the Christian echo and implication in The Temple with its resemblance to Solomon's wise maxims for shaping behaviour and to David's throbbing conscience for understanding spiritual experiences, is well explained by Lewalski in detail.

When one comes out of The Temple after reading the whole of it, as Eliot advises, his soul is purged of all pestilence. He becomes noble, pure clean and fit for regaining the paradise, which is called redemption, and the protecting arm of God Himself saves him from all insecurity and unhappiness. This happy state of life is demonstrated in art through the poem "The paradise" in which Herbert says:

> What open force and hidden charm  
> Can blast my fruit or bring me harm  
> While the enclosure is thine arm. (4-6)

As life is trimmed by crosses to the beauty of divine discipline so the poem is trimmed into a beautiful artistic shape. Commenting on this passage F.E. Hutchinson says "the poet lops the rhyme words letter by letter 'charm', 'harm', 'arm' much as the divine gardner is said to 'prune and pare' (520). R. Seeley in his
Edition of *The Temple* 1894 illustrates this poem by the reproduction of an engraving of fruit trees in a row, gardners, and a pruning knife from the gardner's labyrinth (qtd. in Hutchinson 523).

In this poem it is found that the fusion of ethics and aesthetics is consummated. Here one sees how the beauty of disciplined life and the beauty of well designed poetry are harmoniously blended. The art of "man the maker" and the deed of "man the doer" are fused into a single beautiful entity.