ABSTRACT

Manuduction and the Passion: The Grammar of Participation in Selected Seventeenth-Century Good Friday Lyric Poems

Kalani K. Pattison, Ph.D.

Mentor: Phillip J. Donnelly, Ph.D.

Drawing on the distinction between a "grammar of participation" and a "grammar of representation," this study focuses on the Good Friday lyric poetry of George Herbert, Robert Herrick, John Donne, and Aemilia Lanyer. The argument first identifies four distinguishing features that, when taken together, constitute a grammar of participation rather than a grammar of representation (as suggested by the work of Peter Candler). A grammar of participation is: 1) dialogical rather than monological, 2) temporal rather than spatialized, 3) communicative rather than discrete, 4) itinerant rather than cartographic. A text that relies on a grammar of participation will lead its readers along a particular *ductus* (path) toward a given *skopos* (persuasive end). In these poems, the *skopos* typically bears a particular relation to the human *telos* identified as eschatological beatitude. This study demonstrates the unique insights that arise from relying upon a grammar that is appropriate to these poems. Through reading Herbert's opening poems in "The Church" while assuming a grammar of participation, we understand that *The Temple* begins preparing its readers for the process of sanctification in the rest of the text by leading them through

identification with Christ's suffering and death. The closing poems of Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* lead the reader toward acceptance of suffering and death for the sake of union with Christ. The three Donne poems examined each manuduct the reader toward God specifically by positioning the reader as a member of the Church. Finally, the argument concludes by briefly examining Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* as an example of a poem which only partially relies on a grammar of participation.

Manuduction and the Passion: The Grammar of Participation in Selected Seventeenth-Century Good Friday Lyric Poems

by

Kalani K. Pattison, B.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of English

_____

Kevin J. Gardner, Ph.D., Department Chair

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of

Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

_____

Phillip J. Donnelly, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____

Luke Taylor, Ph.D.

_____

William L. Pitts, Jr., Ph.D.

_____

Michael-John DePalma, Ph.D.

_____

Gregory T. Garrett, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2016

_____

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Page bearing signatures is kept on file in the Graduate School.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

DEDICATION ix

CHAPTER ONE 1
Introduction: Understanding the Grammar of Participation and the Grammar of Representation 1
A Slow Shift in Grammatica 1
Defining a Grammar of Participation and a Grammar of Representation 8
Seventeenth-Century Good Friday Poems 16
Critical Approach 23
George Herbert 24
Robert Herrick 26
John Donne 28
Aemilia Lanyer 30
Conclusion 31

CHAPTER TWO 33
A Framework for Reading Lyric Poetry while Assuming a Grammar of Participation 33
Dialogical rather than Monological 37
Temporal rather than Spatial 44
Communicative rather than Discrete 54
Itinerant rather than Cartographic 69
Conclusion 77

CHAPTER THREE 78
From Salvation toward Sanctification: George Herbert's *The Temple* 78
The Text 79
A Review of Literary Criticism 80
"The Altar" 93
"The Sacrifice" 103
"The Thanksgiving" 117
"The Reprisall" 121
"The Agonie" 125
"The Sinner" 132
"Good Friday" 135
Conclusion 141

CHAPTER FOUR 145
Acceptance of Suffering and Death: Robert Herrick's Passion Poems in *His Noble Numbers* 145
The Text 150

A Review of Literary Criticism 152
"Good Friday: Rex Tragicus*, or Christ going to His Crosse" (1393)* 164
"His words to Christ, going to the Crosse" (1394) 177
"Another, to his Saviour" (1395) 181
"His Saviours words, going to the Crosse" (1396) 183
"His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse" (1397) 187
The Cross Pattern Poem (1398) 189
"To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion" (1399) 193
"His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher" (1400) 195
"His coming to the Sepulcher" (1401) 197
The Final Couplet (1402) 200
Conclusion 201

CHAPTER FIVE 204
A Cyclical Path toward Union with God: A Selection of John Donne's Good Friday Poems 204
The Texts 206
A Review of Literary Criticism 207
"Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day" 216
"Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day" 228
La Corona 240
Conclusion 257

CHAPTER SIX 259
Epilogue: An Incomplete Grammar of Participation in Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* 259
The Text 260
A Review of Literary Criticism 266
Salve Deus Rex Judæorum 269
Conclusion 277

NOTES 280

WORKS CITED 293

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Not only this project, but also my own growth as a scholar would not have been possible without support from the multiple communities to which I belong.

I first offer my thanks to my advisor, Dr. Phillip Donnelly, for his abundant patience, invaluable guidance, and exceptional listening skills. Our discussions concerning this project were not only fruitful, but also enjoyable, renewing my delight in scholarship. I further would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Luke Taylor, Dr. William Pitts Jr., Dr. Greg Garrett, and Dr. Michael-John DePalma for their flexibility, willingness to give time from their busy schedules and commitment to learning. I would also like to thank Dr. Coretta Pittman, Jerrie Callan, and Dr. Mary Lynn Klingman for their assistance in developing my ability to teach and for their model of care for their students. Finally, at Baylor University, I am grateful to Dr. Robert Ray, Dr. Ralph Wood, and Dr. Maurice Hunt whose graduate classes contributed to my understanding and enjoyment of this project's subject.

Secondly, I would like to express my gratitude for the professors at Point Loma Nazarene University who started me on this path. I am grateful to Dr. Karl Martin and Charlene Pate who first demonstrated to me how faith and scholarship strengthen and enrich each other. I am thankful to Dr. Philip Bowles who modeled the boldness to seek the truth without preconceptions and to Dr. John W. Wright who introduced me to the depths of the intersections of theology, philosophy, and literature. I am grateful to Dr. Carol Blessing, whose

classes inculcated in me a love of seventeenth-century poetry. I am even more grateful to Dr. Blessing and Dr. Bettina Tate Pedersen for their example of how to be a woman, a Christian, and a scholar without compromise.

Finally, I have been extremely blessed in having a wonderful family who has provided various kinds of support throughout my graduate school experience. Karissa, thank you for helping with my house (multiple times), driving me to various libraries, and taking care of the details of living when I was occasionally preoccupied. Michael, thanks for letting me talk out my ideas with you and for providing hugs and fortifying words when needed. Ariana, thanks for your encouragement to finish. Thank you, mom and dad, for all of those things as well, and for your emotional and financial support. Thanks, too, mom, for your help in proofreading. Lastly, thank you, all four grandparents, for your love and prayers.

DEDICATION

To my father, without whom I never would have started, to my mother without whom I never would have finished, and to my Heavenly Father without whom is nothing

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: Understanding the Grammar of Participation and the Grammar of Representation

The transition toward modernity in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries was influenced by and reflected in shifts in the verbal arts. Specifically, there was a slow shift from what Peter Candler, in *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction,* calls a "grammar of participation" to what he calls a "grammar of representation." These grammars are based on modes of interacting with texts that are fundamentally different. As a result, we need to be sure to read texts while relying on the appropriate grammar in order to achieve the most fruitful reading possible. I contend that the seventeenth-century devotional poetry we shall consider here is helpfully illuminated by being read while relying on a grammar of participation rather than a grammar of representation. The Good Friday poems of George Herbert, Robert Herrick and John Donne all exemplify reliance on a grammar of participation. By reading a selection of their poetry while relying on the appropriate grammar, we are able to gain some insights that might otherwise elude us concerning both their Good Friday poems specifically and the *telē* of the larger works of which these poems are a part.

A Slow Shift in Grammatica

The shift in *grammatica* that Candler identifies is most clearly illustrated by a shift in the focus of the liturgical service. As he points out, in the late medieval Roman Catholic Church, participation in the Eucharist was the central action in a church service; however, after the Reformation, Protestant churches especially

focused more on the preaching of the sermon (16-17). This shift in liturgical emphasis exemplifies a fundamental shift in the understanding of how a person is transformed and renewed by the mediation of the divine life. Roman Catholic liturgical services carried meaning not only through their words, but also in the bodily movements of standing, kneeling, sitting, praying, eating, and drinking. The liturgical service centered on practices and traditions that required active physical participation rather than passive listening. In addition, the focus of the service was on the Eucharist as a sacrament.[1] Historians have pointed out that the reduction of the sacraments from seven to two in the Protestant Reformation "fundamentally altered the salvific system of later medieval Europe and threw into doubt the means by which individuals could be saved" (K. Edwards 335). Though the transition in liturgical focus was more nuanced, and not limited to a Roman Catholic/Protestant distinction, "The Protestant Reformation stresses the letter and text of Scripture at the expense of its rôle as the embodiment of the Logos, giving voice to the Church in ritual and sacrament" (Young 169). This resulting shift during the Reformation away from a liturgical focus on the Eucharist led most of the movements of the congregation to be cut out of a typical weekly service. In addition, though the Eucharist was still celebrated, the words—of the service, of the sermon, of Scripture in the vernacular—came to be perceived as the main vehicle of communicating divine life.

At first glance, this shift from congregants participating in the service to more passively receiving words as representations in a sermon seems to be a difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant liturgies. While these differences matter, they, too, are a result of similar historical influences. Candler argues, with some support from critics such as Brian Cummings and Catherine

Pickstock, that the multiple changes and shifts around this historical time period cross ecumenical boundaries. For Candler, this shift in liturgical focus is part of a larger shift in modernity. Candler provides a number of possible starting points for this shift,[2] which range throughout the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries (22-23). Candler's overall description is of a long, slow change across Europe that spanned centuries, with the shift in England further complicated by its relationship with the rest of Europe—especially in regard to England's unique path to Protestantism, the Elizabethan compromise, the political role of Puritans in the seventeenth century, and the shifting character of the Church of England.

Candler identifies this transition in modes of interacting with texts, a transition illustrated by the shift between a liturgical focus on the Eucharist and a liturgical focus on the sermon, as a shift between two different "grammars." Though he does not define what he means by "grammar," his usage points to a more traditional/classical understanding of *grammatica* rather than a twentieth- or twenty-first-century understanding of grammar. In a key medieval text on the liberal arts, Cassiodorus establishes that *grammatica*, as the ability "to please through skill in finished speech and blameless writing" (146) is a prerequisite for all other arts. Walter Ong explains how the term evolved to encompass more than the way that parts of a sentence fit together:

> Grammar was concerned in a special way with writing. *Grammatikos* in Greek meant one who studied *grammata* or letters of the alphabet. . . . As one concerned with the totality of what was written, the *grammaticus* or letter man soon was understood to be the learned or scholarly man, the savant. (*Presence* 209)

Eventually, as Latin became not a primarily spoken language, but one learned in school, grammar came to be understood as "not the sum total of learning, but the beginning of learning" (209), though Ong says that the earlier, more

encompassing view was not immediately lost. In either case, whether it refers to the totality of writing or the basics, *grammatica* encompasses the underlying foundations of pedagogy.

Cummings further establishes that *grammatica* in the sixteenth century covered a much broader concept than the modern sense of "grammar" (20-21). In effect, pre-modern *grammatica* covers all ways of interacting with texts and verbal communications. Cummings further teases out the practical implications of considering *grammatica* as the basis for all other liberal arts:

> It was the *ars* before and within every other *ars*. *Grammatica* involved the study of "literary" authors, classical and modern, Latin, Greek, and sometimes also vernacular. Its syllabus could contain the practice both of speaking and of writing, of producing meaning and of analyzing it, of criticism and commentary as well as what is now called creative writing, of literary theory as well as syntactic analysis. Grammar as a word therefore covered the full range of the linguistic and the literary, the semantic and the semiotic. (21)

As Candler uses the term, "grammar" encompasses all of these aspects, as well as arenas often considered part of *dialectica* or *rhetorica*. For pre-modern authors, *grammatica* was the foundation of understanding for all verbal arts. Therefore, a transition in underlying assumptions about language use, the arrangement of texts, and modes of both writing and reading texts, can be comprehended, as Candler argues, as a transition or shift in *grammatica.*

Other changes and transitions occurring around the same time are plentiful and often can be interpreted as influencing and/or being influenced by this shift in *grammatica*. For instance, in 1513, Johannes Rhau-Grunenberg printed for Martin Luther an edition of the Psalms in Latin with extra space around the text so that his students could make their own marginal and interlinear notes (Grossmann 98). While this was not a new practice, some scholars have seen this

separation of the scriptural text from its traditional marginalia as representative of a shift in the ways that people read. For instance, Gerald Bruns calls it "a symbolic moment of transition between ancient and modern hermeneutics" (139), as previously, especially in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, "the biblical text was materially embedded in the history of its interpretation" (139). By changing the context of the text, the interpretation is irrevocably changed as well.

Brian Cummings also sees this as a transition, but as a transition between scholastic and humanist practice. According to Cummings, lecturing about a biblical text and having students fill in the spaces between the lines and around the margins of manuscript texts was a common medieval practice when teaching (72-73). These comments, or *glossae*, were usually supplemented by *scholia,* which were longer theological interpretations, still recorded by students, and added to the end of the text. Luther's lectures on the first series reflect this practice, except for the fact that the central text was in printed rather than in manuscript form. However, according to Cummings, "in the second Psalm series, Luther abandoned the medieval tradition of *glossae* and *scholia* and adopted the new style of a thorough commentary verse by verse" (73). For Cummings, the shift in style reflects a shift in the assumed relationship between the text and its interpretation: "Medieval *lectio* . . . merges in Luther's practice into the new literary form of the printed commentary, a handbook for someone else's reading. The public lecture of the schoolroom becomes interwoven with the private reading habits of the study" (77). Although Cummings focuses mostly on the scholastic/humanist debates, he does recognize that Luther contributes to the transition toward new reading habits.

Candler's book seems to imply that Luther's actions in supplying his students with scriptural texts around which to take notes was innovative, but Cummings makes it plain that the only original aspect was the fact that the supplied Scripture was mechanically printed rather than hand-written. Despite this misleading framework, which I believe to be based on a misunderstanding of Bruns, Candler is correct to maintain that:

> In the early and high Middle Ages, the Scriptures are present not primarily as a physical object, but rather preeminently in the memory. The Scriptures, as they are read, and importantly, heard, by the congregation over the course of the liturgical year, are assigned to certain times in the calendar. (77)[3]

Candler argues that in such texts as the *Glossa Ordinaria,* a distinction between "Scripture" and "tradition" is artificial—the text is embedded in the interpretation, and the two are inseparable—and inseparable from the life of the Church as it is lived liturgically. His argument about the importance of liturgical practice shaping the context in which Scripture is read echoes Pickstock's arguments in *After Writing*, and supports his claim about Scripture and tradition despite the weaknesses in his other arguments about Luther and the *Glossa Ordinaria.*[4]

In addition, Candler argues that the fourth session of the Council of Trent helped to establish the distinction between "Scripture" and "tradition" in biblical exegesis (70). While post-Tridentine theology would not have immediately jumped to the two-source view of the authority of Scripture and tradition, according to Candler the wording in the Council of Trent's 1546 proclamation contributed to the doctrine's development: "hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptus et sine scripto traditionibus" 'These truths and rules are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions' (Council of

Trent 196, 17; sess. IV). This post-Tridentine reaction to questions of Protestant Reformation demonstrates the extent to which modes of interacting with texts had changed since the high Middle Ages, and the ways in which the transition crossed ecumenical lines. For Candler, the establishment of the distinction between "Scripture" and "tradition," and therefore the change in modes of interacting with texts, is part of the greater "shift in modernity" (16). He argues that hearing the text read aloud in the context of the church's liturgical practices forms the audience to read or listen in a manner that assumes a grammar of participation, and that when Scripture began to be more often read outside of that context, readers were more likely to read assuming a grammar of representation.

The medieval monastic and scholastic modes of interacting with texts (8), Candler calls a "grammar of participation." The Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment modes, he renders as versions of a "grammar of representation." These two grammars do not directly correspond to the Scholastic/Humanist debates, or the Reformation debates, despite overlapping influences and consequences. While Candler does not present his categories as "two mutually opposed philosophical *loci*" (34), he does say that "'participation' can be asymmetrically set against 'representation' as the two terms denote distinct grammars, each of which is embedded in a theory of knowledge itself" (34). Though Candler is by no means unique in presenting a contributing factor to the differences between pre-modern and modern worlds, Candler foregrounds the way in which these historical shifts in *grammatica* resulted in shifting assumptions about the character of human knowing.

Defining a Grammar of Participation and a Grammar of Representation

After establishing the existence of an overall shift from a grammar of participation to a grammar of representation, Candler proceeds to elaborate on the characteristics of a grammar of participation, perhaps assuming that his readers are familiar with a grammar of representation as the default mode of interacting with texts in the twenty-first century. As in education, a study of *grammatica* must precede everything else, so a shift in *grammatica* from participation to representation shaped the way people interacted with the world, their attitudes toward knowledge, and their understanding of logic and reasoning. Other scholars have offered explanations for differences between medieval and post-Enlightenment texts. For instance, Cummings postulates that the shift from scholasticism to humanism and the influence of Reformed theology shaped the production of texts and contributed toward the overall shift in modes of interacting with texts. In addition, Ong's *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* examines the rise of universities and the development of moveable text in printing as further causes. However, these explanations leave some gaps which Candler's account addresses.

Because these two competing grammars are rooted in epistemological assumptions, Candler defines them in predominantly theological terms. In using "participation," Candler refers to the understanding that

> Creatures partake in the divine life of God, by virtue of the plenitude of charity which is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As this is presupposed by theologians such as Augustine and Aquinas, it becomes impossible to separate the writing, reading, and commenting on such theological "texts" as the *Confessions* or the *Summa Theologiae* from the ontological participation of beings in the divine creativity of the Trinity. (17)

For Candler, the grammar—which includes the underlying arrangement, structure, *dispositio*—of texts or rituals relies on a grammar of participation if those texts are structured so as to lead the readers "to participate in God's self-knowledge" (4) and therefore, to a certain extent, "to participate in his being" (4). On the other hand, texts or rituals relying on a grammar of representation do not see learning as "participation in the Trinity" (5), but as the transmission of information. Texts relying on a grammar of representation are written in ways that introduce certain dualisms—such as those between Scripture and tradition, "reader and text, form and content, subject and object" (22). In addition, texts relying on a grammar of representation privilege "mathematical accuracy and a universal method or *mathēsis* for the arrangement and teaching of knowledge" (5) and understand "words and images [to] literally represent things, truths, ideas, in a mode of strict correspondence" (23). According to Candler, this shift in changing understandings of *grammatica* not only affects the ways that people read texts but all of the ways in which they interact with them and connect the texts to other parts of their lives.

Though Candler seems to argue for a clean shift from a grammar of participation to a grammar of representation, the specific examples that he both presents and omits seem to instead imply a gradual shift from the prevalence of a grammar of participation to a prevalence of a grammar of representation, in that neither grammar is exclusive to its time period. As Jim Fodor puts it, in his review of Candler's book, "it is probably a bit too simple to suggest that Christian reading habits evolved in a unidirectional and monolithic manner" (656), and Candler "fails to differentiate adequately among the various audiences/readers that comprise the Christian tradition, both synchronically and

diachronically" (657). Candler does not obscure the fact that his analysis, especially his historical analysis, paints very broad outlines, but his categories are still very helpful as a starting point for identifying the different modes of interacting with texts (the different "grammars").

Candler's explication of reading before the shift toward modernity is pedagogically oriented. This is in part because of the texts he chooses to examine and the contexts in which they were read and written. However, this orientation also arises from the way that he construes the knowledge of God—knowledge gained through seeing God's face in the beatific vision rather than knowledge of intellectual lists of properties gleaned from observation of his work in the world—as the ultimate *telos* to which writers using a grammar of participation attempt to lead their readers. Both the structure and *telos* of a text are affected by the grammar in which a text is written. In contrast to modern texts that assume a grammar of representation, which teach by laying out intellectual data and logical propositions, Candler argues that medieval theological texts, which were written, read, and produced using the grammar of participation, teach through manuduction, the "leading-by-the-hand," of readers (4). Candler explains that these texts lead "readers along an itinerary of exit and return from creation to eschatological beatitude" (4). He argues that the texts do not guide their readers in the direction of "the merely instrumental goal of a greater accumulation of intellectual data but, in hope, toward the perfect and simple apprehension of God in the beatific vision, that is, the eternal and immediate reading of God himself" (4). He elaborates on what "manuduction" involves, by explaining that, in a text relying on a grammar of participation, the reader is led along a particular path of movement, or itinerary (*ductus*) (5), toward a particular end

(*skopos*) which is "that state of being persuaded of something . . . not simply . . . a cognition of principles one did not know before, but . . . a 'place' of *being* differently" (5). This *skopos* is one step on the journey that leads to the true *telos* of being, the "eschatological beatitude" mentioned earlier, the beatific vision, *participation* in the life of God particularly through the Sacraments or worship. Candler is careful to point out that, of course, "reading does not effect *salus*" (44), but asserts that reading can contribute to "the activity of rightly ordering our desire towards its proper object" (45) and that "the route to *salus* is not *contained* by the text, but, as it were, furnished by it" (45). The pedagogical goal of such a text is not just to teach and train the mind, but also to guide the soul on its journey toward its proper end.

The assumed potential for reading to guide a soul to its proper end is not limited to medieval writers and readers. Cecile Jagodzinski, in *Privacy and Print*, demonstrates the extent to which conversion narratives, particularly by English non-conformists in the latter half of the seventeenth century, were seen to have power in converting unbelievers. According to Jagodzinski,

> Books, which participated in the holiness of the first of books, the Bible, came to be regarded as efficacious instruments of conversion. In the aftermath of the invention of printing, every reader could observe the command given to Augustine, "Tolle, lege" (50).[5]

In addition to being useful for leading their readers to conversion, Jagodzinski argues that some books were seen as replacements for sermons for those who did not have access to a good preacher (50), and that "the printed word, read in private, . . . could enhance and reinforce public, sacramental ministry" (51). The authors and advocators make clear, however, that it is only certain kinds of texts that were desirable (57, 59). On one hand, these conversion narratives and the

contemporary attitudes toward them support the argument that the view of the printed word as a vehicle for salvation and sanctification was not limited to Roman Catholic writers. This argument in turn supports Candler's assertion that the transition between grammars that he identifies is not due (or not only due) to the divide between a primarily Catholic Europe and the predominance of Protestantism in a few key places, including England. On the other hand, such a view of the texts was strong and continued long after what Candler would consider the beginning of modernity, which throws further doubt on his depiction of the transition as purely from one grammar to the other.

Candler would not deny that it is possible to read a text that was written using a grammar of participation by using a grammar of representation, but he would argue that a part of the *skopos* and *telos* of the text would be lost. For instance, while he advocates reading Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* using a grammar of participation, he would not claim that reading the *Summa Theologiae* using a grammar of representation is fruitless. On the other hand, reading a text while relying on a grammar of participation which was written assuming a grammar of representation could also lead to confusion or false assumptions. For instance, Candler's conception of the grammars includes expectations about the importance of the *dispositio*, or the overall arrangement and organization of a text. His examples follow the itinerary of *exitus/reditus* (the earlier mentioned "exit and return from creation to eschatological beatitude" (4)) because it is the path of the soul to God that the *ductus* and *skopos* of such texts imitates and prompts. On the other hand, John Calvin's *Institutes of Christian Religion*, a text written using a grammar of representation, ends with a discussion of civil government after a logical and intellectually-oriented organization, rather than

ending with some aspect of eschatological beatitude. The point here is not that the *Institutes* are somehow wrong, inferior, or poorly organized, but that their *dispositio* reflects a different *grammatica*—a grammar of representation rather than a grammar of participation.

Cummings and Candler both establish the historicity and importance of shifts in modes of interacting with texts. While Cummings focuses on the influence of these shifts on the Reformation debates and the Scholastic/Humanist debates, Candler attempts to look at the character of the changes in modes of interaction in the terms of *grammatica*. In addition, Candler illustrates the pervasiveness of these grammars' influence on the composition and reading of texts. Because Candler assumes his readers are already quite familiar with reading texts using a grammar of representation, he devotes most of his argument and selection of texts to the development of a description of a grammar of participation. His examples mainly include Augustine's *Confessions*, Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, and the *Glossa Ordinaria*, although he also deals briefly with other texts such as Bonaventure's *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum* and Origen's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. Candler focuses on explicitly theological and pedagogically-oriented prose works and does not illustrate or consider how his grammars might apply to other genres.

In many ways, Candler's depiction of a "grammar of participation" shares characteristics with the twentieth-century idea of reader-response theory. That is, to read a text assuming a grammar of participation is to read a text conscious of the temporal experience of reading and of the way in which a text engages the affections of the reader. However, there are two main attributes that separate Candler's grammar of participation from reader-response theory as, for example,

Stanley Fish defines it. First, as already discussed, in a text assuming a grammar of participation, there is a clear *telos*. Though the *ductus*, the path, matters, the particular *skopos* that a text leads to is union of the soul with God. In contrast, in reader-response theory, the focus is on the path and the *telos* is not clear or relevant.

Secondly, reading a text assuming a grammar of participation keeps in mind the importance of re-reading, while a reading of a text through the lens of reader-response theory, at least in Fish's version, often assumes that the reader is encountering a text for the first time. Of course, other theorists, such as Wolfgang Iser, freely acknowledge and discuss the ways in which reading a text is different between the first and second readings (285). Indeed, one of the problems that Jonathan Culler finds with Fish's *Self-Consuming Artifacts*, is that the reader learns nothing from the repeat of themes that Fish identifies from poem to poem, never mind what the reader might learn on repeated readings (129-30). Phillip Donnelly makes a similar argument when he says:

> The deletion of the category of memory from Fish's account of human knowing informs . . . the account of reading assumed by the main critical argument in *Surprised by Sin*. The central, and commonly noted, difficulty in that argument might be called 'the problem of the eternally naïve reader.' . . . What drops out of Fish's implied account of the reading experience is, again, and still, memory (*Rhetorical Faith* 135).

Donnelly acknowledges, like Iser and Culler, the importance of the distinction between first and second reading. In a second reading the reader is "able to relate each part of the experience to a particularized sense of the whole work, rather than [experience] a purely anticipatory sense of the whole based only on generic considerations, etc." (135). Re-reading, and therefore *memory* within the context of reading, is a key component that is essential for reading texts assuming a

grammar of participation which is downplayed in modernity. Relying on a grammar of representation includes relying on the assumption that parts of works can be read without too much regard for their context. Relying on a grammar of participation, however, means that not only must readers intellectually recall preceding parts of the text and previous encounters with a specific text, they must re-member—that is they must have somehow previously re-made-present, re-embodied, *learned* from, and been changed by (no matter how minutely)—the text. Readers will interpret and understand a text differently upon re-reading at least in part because the text will have led them "to a place of *being* differently," as Candler puts it (5).

As I have hinted previously, there are a few weak points in Candler's argument—namely, the lack of a clear definition of how he is using the term "grammar," the historical misinterpretation of Bruns which leads him to make a few untenable historical claims regarding Luther's use of texts, and the lack of nuance regarding the timeline of the two grammars. Overall, however, Candler's categories are convincing and very useful in providing an explanation for the widespread transitions of the time period, particularly as he presents them as "grammars"—underlying and prerequisite to modes of interacting with and understanding texts.

I propose to argue, therefore, that as the shift he describes is important historically, the differences between these two modes are apparent in other genres of texts. This is especially the case when the texts are theologically and/or pedagogically oriented. In addition, even if the transition is not as clear cut as Candler argues, the particular centuries he focuses on as the transitional centuries—the fifteen to seventeenth centuries—provide examples of texts that

are more likely to be read today with contemporary assumptions about their modernity while having been written under different assumptions. We need to examine these texts from the period of transition from the prevalence of one to the prevalence of the other in order to determine which grammar they more readily imply. This examination will allow us to search out insights that might be otherwise elusive by reading texts while relying on their appropriate grammars.

Seventeenth-Century Good Friday Poems

One of Sir Philip Sidney's first arguments in his 1595 essay, *An Apology for Poetry*, is that some poets are able to "make to imitate, and imitate both to delight and teach, and delight to move men to take that goodness in hand which without delight they would fly as from a stranger, and teach, to make them know that goodness whereunto they are moved" (20). Sidney thus begins his *Apology* by re-stating sixteenth-century rhetorical commonplaces drawn from Aristotle, Horace, Cicero, Quintilian, etc. Genevieve Guenther argues that Sidney reasserts this basic claim in part in reaction to the religious politics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. According to Guenther, radical puritans during Sidney's lifetime and after saw poetry as related to the magical arts and therefore as a demonic art forbidden by God (13). Guenther also argues that Sidney was practical, as was much of the Elizabethan court, and therefore attempted "to establish poetry as a culturally and materially valued production on the basis of its instrumentality to the ends of the powerful" (21). Guenther calls this focus on what poetry can do or accomplish "instrumental aesthetics," delineating Renaissance views on the coercive (or at least powerfully persuasive) rhetorical power of poetry.[6]

Rather than focus on the practical aspects that Sidney advocates, Timothy Rosendale proposes another, parallel way in which Sidney counters cultural suspicion of rhetoric and poetry. Rosendale argues for a close relationship between Sidney's *Defense of Poesy* or *An Apology for Poetry* and the Book of Common Prayer, particularly in the way that they view and utilize "figurality":

> They both, in opposition to powerful and pervasive cultural suspicion, posit a particularly close relationship between figurality and truth; indeed, they both insist that figurality is *essential* for an understanding of certain profound modes of truth. They both view representation as a means toward an ultimate goal of moral or spiritual transformation (141).

Here, and elsewhere, Rosendale does not use representation in the same way as Candler or I use it. Instead, I argue that a figural understanding can help a reader avoid reading a text while relying on a grammar of representation. Rosendale claims that "poetry establishes its claims to truth by way of its representation of the ideal" (142), and connects this "figural understanding" to the Prayer Book Eucharistic service, seeing "figural understanding as a means of spanning the gap between real and ideal, earth and heaven. Both of these forms of truth must be accessed and understood in terms of signification, not absolute identity" (145).[7] Rosendale's comprehension of "figural understanding" in terms of signification is, I think, close to *mimesis*, while the movement toward a desire for "absolute identity" is close to what Candler intends by a grammar of representation. In effect, Candler's account of two grammars opens the possibility of articulating and practicing a mode of *mimesis* that does not presume to offer absolute representation.

Sir Philip Sidney profoundly influenced the development of the English lyric poem, and his nephew, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was a distant

cousin of George Herbert (Miller-Blaise, "O Write" 2). Therefore, it is not particularly surprising that the first few lines of George Herbert's "The Church-porch" echo Sidney's formulations of the rhetorical adage about the purpose of poetry in delighting and teaching:

> Hearken unto a Verser, who may chance
> Ryme thee to good, and make a bait of pleasure.
> A verse may find him, who a sermon flies,
> and turn delight into a sacrifice. ("The Church-porch" 3-6)

This echo of Sidney is especially evident in the image of "flying" from plain teaching and movement toward good, as Helen Wilcox notes (*English Poems* 63). Herbert's particular formulation of this principle regarding poetry was embraced by other poets in the seventeenth century; at least seven poets "reproduced the lines [5-6] in the prefaces or title pages of their works between 1650 and 1700" (McDowell 65). According to Sean McDowell, these lines were repeated so often that they became cliché, but they also "encapsulated a truism about Herbert: more so than many lesser religious lyricists before or after him, Herbert proved remarkably adept at moving readers, influencing their passions, through his deceptively simple verse" (65). McDowell claims that this success is due to Herbert's "precise understanding of the affective engagement of the readers' souls" (65). Especially for Christian poets, "religious poetry could instill spiritual comfort in readers by stirring key passions in the souls of those who read, and in reading, *experienced* their words" (66). By engaging affections and stirring passions, poets were partaking in a particular form of pedagogy, in which teaching is enmeshed with the movement of the soul, that is, movement of the reader along a particular *ductus*. The specific purpose of rhetoric that Sidney and Herbert advocate underlies and compels, in turn, a specific perspective of

pedagogy in which intellectual comprehension is inseparable from engagement of the affections and movement of the soul—that is, in which teaching is manuducting, communicating through a grammar of participation rather than a grammar of representation. As Herbert (and John Donne and Robert Herrick) composed texts assuming a grammar of participation, reading their texts while relying on a grammar of participation should first, allow us to see the common characteristics that they share which differ from texts assuming a grammar of representation, and secondly, grant us insights into their poetry that might otherwise elude us.

As we work to determine how to apply a grammar of participation to seventeenth-century poetic texts, it seems reasonable to begin with a series of authors and texts that are markedly similar in some ways in order to reduce a few variables. First, because Candler's grammar of participation is a decidedly theological and Christian way of interacting with texts, our test cases should themselves be overtly Christian texts. Secondly, if possible, they should deal with similar subject matter. Thirdly, they should be at least somewhat pedagogical, or at least written by poets who might be in a position to desire to teach their readers. George Herbert, Robert Herrick, and John Donne may have become Anglican[9] priests from different backgrounds and for different reasons, but their common vocation gives their poems a starting point both from a theological/ecclesial standpoint and from a pedagogical one. Even if Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* never quite presents the speaker in the persona of a priest, teaching his parishioners was an important part of his job for nineteen years before *His Noble Numbers* was published. Donne, on the other hand, wrote much of his poetry before he became a priest, but his religious poetry shows

commitment to Christ and deep, nuanced thought in both his early and late works. In addition, Herbert and Donne may belong to the group of poets commonly called the "metaphysical poets" while Herrick is a "son of Ben," or one of the "Cavalier" poets, but all three wrote overtly Christian poetry. Finally, Aemilia Lanyer's life, poetry, and assumed grammar are distinctly unlike those of all three of these men, but she shares their poetic interest in one of the central events of the Christian liturgical calendar and redemption story: Christ's Passion—the events of Good Friday.

Concentrating on poems concerning Good Friday is constructive for three reasons. First, Good Friday was recognized as important by these poets and others as an important poetic topic, as can be seen both by the numerous poems about the same subject and by the positioning of those poems within larger works. Secondly, Good Friday (along with Easter and the Incarnation) is a crucial keystone to the Christian journey of the soul toward union with God. Without Christ's Passion, Christian salvation is impossible, and the gap between sinful humans and God is unbridgeable. Finally, Christ's Passion on Good Friday is inextricably linked to the celebration of the Last Supper on Maundy Thursday, that is, the inauguration of the Eucharist. The Eucharistic Sacrament, as I described earlier, epitomizes participation in a liturgical service. In the Eucharist, congregants participate in a remembrance of Christ's Passion—a remembrance which is more than just intellectual recollection, but is a reenactment and re-embodying of Christ's sacrifice. According to Martin Elsky, this distinction of type of remembrance has been lost:

> The Eucharistic rite was to be understood, among other things, as a remembrance of the Passion. To the modern ear, however, the word remembrance connotes only the recollection of something

> itself absent, a meaning inconsistent with its scriptural and liturgical connotations. ("History" 68)

In contrast to recollection, the remembrance in the celebration of the Eucharist should be *sacra memoria*. Mary Carruthers argues that "The injunction to 'remember,' 'be mindful of,' is characteristic of the Hebrew Bible, memorably throughout . . . the Psalms" (67). She identifies the particular kind memory that the Psalms called for as *sacra memoria*, which is "affective . . . and goal-oriented, [and] bears only partial resemblance to the familiar model of memory as the mind's storehouse of things we have experienced in the past" (67). *Sacra memoria* is "a call not to preserve but to act—in the present, for the future. The matters memory presents are used to persuade and motivate, to create emotion and stir the will" (67). This concept of *sacra memoria* applies not merely to remembrance in celebration of the Eucharist, but to liturgical remembrance overall.

Furthermore, Elsky connects this proper understanding of remembrance to meditative poetry, a category into which most of the poems we will examine fall:

> The liturgical principle of remembrance bears strongly on meditative poetry, since the act of memory in the composition of place—imagining a past event in sacred history as if it were present—is the starting point of meditation and meditative verse alike. Like the liturgy, meditation involves a making present of past events in sacred history, and like the liturgy, meditative sequences are often organized as a broad representation of redemptive history. Meditation handbooks attempt to reflect the division of the Bible into two Testaments: the meditator begins with a consideration of his sins as fallen man and passes to a contemplation of Christ's saving acts, a pattern popularized by Loyola and Luis de Granada. This division leads the meditator through the course of salvation history, from the old to the new Adam. But meditation not only represents redemptive history; it re-presents, makes it present as well. (68-69)

The link that Elsky identifies from meditation, and therefore meditative poetry, to liturgical remembrance is especially evident in poetry concerning Good Friday.[10]

Literary criticism of these three male poets whose poetry relies on a grammar of participation rarely occurs together. Though Herbert and Donne are often grouped together in studies of seventeenth-century religious poetry, devotional poetry, poetry of meditation, metaphysical poetry, etc., Herrick is rarely (if ever) mentioned in the same studies. In fact, studies of Herrick's religious poetry are relatively rare. He is much more well known for his *Hesperides*, the collection of works of which *His Noble Numbers* is a part. On the other hand, Herbert and Herrick are distinct from Donne in that they both published in print (though Herbert's book was published posthumously) while Donne's works circulated in manuscript to be collected by others. In addition, Herbert and Herrick both published books or collections of religious poems arranged as larger texts with multiple parts: Herbert publishing or almost publishing[11] *The Temple* and Herrick publishing *His Noble Numbers*. Meanwhile, Donne's poetry circulated mostly in manuscript, and only a few poems were grouped together into a single text before his death. Finally, Herrick and Donne as poets published or wrote both "profane and sacred" or "humane and divine" poetry. Donne's non-religious poems, such as "The Canonization" and "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning" are about equally as famous as his "Hymn to God in My Sickness" and his Holy Sonnets. Herrick's non-religious poems eclipse his "Noble Numbers" in quantity, often in quality, and usually in familiarity and fame. Meanwhile, Herbert's poems are very nearly all religious, most of which are included in *The Temple*. Finally, Lanyer's poems are

occasionally compared to other seventeenth-century poets, but usually this comparison focuses on a specific characteristic. In addition, Lanyer is usually contrasted with other seventeenth-century poets, and the differences attributed to her gender. I, too, contend that Lanyer's poetry is different from that of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, and that some of the differences can, in fact, be attributed to her gender. However, I intend to consider Lanyer's poetry as contrasting mostly based on the grammar that she assumes.

Both the similarities and differences between Herbert, Herrick, and Donne and the similarities and differences in the ways in which they treat the same subject matter of Christ's Passion, or Good Friday, make them ideal candidates for attempting to read while relying on a grammar of participation. First, their similarities in backgrounds, historical context, and subject matter give us a basis for comparison. Secondly, while some might argue that their differences are a detriment—arguing, for instance, that Herrick does not belong in the same study as Donne and Herbert—these differences are actually strengths. Their differences in poetic styles, kinds of physical texts, and focus of subject matter allow us to see how pervasive and widespread the grammar of participation was within the time period—unconfined to certain types of poetry or texts, and irrespective of the subjects of the poets' other works. Finally, a brief examination of Lanyer's Good Friday poem allows us to ascertain the existence of texts in the seventeenth century which do not rely on a grammar of participation.

Critical Approach

Before we can begin reading these poems relying on a grammar of participation, however, we must first establish practically what a grammar of

participation looks like, especially in regard to lyric poetry. On one hand, to propose a particular "method" of reading is to fall into modern ways of thinking, but on the other, relying on the broad generalizations and sweeping historic trends that Candler describes is insufficient. In addition, I believe that some of the characterizations of a grammar of participation that he presents are specific to the texts he examines rather than broadly applicable. The first task of this work, therefore, is to identify which characteristics of a grammar of participation of the many that Candler identifies seem to be the most important and the most generally applicable. Next, then, we must move beyond those broad characteristics to examine how contemporary literary theory provides frameworks and vocabulary to discuss specifics regarding how these characteristics actually appear in texts, particularly seventeenth-century religious lyrics. Chapter Two, regarding the critical approach, therefore, will draw together elements from a variety of theoretical and theological sources. By the end of the argument, however, we shall begin to understand how these elements work together to form a coherent whole.

George Herbert

One of the hallmarks of George Herbert's *The Temple* is its ecumenical appeal, even when it was originally published in 1633 amidst a time of great conflict among the churches in England. The precise character of Herbert's theology, therefore, has been a subject of high interest among Herbert scholars. One variety of criticism, ranging from the 1950s to the twenty-first century, focuses on aspects of the poems related to the Roman Catholic liturgies or Roman Catholic meditational practices. This group of scholars includes

Rosemond Tuve, Louis Martz, and R.V. Young. In reaction to these scholars, Barbara Lewalski's *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* generated a flurry of criticism arguing for Herbert's distinctively Protestant theology. Critics who argue for this perspective include Ilona Bell, Chana Bloch, Richard Strier, and, most recently, Brian Cummings and Daniel Doerksen. A third group of critics, including Heather Asals, Harold Toliver, Gayle Gaskill, Rosemary Margaret van Wengen-Shute, and Clifford Davidson, and focus on religious themes within Herbert's poems without making definitive claims claims about Herbert's doctrinal allegiances. Finally, the last category of critics focuses on technical aspects of Herbert's language and poetic forms, largely setting aside debates regarding his particular theology. These critics include Helen Vendler, Russell Fraser, Barbara Harman, Martin Elsky, and Stanley Fish.

Finally, many critics in all four of these categories have noted particular characteristics of Herbert's poems which reflect reliance on a grammar of participation, without understanding that these characteristics are a part of a larger framework, or *grammatica.* For instance, almost all of the critics already mentioned spend at least a few sentences proposing one organizational principle or another, and an analysis of the organization of the poems features prominently in the introduction to many of the twentieth- and twenty-first-century editions, such as those by F. E. Hutchinson, John Wall Jr., and Helen Wilcox. In addition, Fish, in *The Living Temple*, dedicates quite a few pages to reviewing the history of criticism about the arrangement of poems within "The Church" before proposing his own scheme. All of these critics have been assuming a grammar of representation, trying to establish a means while ignoring the ends, attempting to map out the structure of *The Temple* while

separating the *ductus* from the *skopos*. Reading *The Temple* while relying on a grammar of participation allows us to trace the *ductus* and *skopos* and to see more clearly Herbert's interpretation of the path of the soul's journey toward union with God as it is reflected in the text's arrangement. Reading *The Temple* in this mode also allows us to understand the extent to which the claims about his theology are not mutually exclusive, but mutually supporting.

In reading *The Temple* relying on a grammar of participation, in Chapter Three, therefore, I first propose to demonstrate the ways in which the first seven poems of "The Church," Herbert's Good Friday poems, reflect the characteristics of a grammar of participation. Each poem demonstrates a *ductus* leading to a specific *skopos*, with the *skopos* of each poem as part of a larger *ductus* leading toward an overall *skopos,* or *telos,* of the work as a whole. Secondly, I argue that the poems regarding Good Friday at the beginning of "The Church" in their specific sequence—"The Altar," "The Sacrifice," The Thanksgiving," "The Reprisall," "The Agonie," "The Sinner," and "Good Friday"—and their position within *The Temple* as a whole lead readers through the necessary elements of saving knowledge by means of identification with Christ's suffering and thus into the beginning of the soul's journey of sanctification that ultimately culminates in eschatological beatitude.

Robert Herrick

Like Herbert, Robert Herrick was an Anglican priest who published a collection of shorter poems as part of a larger work. However, his work was different in two ways that were important for its reception—first, *His Noble Numbers*[12] was not published alone although it does have its own title page with

the print date of 1647. Instead, it was actually printed together with *Hesperides*: *Or, The Works both Humane & Divine of Robert Herrick Esq.* in 1648. Nor was it published at the end of Herrick's life with a well-known biographer later writing a sort of hagiography of his life, as Izaak Walton did for Herbert. Instead, it was published during the English Civil Wars, after the King had been deposed, though not yet beheaded, and after Herrick had been removed from his parish, Dean Prior, by the Cromwellian regime. Since some of *His Noble Numbers* and some of the poems in *Hesperides* express political and theological convictions that were distinctly on the losing side of the war at that time, it is not surprising that the immediate reception of his poetry was rather lackluster, and Herrick was largely forgotten for over a century. Eventually, although he was "rediscovered" in the late eighteenth century, most appreciation has fallen on his non-religious poems in *Hesperides*.

Criticism concerning *His Noble Numbers* is relatively rare. Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly's 2013 two-volume edition of *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers*, entitled *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick* answers an important need in Herrick scholarship. Like Herbert's critics, critics addressing Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* often focus on either Herrick's theology or on the poems' arrangement within the work as a whole. Critics addressing Herrick's theology include Roger Rollin, John Creaser, Graham Parry, and Janie McCauley. Critics focusing on the *dispositio* or arrangement of the poems often overlap with those looking at Herrick's theology, and include Cain and Connolly, Rollin, Katharine Maus, L. E. Semler, and Anthony Low. As with Herbert's critics, however, Herrick's critics often attempt to map out the arrangement of the poems while ignoring the *telos* of the whole. Their explanations of the text's arrangement are therefore

unsatisfactory. In addition, though more than a few critics have commented in passing on the lack of Easter or Resurrection at the end of *His Noble Numbers*, no one has yet proposed a convincing reason for this lack.

In Chapter Four, therefore, I shall examine all ten of Robert Herrick's consecutive Good Friday poems: "Good Friday: *Rex Tragicus*, or Christ going to His Crosse," "His words to Christ, going to the Crosse," "Another, to his Saviour," "His Saviours words, going to the Crosse," "His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse," the cross pattern poem, "To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion," "His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher," "His coming to the Sepulcher," and the final, untitled couplet. I shall argue that the placement of these poems in sequence at the end of both *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers* (in contrast to Herbert's placement of his Good Friday poems at the beginning of his text) implies that in the particular structure of *His Noble Numbers* the union of the soul with Christ is still the *skopos* of this text. In reading these poems while relying on a grammar of participation, even before readers encounter a risen, triumphant Christ in the Resurrection, they are led to a point where they are prepared to hear the Passion story and respond properly to it. Though the sequence ends in the tomb and in Hell, by reading the text assuming a grammar of participation, readers have followed the focalizer in acceptance of suffering and death alongside Christ's suffering and death, for the sake of union with Christ. In effect, Herrick ends *His Noble Numbers* where Herbert begins *The Temple*.

John Donne

John Donne's poetry, unlike that of Herbert and Herrick, was not published in a single collection or book. Instead, it was circulated in manuscript.

There were a few posthumous printed publications and collections of his poems, which were taken to be mostly authoritative until the latter half of the twentieth century, when manuscripts (few holographs survive) began to be examined more carefully for differences and revisions. Therefore, a small but significant portion of criticism by such scholars as Robin Robbins focuses on textual matters.[13]

Donne is often presented as the first of the seventeenth-century poets who are classified variously as metaphysical, devotional, and/or meditational poets. Therefore, he is often grouped with Herbert in particular, and critics and editors such as Frank Huntley, Fish, Lewalski, Martz, and Young have included chapters on both Herbert and Donne in their book projects. In addition, often the same critics preoccupied with the theological and doctrinal beliefs of Herbert, such as Martz, Lewalski, Gene Veith, and Young, debate the relative strengths of Protestant and Catholic influences on Donne. Other critics who participate in this debate include Jeanne Shami, Theresa DiPasquale, and Julia Smith. This debate is reinforced in its significance due to the fact that John Donne is a convert to Anglicanism, having been raised as a Roman Catholic.

In addition, as in Herbert criticism, a number of scholars have noted characteristics of Donne's poetry which reflect reliance on a grammar of participation, without seeing these characteristics as part of a larger framework. For instance, Mary Sloane in particular sees Donne as writing in response to a shift in epistemology (2-3). Other critics who observe these characteristics include Alan Fischler and Ilona Bell. What none of these critics do is present their readers with a comprehensive and cohesive explanation that brings to fulfillment their various insightful observations. Though critics have noticed the importance of the liturgical cycle to Donne's poetry, for instance, they have not connected this

to the dialogical character of the poems to gain a deeper understanding of the liturgical cycle's function in leading readers toward a particular *skopos*. In fact, most critics writing about Donne's religious poems focus almost exclusively on the elements of spiritual autobiography in Donne's poetry.

As Donne's work is scattered through multiple manuscripts, to look at it while relying on a grammar of participation, we need to consider the arrangement internal to each poem rather than reading his poems in a sequence, as we need to do with the poems of Herbert and Herrick. The three Good Friday poems of Donne that I intend to address in Chapter Five— "Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day," "Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day" and *La Corona*[14]—were all written in generally the same time period of his life and share certain patterns and themes beyond that of Good Friday. While Herbert's Good Friday poems start the reader on the path from salvation to eschatological beatitude, and Herrick's Good Friday poems provide the culmination of a path preparing the reader for salvation, I contend that reading each of John Donne's Good Friday poems relying on a grammar of participation leads the reader along a *ductus* that reflects the medieval account of the path of the soul toward God—the path of *exitus/reditus*—specifically by positioning readers as members of the Church.

Aemilia Lanyer

Finally, Aemilia Lanyer's Good Friday poem, "Salve Deus Rex Judæorum" presents a helpful contrast to the poems by Herbert, Herrick, and Donne. One set of critics, including Lewalski, Constancy Furey, and Sidney Sondergard, attributes this to Lanyer's gender and the "proto-feminism" of her

poems (Lewalski, "Re-writing" 98). These critics tend to focus on Lanyer as a woman writer to the exclusion of addressing the theological concerns of her poetry. Other critics, however, such as Guibbory, DiPasquale, and Carol Blessing take seriously both Lanyer's concerns as a woman and her religious devotion.

In *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, Lanyer, like Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, writes about Christ's Passion. Unlike Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, however, Lanyer's poem does not rely fully on a grammar of participation. While the poem demonstrates some of the characteristics of a grammar of participation, it lacks others. Though I would not necessarily claim that the poem assumes a grammar of representation, it tends in that direction. In Chapter Six, the Epilogue, therefore, I present a brief reading of Lanyer's poem as a foil to the Good Friday poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne. Such a reading not only sheds light on the problems inherent in reading a text while relying on an inappropriate grammar, but also further substantiates the insights gained by reading the Good Friday poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne while relying on the appropriate grammar.

Conclusion

In short, I contend that if we ignore the implications of the contrasting grammars that Candler identifies, our readings will lead to misunderstandings. We glean valuable insights into texts, particularly some seventeenth-century lyric poems, by reading them while relying on the appropriate grammar. Specifically, reading the Good Friday poems of Herbert, Herrick and Donne while relying on a grammar of participation rather than a grammar of representation allows for new observations concerning these texts. First, I contend that the Good Friday

poems at the beginning of "The Church" lead readers through salvation in preparation for sanctification by manuducting them through identification with Christ's suffering and death. Secondly, I maintain that Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* culminates with a series of Good Friday poems wherein readers are led toward acceptance of suffering and death for the sake of union with Christ. Thirdly, I claim that Donne's poems, by positioning readers as members of the church, manuduct readers toward God, following the medieval account of the soul's journey. Finally, in contrast, I briefly present Lanyer's Good Friday poem as a foil to the works by these authors as an example of a text which only partially relies on a grammar of participation and which, therefore, illustrates certain pitfalls of reading a text while relying on an inappropriate grammar. Overall, though I do not contend that reading these poems while relying on a grammar of representation is fruitless, I assert that reading the poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne while relying on the appropriate grammar—that is, the grammar of participation—is crucial for reading that fully appreciates these texts.

CHAPTER TWO

A Framework for Reading Lyric Poetry while Assuming a Grammar of Participation

Having established the substance of the grammars Candler identifies and considered the ways in which applying the appropriate grammars to texts enable us to read a text well, this chapter considers how we might go about doing so. What characteristics will enable us to identify a text that relies on a grammar of participation rather than a grammar of representation? What approaches should we employ once we have identified that a text relies on a grammar of participation? In what ways can we apply these concepts to religious poetry in the seventeenth century? Here, Candler is of limited help. Though he identifies multiple characteristics of both grammars, his treatment of the differences is unsystematic and spread throughout his argument. Therefore, I have distilled the various characteristics he notes into four basic qualities or tendencies that appear in a variety of genres, that are comparably definable, and that are central to reading a text that assumes a grammar of participation.

First, texts assuming a grammar of participation are dialogical**.** Candler does not seem to mean "dialogical" in precisely the same way Bakhtin does, but as we will see, the concept is similar. Texts relying on a grammar of participation are in dialogue with the life of the Church and its liturgical practices (79-81). Texts relying on a grammar of participation are also dialogical in that their interpretation depends on an awareness of *persons* responding to other persons in writing and reading the texts. In contrast, Candler calls texts that assume a

grammar of representation monological (31), in that a reader merely "listens and does not respond or dispute" (31). For Candler, a dialogical text is formed by the context of the liturgical church and forms both its readers and the practices of the liturgical church that come after it, while a monological text, though obviously not working in a vacuum, is generally presumed to operate unidirectionally. The meaning or sense of a text that assumes a grammar of participation is inseparable from the particular context of the living embodied Church, while a text that assumes a grammar of representation would presume to address a much more generalized sense of "reader" without evoking a particular sense of audience.

Secondly, texts that rely on a grammar of participation emphasize their own temporal character in a manner that is both "diachronic and synchronic" (77). In the context of reading Scriptures, this involves reaching "across the historical life of the body of Christ and [looking] forward to the eschatological fulfillment of that meaning, . . . [while also making] sense within the liturgy of the Church as it is performed daily" (77). Again, this contrasts with texts that assume a grammar of representation. The latter are "ahistorical" (31) in the sense that "making sense of the argument . . . requires little more than the ability to read a language" (31); this effectively "removes temporality from both the composition and the act of interpretation" (31). Unlike texts that rely on a grammar of participation, texts assuming a grammar of representation are spatial, in that they tend to posit an implied reader who is abstracted from the surrounding historical contingencies.

Thirdly, in texts that assume a grammar of participation,

> Christian pedagogy . . . understands its task not to be the impartation of information about God, but a real leading into the Trinity. Thus to know, in this mode, is an ontological endeavor—

> one comes to know more truly only by 'being' more perfectly, and therefore by loving more rightly. (Candler 34)[15]

In reading a text relying on a grammar of participation, the "reader is not merely given information, but led into God" (44) through guidance toward loving more rightly. As Augustine explains in *On Christian Teaching*, "Anyone who thinks that he has understood the divine scriptures or any part of them, but cannot by his understanding build up this double love of God and neighbour, has not yet succeeded in understanding them" (27; 1.86). The goal of reading while relying on a grammar of participation is an increase in love of God and neighbor, by means of reaching true understanding, rather than merely intellectual comprehension. In contrast, a text assuming a grammar of representation "seeks to confirm and validate itself by a 'proof,' by the correspondence of a discourse to a given text, a *datum*" (Candler 30). In addition, texts relying on a grammar of representation

> [assume] God to be a kind of object which can be depicted. Representation assumes a neutral and unequivocal register across which descriptions can be ferried from a code or tableau of knowledge to the mind, regardless of either the temporal identity of the mind or the temporality of texts themselves. (34)

In texts relying on a grammar of participation, readers learn by "manuduction," that is, by being led by the hand. It would be helpful to be able to say that texts assuming a grammar of participation are participatory, in that they draw the reader in to act and be acted upon by the text, but using the word communicative, will help avoid a confusion of terms. Texts relying on a grammar of participation are "communicative" in that they provide an opportunity for transformation in the reader and do not operate in a vacuum. Unlike texts

assuming a grammar of participation, however, texts assuming a grammar of representation construe meaning as discrete, as units complete in themselves.

Fourthly, texts that assume a grammar of participation are itinerant, in the sense that "the reader is given a route, with indicative markers and signs, towards a destination" (Candler 45). That is, a reader of a text will be lead along a particular *ductus* toward the *skopos* or *telos* of the text. By contrast, texts that rely on a grammar of representation are cartographic, map-like: "knowledge has . . . become spatialized, mapped out, and legible" (43) and is "'spatialized' to the exclusion of the reader" (43). This does not mean that texts relying on a grammar of participation cannot be outlined, or that they lack the organization or planning of texts relying on a grammar of representation. What this could mean in practice is that if a text assuming a grammar of representation is broken into units or *loci*, the formal aspects of technical meaning are presumed to be spatial and the sequence of reading is less consequential for understanding of the text. By contrast, reading a text using a grammar of participation requires starting at the beginning and moving through the text in sequential order, in order for the temporal experience to unfold toward a given *telos*. In this sense, what I am calling a grammar of participation could be described as dialogical, temporal, communicative, and itinerant, rather than monological, spatial, discrete, and cartographic.

Though I have presented these characteristics as a series of binaries, I do not intend to depict these traits as absolute exclusionary identifiers, but as indicators. These are qualities and tendencies, not definitions. Nor do I intend to depict each of these characteristics as isolated traits. Instead, they are all closely interwoven ideas, as further examination will demonstrate. In addition, thus far

they have remained rather abstract concepts, so let us discover how these characteristics of a grammar of participation appear in seventeenth-century devotional lyric poetry.

Dialogical rather than Monological

It is impossible to use the word "dialogical" in the context of literary criticism without encountering the specter of M. M. Bakhtin—without his intervention in the space between the word "dialogical" and its object. "Dialogical" is the word Candler uses (79), and my interpretation and re-use of it is similar, though not identical to Bakhtin's meaning in "Discourse in the Novel." In the context of a grammar of participation, to say a text is "dialogical" is to say that it is in implicit dialogue with the persons who make up the liturgical church and with the way that the text's narratives, especially scriptural narratives, are being lived out. The different languages and voices that contribute to the heteroglossia of a text assuming a grammar of participation are the voices of the Church. Texts written assuming a grammar of participation are written and read within this context of multiple voices. For instance, in England in the first half of the seventeenth century, such voices would include the Bible (particularly the Authorized Version commonly called the King James' Version, but also the Genevan translation and the Latin and Greek versions), the liturgy (particularly the Book of Common Prayer and Post-Reformation versions of the Roman Catholic liturgy), and other devotional traditions and tropes such as emblems and images.

The confluence of these voices is similar to what Bakhtin argues when he says, "no living word relates to its object in a *singular* way: between the word and

its object, between the word and the speaking subject, there exists an elastic environment of other, alien words about the same object, the same theme" (276). Bakhtin further states

> The linguistic significance of a given utterance is understood against the background of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view and value judgments—that is, precisely that background that, as we see, complicates the path of any word towards its object. (281)

In the case of the poems we will be examining, that background is not only the general cultural and literary context of England as it approached the civil war, but the specific background of the Scripture, liturgical practices, and devotional practices of the worshipping embodied church.

In addition, as Bakhtin says, "The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker . . . appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention" (293). This is because "the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions" (294). Bakhtin's account underlines the extent to which dialogue requires other persons, even when a word or a text is in dialogue with other words and texts. In contrast to the ways in which I am using "dialogical" to identify the dialogue between a text and other texts, Bakhtin concentrates on the dialogical qualities *internal* to a work. In Bakhtin's focus on the novel, for instance, he discusses the differences between the speech of a character and the speech of a narrator.[16] I contend that Candler's concept of the word "dialogical" differs sufficiently from

Bakhtin's that I may use it discussing poetry and other genres outside of the novel.

In Candler's discussion of dialogical and monological texts, he draws heavily from Walter Ong's discussion of the widespread impact of Ramist logic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. According to Ong, "In Ramist rhetoric, dialogue and conversation themselves become by implication mere nuisances" (289). Instead, "Ramist rhetoric . . . is not a dialogue rhetoric at all, and Ramist dialectic has lost all sense of Socratic dialogue and even most sense of scholastic dispute. The Ramist arts of discourse are monologue arts" (287).[17] Rather than texts reflecting speech and the give-and-take of conversation, "in the characteristic outlook fostered by the Ramist rhetoric, the speaking is directed to a world where even persons respond only as objects—that is, say nothing back" (287). The spatialization and eventual commodification of knowledge contributed to a breakdown of dialogue in texts, as texts became places that "held" knowledge rather than means to convey knowledge between persons.

Candler's use of the word "dialogical" mainly occurs in the context of discussing the *Glossa Ordinaria*, which he calls "essentially dialogical" (79) because "it presents an ongoing conversation between the Scriptures and its readers, between the people it forms and the story which is its form" (79). Candler likely over-interprets the implications of the physical form and location of the book within the liturgy and within the church. Although he makes a number of good points about scriptural narratives forming the liturgical practices and the liturgical practices in turn forming interpretation of Scripture (80-81), he grants too much determination to the physical formations of the text

and *glossae* in this context (82). A text does not need to be written in multiple hands to be in dialogue with the practicing church. Even in texts such as the *Glossa Ordinaria*, where the dialogue is made explicit between a central text and the marginalia, the dialogue includes (and in fact, necessitates), rather than excludes the embodied Church. The dialogue that Candler identifies within the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and which he implies exists in other manuscripts of Scripture from the time period, is ultimately with something (whether text, practice, ritual, trope, or *zeitgeist*) external to the text. That is, Scripture does not have to be in manuscript form with marginalia in order to be considered dialogical with respect to the interpreting Church.

So how might a lyric poem be dialogical? In addition to the ways in which many lyric poems are dramatic, which I will address later, dialogical texts exhibit a particular type of intertextuality. Dialogical texts not only contain references and allusions to other texts previously encountered by readers, but also affect readers' interpretation of those texts when they are reencountered in the future. In addition, dialogue between texts relies on the presence of memory, as readers' memories of previous encounters of texts are necessary for one text to at all affect the reading of another. Gregory Machacek points out that literary criticism has a long history of noting ways in which texts indirectly refer to each other, whether we call it allusion, an echo, or intertextuality (522). In his article entitled "Allusion," Machacek traces the history of the word "intertextuality" and discusses the ways in which poststructuralist and cultural studies critics have dismissed the concept of allusion because of its association with source hunting. According to Machacek, over the past couple of decades, allusion has more and more been considered the same kind of rhetorical trope as metaphor, but he

argues that it has a valuable place in understanding intertextuality—in fact, in being an axis, "a point on which to move between synchronic and diachronic analyses of culture" (534). In addition, he argues, there is a

> broad distinction between approaches that study the text diachronically, in connection with earlier works of literature, and those that examine the text synchronically, in connection with a contemporaneous semiotic field made up of literary and non-literary texts. (525)

He goes on to demonstrate, by examining the ways in which Milton's editors have glossed one particular allusion to Homer, that "the recognition and interpretation of a verbal echo are culturally mediated and do not automatically occur in a transhistorically stable and predictable fashion" (534). This reflects the fact that "part of what cultures do is select from among the works that were valued in the past, assign contemporary significance to those works, and pass them on to the next generation" (534). The cultural significance of a particular text is often reflected by other texts' uses of allusion toward it.

I contend that for a text to be considered dialogical, it must first contain allusions that are illuminated by both of these approaches—allusions that look back toward past literary and non-literary texts and allusions that reference other texts and ideas contemporary with it. Or, to put it in Bakhtinian terms, the words of a dialogical text must be interrupted in their paths toward their objects by recognition and knowledge of a larger context, so that a word does not only evoke its dictionary definition, but also knowledge of previous usage and contexts. For instance, the word "altar" in the first poem of "The Church" within Herbert's *The Temple,* not only evokes the general idea of an altar, but specific previous altars, such as those in the Old Testament or Roman Catholic churches,

and contemporary altars, such as those in the debates about altar position and content in the 1620s (Guibbory, *Ceremony and Community* 46-47).

Machacek identifies two tropes or patterns that are normally both categorized as allusion—learned or indirect reference and phraseological appropriation (526). Either of these can be used to establish or continue dialogue between a text and an external text or ritual, and both of them include assumptions about the readers of a text and their place in the dialogue occurring:

> Both are instances of what might be called advanced literacy. Moreover, the literacy that is necessary for the recognition of learned references and phraseological adaptations is part of a larger precondition: the reader must share a tradition with the author. . . . In the case of a learned reference, this shared tradition is a body of knowledge with which poet and reader are acquainted. In the case of phraseological adaptation, the nature of this shared tradition is a little more complex. Author and reader must have been exposed to the same text, which therefore must be highly valued by the author's and the reader's cultures—valued, moreover in a way that encourages minute attention to verbal detail and remembering of such detail. (526)

In the seventeenth century, texts assuming a grammar of participation share the tradition of the Church—that is, Scripture and liturgical practices, specifically the Book of Common Prayer. Other traditions, such as Ignatian meditation, emblems, and Petrarchan love poetry would have also been familiar traditions to many readers, if not to the same extent. A learned reference or phraseological adaptation from any of these texts would likely have been recognized and would then influence readers' experience of and understanding of the text.

Of course, not all instances of allusion are dialogical; it is possible for a text to allude to an earlier text or ritual while maintaining unidirectional, monological communication. Texts written using a grammar of representation are still full of allusions; according to David Perkins, romantic lyric poems, most

of which I would count as relying on a grammar of representation, "abound in intertextual allusions, but I know of no Romantic criticism that takes intertextuality as a dimension of meaning. If it was noticed at all, it was only as unoriginality" (235). As the presence of allusions or references to other texts is insufficient to identify a text as relying on a grammar of participation, to be considered dialogical, a text, secondly, must also have the opportunity to affect future encounters with particular texts.[18]

There are two ways in which a text that relies on a grammar of participation can affect future readings of other texts with which the text is in dialogue. First, the reader must be reasonably certain to encounter these other texts in the future. This, then, privileges scriptural and liturgical texts which were repeatedly encountered in a regular cycle, though other texts are not necessarily excluded. Secondly, the learned reference or phraseological adaptation must adapt, adjust, or alter its meaning in the context of the text so that once encountered again in its original context it has added or shifted meaning when compared with the meaning it originally carried. For instance, in Herbert's "The Altar," mentioned earlier, the text juxtaposes ideas about altars, hearts, and stones in such a way that a reader returning to the source texts of the Old Testament might understand God's commands concerning building altars in a different way. Or, in returning to the source texts of the contemporary debate about altar position in the Church, the reader might think that the important issue was not necessarily the external physical location of the altar but the inward condition of the heart.

The poems of George Herbert, Robert Herrick, John Donne, and Aemilia Lanyer that we shall examine are all in dialogue with Scripture, the liturgy

(especially as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer), and with other literary and religious patterns of their time. First, their poems heavily reflect the Psalms in form and content, they incorporate lines from biblical texts, they rely on biblical narrative context, and sometimes they even foreground the dynamics of scriptural interpretation. Secondly, their poems reflect knowledge of and use of the liturgy, liturgical readings, and liturgical calendar in their content and arrangement. Phraseological adaptations from the Book of Common Prayer and from other liturgical texts like the Good Friday Litany abound. Thirdly, all four poets often demonstrate their familiarity with (and adaptation of) the literary and devotional practices of their contemporaries, especially in their participation in the emblematic tradition, their adaptation of the tropes of secular love poetry, and their use of or response to practices such as Ignatian meditation. Herbert, Herrick, Donne, and Lanyer's poems interact with these kinds of texts both diachronically and synchronically so that each poem's significance is formed by its dialogue with the Church as seen in Scripture, the liturgy, and contemporary conventions, even as they influence readers' subsequent interactions and interpretations of Scripture, liturgy, and devotional practice in the church. In this sense, their poems are "dialogical."

Temporal rather than Spatial

The idea of temporality within the context of a grammar of participation is inseparable from the way that texts assuming a grammar of participation are dialogical, and are in dialogue with the liturgy. One of the most prominent features of the liturgy is the liturgical calendar and thus the concept of liturgical time. According to Edward Muir, "profane time is linear—a continuous sequence

of equal days, equal years, equal centuries—sacred time is cyclical, a continuous return to the same place, a sameness guaranteed by the rituals repeated on the sabbath" (Muir 80). The Christian "calendrical rhythms of liturgical seasons and weeks" depends on "the definition of certain days as different than others" (81). While Muir's depiction of profane or secular time as linear and progressive seems accurate, his claim that Christian sacred time is purely cyclical fails to take into account the progression toward the particular *telos* that drives the Christian calendar. For instance, the season of advent not only celebrates the anticipation of Christ's birth, but also the anticipation of his Second Coming. The view of time as endlessly cycling is a pagan view of time, tied to the observable repeating cycles of the natural world (days, months, seasons, and years). The Christian liturgical year acknowledges and incorporates these cycles, but in a way that is always conscious of the movement of time from creation toward eschaton. According to Muir, "although the notion that some days were holy survived the Reformation and industrialization, the grand liturgical passage of the seasons did not" (84). Though celebration of the Sabbath and liturgical seasons survived to various extents within the churches, society at large came to live their lives by the profane, linear calendar.

In order to understand the impact of the primacy of the view of time as primarily linear, we first must understand the effects of the cyclical aspects of liturgical time. According to Martin Elsky,

> One of the most important functions of any liturgy is to make possible the recovery of sacred past events through renewal in the present. The liturgy of the Church is a dramatic representation of the history of redemption, a celebration of those events in the past (and the future) that constitute God's scheme for the salvation of man through history. ("History" 67)

The liturgical calendar and its celebrations were deeply embedded within the medieval and Renaissance patterns of living. Muir writes that "The intertwining of the superficially astronomical and the cultural gave the tempo of the calendrical system the illusion of naturalness, an illusion that bequeathed enormous power over people's lives" (63). The marking of certain times, days, and lengths of times as significant formed a rhythm that governed people's lives: "In traditional Europe, these rhythms were established, celebrated, promulgated and altered through rituals—the rituals of work and the rituals of festivity" (63). Pickstock argues that the liturgical calendar's pervasiveness in everyday life was just one part of the way the liturgy was embodied in the living church in the Middle Ages. She points out

> The liturgy of the Middle Ages was embedded in a culture which was ritual in character. This was a time when the Offeratory gifts were not disconnected from the produce of everyday life; indeed, the category itself of "everyday life" was perforce a thoroughly *liturgical* category. For the community was not something which existed prior to, or in separation from, the Eucharist as a *given* which simply met at regular intervals to receive the Sacrament. Rather, the community as such was seen as flowing from eternity through the sacraments. (171)

In early modern Europe, society was long accustomed to the four levels of cycles on which the calendar operated. The first, based on longer time periods, consisted of "the church's cycles of jubilee years, the liturgical year, and liturgical seasons [and] found its origins in a blending of ancient Roman solar calculations and Jewish lunar holidays" (Muir 64). The other three levels of the calendar—the week, based on the Jewish Sabbath and the creation of the world, the day, and the hour which developed from the rule of the Benedictine Order (64)—are also cyclical. A liturgical, or temporal, understanding of time foregrounds how these cycles overlap and coincide. For instance, the celebration of a day of rest once

every seven days is a Hebraic tradition, but that it takes place on Sunday reflects the Christian celebration of Christ's resurrection that day of the week. The weekly mini-celebration of the resurrection is yearly brought to the foreground in Easter.

The observation of liturgical time is particularly inseparable from the celebration of the Eucharist. As Pickstock says, this "community was not something which existed prior to, or in separation from, the Eucharist as a *given*" (171). According to Rosemary Margaret van Wengen-Shute, there are two aspects to the relationship between the liturgy and time:

> On the one hand the liturgy transcends historical time; on the other it focuses on certain specific events of the past and transposes them into the present. It is timeless in the sense that it is not confined to any single time or place, but extends backward and forward through history until the end of time. While this is true of all the ordered worship of the Church it is true in a unique sense of the Eucharist, which forms the very centre of Christian worship. (90)

In its transcendence of time, the liturgy "incorporates the worship of all those who have participated in it in times past and all those who will do so in times to come" (91). Texts which assume a grammar of participation depend on the liturgy's role in both transcending time and in making past events present. Such texts avoid the spatialization which ignores or deems time irrelevant, while at the same time they encompass more than the experiential present. Texts which incorporate this view of liturgical time, are temporal. According to Wengen-Shute,

> One of the essential functions of the Christian liturgy is to bring into the present those sacred events of the past—the passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ—which are its very *raison d'être.* In the liturgy these events become continuously present, as they are re-enacted and re-experienced in the lives of individual worshippers. (91)

Poems which display a liturgical view of time often are poems which include Eucharistic images.

Of course, the liturgical calendar was one of the main areas Protestant Reformers addressed, as they attempted to excise that which they viewed as idolatrous or empty ritual. Though by the interregnum there would be such a poor view of the liturgical calendar as idolatrous that there was an injunction against the celebration of Christmas (Moorman 246), at first, the Church of England kept most of the liturgical calendar intact, and it was not until the radical Puritans that the "more thorough purge" (Muir 84) was demanded. Eventually, modern views of secular or profane time as linear predominated.[19]

The connections between the liturgy and time also had a profound effect on devotional poetry. Elsky in particular argues that the reform of the liturgical calendar "profoundly affected Protestant devotional verse in England" ("History" 67). One of the main reforms in the liturgy was, of course, the method and place of the celebration of the Eucharist, which Elsky points to as a deeply temporal ritual, "a reenactment of past sacred events in the present" (72). Elsky argues that one result of the Protestantization of the Eucharist is that it becomes " 'subjectivized' . . . so that the past is reenacted in the interior time of the communicant" (72). Pickstock also emphasizes the temporal character of the liturgy in general, saying that it is "prefatory" (220) and "that which is both before and after, and repeated with difference" (221). Repetition with difference is *possible* because of memory, whose role—as briefly discussed earlier—was altered with the proliferation of printed texts. Printed texts, in allowing identical repetition from one copy to another, enabled repetition without apparent difference. In supposing to provide repetition without difference, printed texts,

therefore, affected conceptions of the possibilities of representation. Texts assuming a grammar of participation are temporal in that they assume that liturgical, cyclical *and* progressive, repetition with difference is the true character of time, and that it is around this depiction of time that knowledge and texts are oriented. That is, a text is considered temporal rather than spatial when it is oriented toward and organized by time, particularly liturgical time.

The shifting of the perception of time from liturgical (cyclical and progressive) to linear was concurrent with a shift in the perception of knowledge from oral-based temporality toward spatialization. This is not to say that temporal thinking ignored places—indeed, the place of the human body and the place of the church are both key images and figures within texts assuming a grammar of participation. However, modern spatialization of knowledge and thought tended to exclude the temporal, whether liturgical or not. Ong attributes at least part of the roots to Ramism: "The origins of Ramism are tied up with the increased use of spatial models in dealing with the processes of thought and communication" (*Ramus* 314). He also believes that the shift from an oral to a print culture influenced the development of the spatialization of knowledge: "The Ramist reworking of dialectic and rhetoric furthered the elimination of sound and voice from man's understanding of the intellectual world and helped create within the human spirit itself the silences of a spatialized universe" (318). Adrian Johns further explains the connections between the Ramists and printed books:

> In making logic spatial, they [Ramists] in effect bound reason and memory to the kind of page that the press made. They turned books into containers of knowledge. Volumes were no longer authorities that *told* you stories, in a prescribed linear sequence.

> Instead, their pages *held* ideas for you, in fixed locations (in Latin, *loci*) that were mechanically reproducible. (vii)

The Ramists were important to the history of thought not necessarily because of the new ideas they promoted, but because of the way that Ramist assumptions and organization of knowledge and books permeated Europe:

> Within a generation, Ramist practices were appearing in every sphere of inquiry. . . . In two generations, Ramism was becoming less evident, not because it ceased to exist, but because it had been incorporated into the standard organizational protocol for books themselves. (Johns ix)

The Ramist principles of textual arrangement and focus on visual rather than auditory communication and learning contributed to changing the way the modern Western world thinks and operates.

While philosophers like Foucault, de Certeau, and Gérard Genette identify spatialization as one of the key aspects of modernity, Pickstock, in turn, examines the effect that spatialization had on the liturgy and the church. She especially focuses on the ways in which spatialization influenced liturgical reform. Pickstock attempts to explain,

> It is not simply that space came to obliterate time; it is rather that this became necessary because space now had *to substitute for* eternity. Thus, spatialization constitutes a bizarre kind of immanentist ritual, or 'anti-ritual,' without any ultimate justification except its subordination to the State. As soon as subjects and objects are located within an undying space, they are also paradoxically robbed of life, and of any genuine bodily content. From the outset, mathesis was really an arbitrary ordering of nothing, a nihilistic project in the merely formal interests of control itself. (xiv)

This attempt to replace concepts of eternity in time with eternal space leads to the attempt to "map all knowledge onto a manipulable grid" (xiii). This, too, is an attempt to construe the purpose of knowledge as control of the world,

reflecting an epistemology where knowledge controls and can be controlled and ordered to fit the knower's ends.

Pickstock places some of the responsibility for the shift from a liturgical view of life toward an over-spatialized modern view on Duns Scotus and his idea of univocity of Being for both God and Creation, as well as his idea of "formal distinction" rather than the Thomist "real distinction" or "intellectual distinction" (121-25).[20] Scotus "detaches time from motion of every kind, even psychic motion" (139). This leads to the development that "time and motion were now conceived separately, so as to produce a possible time cognized distinctly in the absence of any body's movement" (139). According to Pickstock, in the conception of time arising from Scotus' legacy, "the independent variable of time operates upon a reality univocally governed by a numerical and linear, rather than differential and cyclical, order" (139). Pickstock argues that proper tension and interaction between the spatial and the temporal can only be restored in the context of worship. She argues that language is *doxological* and "exists primarily, and in the end only has meaning as, the praise of the divine" (xiii). Therefore, "it is this reference to the transcendent which *alone* allows one to keep space and time in a balanced interplay, avoiding either a spatial degeneration into a dominated presence, or a temporal degeneration into flux without pause and therefore any real embodiment" (xiv). Both extremes of orientation—toward the completely temporal and the completely spatial—have their own pitfalls, and our particular modern society has happened to fall, generally speaking, into the problems of spatialization.[21] Despite the fact that Pickstock identifies "balanced interplay" as the antidote to modern over-spatialization, my examination of the tendencies of texts relying on a grammar of

participation will focus on the liturgical temporal aspects of these poems, as it is the presence or preeminence of these temporal features that distinguish texts assuming a grammar of participation.

So what features might indicate the temporal character of lyric poetry? As has already been implied, in regards to content, poems assuming a grammar of participation will indicate awareness of Christian liturgical time, calendars, seasons, feasts, and fasts. They will also indicate an awareness of the cyclical and progressive character of time, and the importance of repetition with difference. Repetition in particular is an important indicator of temporality, especially as temporality is related to orality. False starts can also be a signal of temporal orientation, as they indicate a performative quality, and the unfolding of knowledge as the poem develops rather than a presentation of knowledge fully comprehended and already manipulable. For instance, Pickstock identifies multiple points that she identifies as restarts within the Rite, which she links to the liturgy's lack of spatialization (173).[22]

In addition to awareness of cyclical liturgical time, repetition with difference, and recommencements, poems relying on a grammar of participation often play with tense and time in order to make present past liturgical events. Elsky points out that this is a common practice in medieval poems: "In medieval poetry the Gospel events are maintained as present and ongoing usually through the simple device of using the present tense, or through mixing past and present tenses" ("History" 70). These same devices are present in seventeenth-century poetry. Elsky also identifies a specific "Middle English genre in which Christ appeals to man from the cross as if the Passion were just now occurring" (70), a

genre which Herbert and Herrick both emulate, Herbert in "The Sacrifice" and Herrick in "His Saviours words going to the Crosse." For Elsky, therefore,

> The way a past sacred event is made present in meditative poetry, then, is related to the way the liturgy 'remembers' events in salvation history. . . . Christ's presence in the age of the Church—between the Passion and the endtime—is indeed real through the continual renewal of the sacrifice in the Mass or the Lord's Supper. Meditative verse is in many ways the private offspring of public liturgical 'remembrance,' as meditative writers themselves seem to have been aware in often making their meditations coincide with celebrations on the Church Calendar. (82)

Through liturgy, Elsky connects public worship to private meditation.[23]

Furthermore, Elsky links the "private" character of mediation with the location occupied by these poems. He argues that meditative poetry has an "internalizing subjective approach to the history of salvation" ("History" 75), which is brought about by the location of the action of the poem: "the composition of place is not imagined objectively outside the meditator, but its site is in the meditator's very heart and soul" (78). In these cases, the poems have not been spatialized to the exclusion of the reader; rather, the poems are constructed within the reader. This results in poems which, though ostensibly about certain times of the calendar, are really more focused on the speaker or audience rather than the original sacred event, so that they "reenact the past sacred moment in the soul of the poet" (75). In certain poems that assume a grammar of participation, then, the spiritual "work" done by the liturgical moment for the Church as a whole is also made present within either the speaker, the reader, or both. Taken together, indications that a text is temporally oriented include: indications of cyclical liturgical time, repetition with difference, recommencements, playing with verb tense, and internalized location.

Communicative rather than Discrete

The third characteristic of texts assuming a grammar of participation, that they are communicative rather than discrete, is the characteristic in which the central concept of "manuduction" is most fully developed. This characteristic is the most tightly interwoven with the other three, relying on dialogue (with any two interlocutors) that leads the reader sequentially/chronologically along a particular itinerary. "Manuduction" is, of course, not a word limited to or invented by or even Anglicized by Candler. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, manuduction is "the action or an act of leading, guiding, or introducing; guidance, introduction, direction" or "a means or instrument of guidance; a text serving as a guide or introduction to some subject" ("Manuduction," def. 1, 2). In the earlier discussed Bonaventure text, *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, for instance, Bonaventure uses "manuduction" to describe the way in which Augustine's works teach their readers: "Ex quo patet, quam mira est haec contemplation, per quam Augustinus in multis libris *manuducit* ad divinam sapentium" (54; sec. 18; emphasis added), or, as Zachary Hayes translates it: "From this it becomes clear how wonderful is this contemplation by which Augustine in his many writings leads us by the hand to divine wisdom" (55; sec. 18). Hayes translates manuduction as "lead by the hand"—a literal translation, fitting for today's English readers for whom "manuduction" is not a common word.

However, in the seventeenth century, "manuduction" had already been Anglicized from the original Latin. The oldest use as recorded in the OED is from Wynken de Worde's *Ordynarye of Crysten Men*, published in 1502: "By ye meane manduccyon of thynges corporalles & sensybles a man may come unto the

contemplacyon of spyrytualles" ("Manuduction," def. 1). A few examples more contemporary with our authors are uses in Bishop Francis White's *Replie to Iesuit Fishers Answere*, and a book entitled *A Manuduction, or Introduction unto Divinitie: Containing a Confutation of Papists by Papists, Throughout the Important Articles of our Religion* by Thomas James who was the first librarian of the Bodleian library at Oxford (Clement 171)—works from 1624 and 1625 respectively ("Manuduction," def. 2). The concept of manuduction as a pedagogical strategy would have certainly been familiar to Herbert, Herrick, and Donne.

From Bonaventure's and others' usage, we can see that in manuduction the text provides a clear pedagogical link between author/speaker and addressee/reader. None of these elements can be abstracted from each other—there must be someone or something leading, the text to provide an itinerary, and someone being led or taken by the hand and brought to a place of being differently. Thus, there is a web of relationships between the author-speaker-text-addressee-reader. In short, texts are understood to be interpersonal. This differs from texts relying on a grammar of representation and reflecting spatialized views of knowledge. Ong expounds on the results of the influence of the Ramists on schools, saying "As purveyed under the supervision of a corporation, knowledge naturally tended to be viewed less as a wisdom transmissible only in a context of personal relationships than as a commodity" (*Ramus* 152), and "Insofar as knowledge was standardized by being put in the keeping of teachers' guilds, where it inevitably became more and more a commodity, it tended to retreat from the evanescent world of discourse (*verba volant*) to the more stable world of writing (*scripta nonent*)" (155). The interpersonal character of texts was one aspect that changed in the shift in

prevalence from a grammar of participation toward a grammar of representation.

The way that texts are communicative is related to the way that they are dialogical due to their interpersonal character, but is more due to the traditions and communities of writers and readers. Just as a text relying on a grammar of participation can be in a dialogical relation to Scripture or the Liturgy, meaning that words and phrases are spoken against a background of these texts, so also a text relying on a grammar of participation is communicative because to read these texts properly in dialogue with the other texts is to participate in the conversation around those other texts. Dialogical texts imply an overt readerly participation, which I have called "communicative," as they induct readers into the communities and traditions with which the texts are in dialogue.

The communicative tendencies of texts assuming a grammar of participation are also tied to the temporal and itinerant tendencies, as well as to liturgical performances and influences. First, the communicative character of texts relying on a grammar of participation is related to the temporal aspects in that these texts are not spatialized so that the reader is assumed to be external to the text. Instead, communicative texts may locate themselves internal to readers. For instance, as noted previously, Elsky argues that within the Eucharistic service "events in the life of Christ are reenacted in [the Protestant poet's] heart, as they are in the Protestant communicant" ("History" 83). This, in turn, influences,

> the re-presentation of sacred history by making the object present in the subject . . . [which] makes meditation on redemptive history and on oneself one and the same. . . . To reenact redemptive history in the self is to make the history of salvation one with the history of the soul, or spiritual autobiography. (80)

Though Elsky's focus is on the particularly protestant aspects of meditative poetry and of the celebration of the communion, his description makes clear the connection between an internalization of sacred time and the communicative and transformative character of certain poetry. Secondly, the communicative tendencies of these texts are related to their itinerant tendencies because of the transformative character of the *skopos* and the assumptions that there must be someone or something to do the leading along the *ductus* to that *skopos*, that is, manuduction.[24]

To understand truly the communicative character of texts, specifically poems, which rely on a grammar of participation, we first need to understand how readers are drawn to participate in a poem and *how* they are manuducted through a poem. To do this, we need to understand the web of relationships between author-speaker-text-addressee-reader. We will start by investigating possible theoretical frameworks for discussing the fraught complexities of the "I" in lyric poetry. I argue that focalization is the most fruitful concept to apply to poems that assume a grammar of participation. Ultimately, I contend that the communicative character of a poem is established through the readers' relation to the speakers, characters, and addressees in lyric poems.

First, the complexities of the "I" in lyric poetry have been addressed by critics from a number of different theoretical standpoints, though most studies seem to concentrate on lyric poetry in the Romantic era and following. David Perkins explores today's conceptions and conventions for addressing the "I" in lyric poetry. After pointing out that the identification of the "I" with the author is often seen as naïve (225), he argues that some critics do just that when they use the term "poet," which "conflates the subject constructing the discourse with the

subject or 'I' constructed in it" (225). Another convention of critics, especially those from the "New Critical" school of thought, is to use the term "speaker"—a convention that I myself have followed. While a useful and widely understood shorthand, "speaker" implies "an invented, constructed figure in a work of art, rather than a real-life, spontaneous voice, and this ontological difference grounds dissimilar acts in reading" (227). Other critics use "persona," but this term, even more than speaker, implies an artistically created character. Still others avoid poet, speaker, and persona, but still need to "do the critical job these imaginary beings allow . . . [them] to perform, which is to describe a movement of consciousness," which leads to them saying that the poem or the text does this or that (226). This last option is a similar rhetorical move to what Candler does when he talks about how certain texts manuduct the reader, or says "a grammar of representation, then, is strategic; it seeks to confirm and validate itself by a 'proof'" (30) attributing motivation to the grammar itself. Candler, like the critics that Perkins investigates, however, is inconsistent in his usage, sometimes saying that the grammar or text manuducts the reader, other times attributing manuduction to the author of a particular text such as Augustine or Aquinas. Perkins concludes that as "each theory foregrounds aspects of lyrics that the others do not," the best solution is for an aware and planned inconsistency in which the critic should use whichever term carries the emphasis the critic wishes to focus on (228). While I might agree with him in certain cases where word choice might help highlight certain aspects of texts, I do think that there is an alternative that he does not consider which can be used consistently and more clearly illustrates the relationships inherent in a communicative text.

To begin, we need to first complicate the category of "lyric" as it applies to poems assuming a grammar of participation. As they are itinerant and temporal, they contain at least an implied narrative of the soul's internal movement of attitudes and dispensations, with occasionally dramatic characteristics. Because there is a clear story being told, we are free to investigate terms and concepts from narratology if they fit. Gérard Genette divides the common usage of narrative into three different usages. The first "has *narrative* refer to the narrative statement, the oral or written discourse that undertakes to tell of an event or series of events" (*Narrative Discourse* 25); the second "has *narrative* refer to the succession of events, real or fictitious, that are the subjects of this discourse, and to their several relations of linking, opposition, repetition etc." (25); and the third "has *narrative* refer once more to an event: . . . the event that consists of someone recounting something" (26). So Genette calls the first meaning "story", the second "narrative"—"the signifier, statement, discourse, or narrative text itself"—and the third "narrating" (27). Within narrative, each text has a particular "narrative perspective" (185), which Genette calls focalization. He distinguishes between "mood" and "voice," between "the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective" and "the narrator" (186). As Manfred Jahn explains, "focalization is the submission of (potentially limitless) narrative information to a perspectival filter" (94). Genette later claims that he merely intended focalization to be a "reformulation" of other widely accepted standard ideas rather than a radical new concept (*Narrative Discourse Revisited* 65). In this context the "focalizer" is "the person who *focalizes the narrative*—that is, the narrator, or, if one wanted to go outside the conventions of fiction, the *author* himself, who delegates (or does not delegate) to the narrator his power of

focalizing or not focalizing" (73).[25] Though Genette's concepts are not, as he says, revolutionary, they do give us a useful vocabulary and framework.

The concept of focalization and a focalizer is the best framework for our discussion of seventeenth-century lyrics for four main reasons. First, using "focalizer" instead of speaker allows for consistency across multiple poems. While most, though not all, of the poems by Herbert, Herrick, and Donne have a clear lyric "I," including those I discuss later, other poems in the same collection do not, and I do not believe that the lack negates the possibility of reading them while relying on a grammar of participation. Examples of poems without a clear "I," include works such as "Prayer" by Herbert and many of Herrick's couplets in *His Noble Numbers*. There are also a couple of poems that I wish to address where the speaker is the character of Christ. However, despite this change or shift in speaker, the use of "focalizer" will help indicate the consistency in perspective through the shifts of the manuduction of the reader.

The manuduction of the reader brings us to the second reason—in manuduction, there must be someone/something doing the leading. As mentioned earlier, Candler variously says the "text" or the particular author leads. At least in the cases of these poems, it is the focalizer—as something or someone that occupies the gap between author and speaker—which manuducts the reader. Though this does not actually occur in any of the poems I plan to discuss, occasionally, the speaker of a poem may not be the one leading the reader. For instance, in poems containing dialogue, the speaker at a particular moment may, in fact, be overtly encouraging the reader along a path from which the focalizer, with knowledge of a larger context, is leading the reader away. For instance, in *Paradise Lost*, when Milton's Satan speaks, it is the focalization that

includes the distance between author and speaker which allows the poem to continue manuducting the reader toward the poem's end.[26] Using the term "focalizer" will allow us more accurately to describe and discuss *who* or *what* is "doing the manuducting" in cases where there is ambiguity. Thirdly and finally, although many times the "focalizer" as a term may be used interchangeably with "speaker," occasionally in these poems, especially Herbert's poems, the shift in focalizer leads the reader to "speak" the poem either as the speaker of the poem or alongside the speaker in solidarity as in communal prayer, and it is useful to have two different terms in order to avoid confusion.

Furthermore, the concept of focalization is particularly helpful when applied to texts that are oriented temporally and use "I". As Jahn argues, sometimes when a narrator tells an autobiographical narrative that occurred in the past, "the point of perceptual origin hovers between two co-ordinate systems because first-person narrator and protagonist . . . are separated in time and space but linked through a biographical identity relation" (100). In the same vein, critics within the field of narratology have concluded:

> On the cognitive level, perception and apperception (in both real and imaginary forms) affect *all* participants in the game of storytelling, including readers. In the greater picture, the general frame of storytelling contains (1) a narrator who is grounded in the point-of-view co-ordinates of his or her discourse here-and-now; (2) a reader who is situated in a reception here-and-now; and (3) the characters situated in the story here-and-now. (102)

The concept of focalization accounts for various levels of temporal presence within a narrative—an important capability in our discussion of texts' liturgical cyclical and progressive character.

But can "focalization" and other narratological concepts really be applied to poetry? Within the last ten years, the place of narratological terms in

discussion of lyric poetry has been an ongoing topic of journal articles. Despite critics' treating narrative in poetic form since the beginning of the critical theory, Brian McHale argues that when narratologists look at narrative poetry, they often ignore the characteristics that make it poetry and treat it as fiction ("Beginning" 11). Bruce Heiden seconds this opinion, stressing that storytelling and poetry developed concurrently: "From the standpoint of historical practice, verse and storytelling come into view simultaneously as synergic dimensions of poetry" (Heiden 276). Though McHale and Heiden disagree on a few key points, their specific arguments have little bearing on this argument. Instead, their discussion[27] raises two points on which they seem to establish solid agreement. First, both critics defend the ways in which narratological concepts can be applied to poetry as poetry rather than merely to the narrative within a poem or poetry treated as fiction. Secondly, both authors in different ways demonstrate through the examples they choose that narrative and lyric poetry are not diametric categories, but overlapping parts of a continuum.

Part of the reason that narrative and lyric poetry overlap is that "readers often narrativize lyric situations," that is, readers impose narratives, sometimes biographical or historically contextualized narratives, on lyric poems where they do not exist (Kjerkegaard 189). Stefan Kjerkegaard is primarily concerned with what to do with the lyric "I" in autobiographical poetry, or ostensibly autobiographical poetry, a category into which many of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne's poems fall. According to Kjerkegaard, the transformation of autobiographical narratives into lyric poetry alters them in three ways: first, "narrativity gets reduced and lyricality gets emphasized" (185). This means that, although the order of events (the narrative) is not eliminated, it may be

somewhat obscured by what makes a text lyric poetry. Secondly "the question *who speaks?* becomes pertinent at the same time as this question is distorted by the lyrical transformation" (185). "Who speaks?" is Gérard Genette's question about the second part of focalization, voice. Kjerkegaard means that changes in the narrative voice are sometimes unexpectedly altered or obscured in lyric forms. Finally, "the reader's conceivable expectation of narrativity (and experientiality) must be handled differently in relation to lyric poetry as well as autobiographical lyric poetry, thanks to the way the devices of poetry contribute to the general signification of the poem" (185-56). Among these three alterations, our concern is with the second: "While the question of who is speaking would seem to be most important in lyric poetry, it is a question that most theories of lyric poetry have ignored" (188). Narratological concepts are particularly useful when there is no person as narrator—a problem many critics have encountered or avoided without addressing directly while using conventions such as "speaker." According to Kjerkegaard, "For the message to get across, we as readers do not need to imagine a somebody telling us something, simply because *the poem tells* us something" (192). As I mentioned, the lack of a particular persona or character to speak while still having a term to denote the consistency of the leading or manuduction and without giving into a conflation of the author and "speaker," is a particularly useful feature of the concept of a "focalizer."

Traditionally, there are four main ways that a reader can encounter a first-person lyric poem, that is, four modes of readerly engagement with the focalizer. First, and probably most often advocated by professors in undergraduate survey courses, is that from Northrop Frye's *An Anatomy of Criticism*, first published in 1957: "The lyric is . . . preeminently the utterance that is overheard. The lyric poet

pretends to be talking to himself or to someone else" (Frye 249). This is an excellent example of reading poetry as if it is discrete rather than communicative. It is a definition of lyric poetry that assumes a grammar of representation; the poem purports to be sufficient to itself.

In contrast then, the other three modes of reading lyric poetry are much more communicative. The second mode applies when the focalizer is clearly a character or persona, and the reader imaginatively assumes the attitude and position within the poem as the addressee. The poem is communicative in that the reader is drawn into interaction with the focalizer by being addressed. In Vendler's introduction to her anthology, entitled "About Poets and Poetry," she distinguishes the lyric from other more "social" genres: "There may be an addressee in lyric (God, or a beloved), but the addressee is always absent" (*Poems* x). Vendler adds that dramatic monologues are an exception, but I would like to add that another exception occurs when the reader is the addressee and the poem is read relying on a grammar of participation. In addition to direct address, rhetorical questions can also draw the reader in to participate in this way.

The third mode is another common mode among the poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, and that is the identification of the reader with the focalizer. Concerning this way of interacting with lyric poetry, Vendler assumes that all lyrics have certain dramatic characteristics:

> A lyric poem is a script for performance by its reader. It is, then, the most intimate of genres, constructing a twinship between writer and reader. And it is the most universal of genres, because it presumes that the reader resembles the writer enough to step into the writer's shoes and speak the lines the writer has written as though they were the reader's own. (*Poems* xi)

This is especially true if a lyric poem happens to be read aloud, so that a reader's voice speaks the "I" in a poem. Vendler further states, "To read these lines is to be transformed into the . . . speaker. We do not listen to him; we become him" (xi). She calls this putting herself "into the subject-position" of the speaker (xi). One weakness of Vendler's account is that she assumes throughout that there must be a persona or character speaking the poem in order for this identification to occur.

However, even in poems where there is no dramatic persona, the reader and the focalizer can still be collapsed or identified with each other. Ralph Rader says that the "behind the eyes" effect is that which separates what he calls a dramatic monologue from a dramatic lyric. In a dramatic lyric, the speaker (focalizer) "has no name or specified identity" (105). In dramatic lyric, which is how I believe Rader would identify Herbert's, Herrick's, and Donne's poems, "the reader, following the poet, is imaginatively conflated with the speaker's represented subjective act, as for the moment he dwells in the image of the poet's spirit" (105). I contend that Walter Ong would also characterize most poetry from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as dramatic lyric, though he focuses more on the dialogical character of such poems:

> Most of the best Elizabethan and Jacobean poetry is dialogue at root. This is true not only of the stage, but of the lyric as well (although here only one side of the dialogue is commonly set down), and so true as to be commonplace. We may wonder to whom Shakespeare's sonnets are addressed, but there is no mistaking that in them he is talking to someone, real or imaginary. He does not muse, as Wordsworth does at his less than best, or as John Stuart Mill believed all poets should. The overtones of 'real' or colloquial speech, that is, of *dialogue* between persons, which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century poetry specializes in, give it its characteristic excellence. (*Ramus* 286-87)

The dialogical character of dramatic lyric is part of what separates it from the later poetry which relies on a grammar of representation.

The fourth mode of readerly engagement with a text is similar to the third mode, but instead of the reader identifying as the focalizer of the text and speaking the poem as the focalizer, the reader speaks alongside the focalizer. In such lyric poems, the focalizer speaks as a representative of a group or community and the reader is drawn in to participate as a member of that group. Usually this mode is encouraged through the poem's use of first-person-plural pronouns in a particular manner. Such a mode of interaction between the reader and focalizer would be familiar for seventeenth-century readers, particularly as it reflects the rhetorical situation of communal prayer. There are two forms that such an interaction could take. First, the group could speak together as when a congregation recites the Lord's Prayer together. Secondly, the group could silently "pray along" with a speaker—usually a priest—as he "leads" the congregation in a prayer. Both of these modes of interaction in churches reflect possible relations between the readers and the focalizer which establish readerly participation in the poem.

Finally, there are some poems in which the reader alternates among these relationships and modes of interaction. For instance, in Linda Gregerson's reading of Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress," she argues,

> The push and pull of pleasure and abatement, teasing and withdrawal, coyness and expectation are every bit as 'inward' to the process of reading-in-time as to the process of dramatized seduction. The reader may ally herself now with the poet's virtuosity, now with the beloved's strategic silence, now with the momentums of genre and convention, now with their witty overturning; but in all these modulations the reader is an intimate too, one of the partners in utterance. (167)

The reading of Marvell's poem that Gregerson provides is both temporal and communicative. The temporality of the reading—that is, the dependence of reading the poem on temporal experience—is necessary for the communicative character of the poem, the "allying" of the reader with various participants in the conversation, to show itself.

In addition to these relationships between readers and the focalizer, other characteristics of the addressees may be important in establishing the means by which texts can be communicative. One characteristic that seems particularly strong in Herbert and Donne is that of shifting audience. Bruce Johnson focuses his analysis of audience on Herbert specifically, but many of his observations are also more widely applicable. According to Johnson, "Herbert's poetry habitually signals its awareness that a tripartite audience—others, self, and God—is listening, even when a poem is directed to only one part of it" (89). He elaborates on the tripartite audience with further description, saying that it includes:

> The general human audience, which needs the edification and instruction the work offers; . . . self as poet, who 'uses' this work as a way to be with God . . .; and God, the very interested audience, and inspiration of all prayer, meditation, and spiritual exhortation. (89)

Johnson argues the threefold audience is accommodated through shifts in whom poems are addressing. Though this is difficult, Herbert uses it to great effect in teaching his readers, mirroring the different rhetorical shifts of a priest giving a sermon (89-90). Johnson identifies two types of a shift in audience. First, the "oratorical shift" where "all three audiences are recognized and . . . the speaker is deliberately turning his attention to one part of the audience or another" (91). This has the effect of making other parts of the audience pay attention while one particular part is singled out. The second type of shift is a "sudden shift," which

Johnson says Herbert does when trying to address all three audiences at once seems too hard, where "the initial audience seems to have been forgotten, but suddenly becomes again the object of the direct address of the poem" (94). The effect of this is to raise tension in the drama as the speaker stumbles. According to Johnson, though this second type of shift at first seems to be a symptom of poor writing, "many of those poems that best create for us the illusion of looking in on the speaker wrestling privately with his doubts, fears, and afflictions, or wrestling with God in prayer, are successful because they employ a sudden audience shift" (98). These audience shifts contribute to the communicative aspects of a text by embedding the poem amongst multiple audiences and addressees, which prevent the poem from presuming to function in isolation, as if complete in itself.

One of the main rhetorical tropes that a poem can use to identify its addressees is apostrophe. Paul Alpers establishes that "apostrophe" in the English Renaissance still had the classical meaning of turning aside to address someone else, rather than the later meaning that it came to take on during the Romantic and post-Romantic eras. Many of the audience shifts, then, that Johnson identifies are examples of this type of apostrophe. Apostrophe also has a particular effect when used in liturgy, as Pickstock points out. She recognizes two types of apostrophe in the Roman Rite: "invocations which seek assistance for projects related to the vocation of the liturgical journey" and

> functionally gratuitous apostrophic identification . . . [which] takes the form not of a petition but a calling which . . . both *invokes* and *attracts*. The apostrophic voice calls in order to be calling, . . . and is thus situated within an expectant and passionate order of language. (193)

These two types of apostrophe are two ways that the liturgy addresses God directly. In lyric poetry, these two types—petition and identification—are also present in their apostrophes to God. In a text assuming a grammar of participation, apostrophes assist in establishing the communicative tendencies of the text by giving a particular identification to the addressee. They also provide a way to incorporate prayer into the poems through directly addressing God. As a reader is conflated with the focalizer, or established as part of the community for which the focalizer is speaking, in a poem that then addresses God, the reader is also manuducted into and through prayer, which is understood to be inherently transformative.

Itinerant rather than Cartographic

As I have noted, texts that assume grammar of participation are largely defined by their *telos*, which is to lead the reader toward the union of the soul with God in eschatological beatitude. To this end, each text has a particular *skopos*, which is not merely cognitive comprehension, but "that state of being persuaded of something" (Candler 5). To read a text assuming a grammar of participation is to advance along the path of the soul to God: "To read the *skopos* of the text is to be led along the *ductus*, not simply to a cognition of principles one did not know before, but to reach a 'place' of *being* differently" (5). The *ductus* of a text is the particular itinerary or movement of a text. In texts assuming a grammar of participation, the *ductus* is inseparable from the *skopos*. That is, the means or path cannot be separated from the end or goal. A text assuming a grammar of participation is itinerant in its presentation of the path, or part of the path, of the soul toward God as a series of steps rather than as a spatialized,

mapped-out whole. This *ductus* and *skopos* is mainly reflected in the *dispositio* or arrangement of the text.

This itinerant character of texts is closely related to the temporal character of these texts in two ways. First, the *ductus* reflects a movement through the text in time. A reader does not immediately comprehend a text's path and goal, *ductus* and *skopos,* as a whole. Instead, the movement is rendered through temporally unfolding experience of reading. Secondly, the path of the soul to God is like the liturgical calendar in that it is both cyclical and oriented toward an end that is not an identical repetition. The pervasive medieval understanding of the journey of the soul to God that appears repeatedly throughout medieval texts is the concept of *exitus/reditus*. Despite the radical changes of the Protestant Reformation, Protestants did not by any means completely jettison all writings of the medieval Church Fathers. While they tended to virulently oppose writings dealing with what they saw as idolatrous rituals and those dealing with what they identified as ecclesiastical authority rather than scriptural authority, the devotional aspects of Christianity, particularly those focused on loving God, were not nearly so completely rejected. Medieval conceptions of the path of the soul toward union with God were still greatly influential.[28] Richard Hooker, in *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (certainly an archetypal Protestant text) says of charity that its "final object" is "the incomprehensible beauty which shineth in the countenance of Christ the son of the living God" (106). He also declares that charity begins "here with a weak inclination of the heart towards him unto whom we are not able to approach, [and] endeth with endless union, the mystery whereof is higher than the reach of the thoughts of men" (107). This conception of charity strongly echoes the medieval understanding, but in order to be able to

recognize it fully in our texts, we ought to consider further the medieval account of the soul's movement toward God.

The medieval accounts of movement of the soul toward God follows certain patterns that we ought to be able to recognize in other texts. One of the main patterns of movement of the soul is that of *exitus/reditus.* In the medieval understanding of *exitus/reditus,* everything proceeds from God, as the *Alpha* and creator, through Christ as the Redeemer and Incarnate One, and back to God as the *Omega* and final goal/*telos* in the Beatific Vision. As Zachary Hayes explains in his introduction to Bonaventure's *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology,* "reduction" (from the title) "means literally *leading back*. In its final consummation, creation is led back to its point of origin in God" (1). Hayes' introduction also quotes Bonaventure's last (unfinished) work, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*: "This is the whole of our metaphysics: it is about emanation, exemplarity, and consummation" (qtd. and trans. in Hayes 6). That is, Bonaventure describes the spiritual journey of all creation as emanation (*exitus*), exemplarity (imitation of Christ), and consummation (*reditus*). In *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, Bonaventure says "*metaphysics* is concerned with the knowledge of all being according to their *ideal causes*, tracing them back to the one first Principle from which they proceeded, that is, to God, in as far as God is the *Beginning*, the *End*, and the *Exemplar*" (43; sec. 4) This three part, cyclical structure can be seen multiple times throughout *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, in describing the steps to the union of the soul with God:

> Understand that from the supreme Mind, which has emanated a Similitude, an Image, and an Offspring; and afterwards, when 'the fulness [sic] of time came,' He was united as never before to a mind and to flesh and assumed a human form. Through Him all our

> minds are led back to God when, through faith, we receive the Similitude of the Father into our hearts. (47; sec. 8)

Bonaventure goes on to say, "In this illumination we can see the same three truths; namely the *generation and incarnation of the Word*, the *pattern of human life*, and the *union of the soul with God*" (49; sec. 10). And "Therefore, as creatures went forth from God by the Word of God, so for a perfect return, it was necessary that the Mediator *between God and humanity* be not only God but also human so that this mediator might lead humanity back to God" (59; sec. 23). This pattern of the journey toward the soul's union with God is not unique to Bonaventure; indeed, he largely takes the process for granted.

Understanding the medieval perception of the path of the soul toward God is essential to understanding the way to read texts that rely on a grammar of participation. The readers' movement along a particular *ductus* toward a particular *skopos* is the central object of texts written relying on a grammar of participation. I contend that this general pattern of movement—leaving God or emanating from God in creation and the Fall, imitation of Christ in his suffering and death, and final eschatological beatitude or union of the soul with God—is evident in the poetry of all three authors we will examine. In addition, understanding the medieval account of the shape of the path of the soul toward God is particularly essential for reading Donne's poems, which, though they cannot be read sequentially as Herbert and Herrick's poems can, contain in each poem a *ductus* which reflects this conception of the shape of the journey of the soul toward God.

Other medieval writers besides Bonaventure, particularly mystics, identify the same pattern, and its relationship to the ultimate telos of the soul in union

with God or eschatological beatitude. Ray Petry helps to establish what is meant by the ultimate *telos*:

> For all of these [Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St. Thierry, and Guarric of Igniac], love's possession, or the experience of divine companionship, rather than the mind's comprehension of God, is paramount. Thus in Bernard, for instance, consideration seeks to think and know but contemplation longs to see, savor, and taste. Furthermore, *scientia*, that erstwhile, estimable knowledge of divine things that comes with consideration, must give way to *sapientia*, that supreme wisdom which is the fruition of the love of charity. Both William and Guarric see this wisdom as a joyous incommunicable earnest of celestial happiness. Even for William, the most intellectualized of this group, intellectual love (*amor intellectus*) is less a matter of sheer knowledge than it is a fruitive participation in the life of God. (47)

The path that the soul takes to get to this end, this *telos* is a central concern in Bernard of Clairvaux's treatise "On the Love of God" and in his sermons on the Song of Songs. His language about the love of God inherently reflects the *exitus*/*reditus* conception of this path, though it, as often is the case, does not include the central step of exemplarity that Bonaventure includes: "The reason for our loving God *is* God . . . for he is both prime mover of our lives and final end" (59), and "Thou art good, Lord, to the soul that seeks thee. What, then, art thou to the soul that finds? The marvel is, no one can seek thee who has not found already" (60). The image of the cyclical character of the path toward God is strengthened as even Bernard's conception of the development of love of God has a cyclical and progressive character. He identifies four degrees of love: love of God for one's own sake, love of God for what he gives, love of God for what and who he is, and finally love even of one's own self for God's sake. The fourth reflects the return to the first stage with a key difference.

Union of the soul with God, the ultimate *telos* toward which texts relying on a grammar of participation move, is ultimately love, as God is Love. Seeking

to love God more rightly leads the soul toward union with God. As these texts we plan to examine work on a small scale to move their readers toward this end, identification of the medieval perception of how the soul seeks God illuminates what we should expect. In Bernard's Sermon LXXXIV on the Song of Songs,[29] he further illuminates the character of the path of seeking God: "It is a great good to seek God. I think that, among all the blessings of the soul, there is none greater than this. It is the first of the gifts of God; the last degree of the soul's progress" (74). He further emphasizes the reciprocal character of seeking God, as he did in both the title of the sermon and his treatise: "Every soul among you that is seeking God should know that it has been anticipated by him, and has been sought by him before it began to seek him" (74-75). And what, exactly should the soul seek? Bernard makes it clear that seeking God is the *telos*, not the means to an end, and that finding does not mean the end of the search. He also briefly describes what the movement of the search should look like:

> *Seek his face evermore*, says the psalmist; nor do I think that when a soul has found him, it will cease from seeking. God is sought, not by the movement of feet, but by the desires of the heart; and when a soul has been so happy as to find him, that sacred desire is not extinguished, but, on the contrary is increased. . . . The joy will be fulfilled; but the fulfillment will not be the end of the desire, nor therefore of the seeking. (74)

Even at the fulfillment of the search, the search for the face of God continues. Finding God leads to increased desire for union with him, so the search repeats, again, with difference.

The reciprocal (and therefore cyclical) character of the soul's search for and movement toward God is also embodied in the practices of the medieval Roman Rite. According to Pickstock, the "the worshipping 'I'" in the liturgy "identifies himself by means of his situation in a particular (mobile) place, within

and towards the Trinitarian name; a place itself identified as that which travels towards the altar of God" (183-84). The identity of the "I" in the liturgy is bound up with the soul's movement in that search:

> If the identity of the worshipper is radically affected by the ever-receding altar which requires perpetual recommencement of the journey, it is equally affected by the fact that the journey towards the altar instantiates, and is made possible by, a movement of God toward the worshipper. (184)

This movement is reenacted multiple times through the liturgy. At one point the Rite reads "Emitte lucem tuam et vertatem tuam: ipsa me deduxerunt et adduxerunt in montem sanctum tuum," 'O Send out Thy light and Thy truth: let them lead me and let them bring me unto Thy holy hill,' (Pickstock 184). According to Pickstock, "Here, in asking God to send His light and truth in order to lead the worshipper to God, the 'I' vocalizes more precisely the aporetic impossibility of liturgy: our journey towards God cannot begin before its ending, before God Himself has journeyed towards us" (184-85). In addition to presenting the altar of God as both the origin and the end of the journey, Pickstock points out how the Roman Rite also presents Christ as the exemplar that Bonaventure presents as part of the soul's journey:

> On the one hand, Christ enables us to journey towards the altar of God, and, on the other hand, this true 'way' which He opens for us is itself the altar of God, since Christ only mediates God by being fully God. . . . It seems that to be in the time of sin is nonetheless to dwell in a kenotic space in which we have always already unknowingly arrived. Thus, the prior inversions—arriving is beginning, the goal is the journey—are now themselves inverted: to begin is to arrive, the way is the goal. And one can only ever have begun; there is no other way to be than to be on the way. (185)

Though I have not the space to include Pickstock's line-by-line break down of the medieval Roman Rite, her (persuasive) reading of the Rite reinforces the ubiquity of the shape of the soul's journey toward God; the medieval conception of

exitus/reditus (and occasionally the inclusion of Christ as medium, enabler, or exemplar) is so pervasive that it is embedded in the regular celebration of the Eucharist by the worshipping Church.

Despite the general perception of the soul's journey toward union with God in the middle ages, by the seventeenth century understanding of what this journey should look like and how it should be conducted was significantly complicated and controverted by the Protestant Reformation and the proliferation of conflicting theological stances.

In applying these ideas about the soul's itinerary to lyric poetry, we can see that on one hand, poems which rely on a grammar of participation are still oriented toward the ultimate *telos*. However, on the other hand, the *skopos* of a particular text may or may not be the ultimate *telos*—that is, not every text will end with explicit reference to the Beatific Vision or Eucharist, though many medieval texts actually do so. Instead, they may have a *skopos* that reflects one stage or section of the larger journey (especially when the shorter poems are parts of a larger work as in Herbert and Herrick). Alternatively they might have a *skopos* and *ductus* that reflect a different view of the journey, though this would be less common. Despite these caveats, if lyric poems are written assuming a grammar of participation, they will be oriented toward a clear (but by definition implicit) *skopos*, and the *ductus*, the stages and paths through which readers move, will be oriented toward particular ends, particular lessons or virtues, or particular attitudes of the soul, orientations of desire, and alignments with God's will. In poetry that is itinerant, the reader will move through the *ductus* of the poem, following an itinerary with a cyclical character reflecting varying degrees

of *exitus/reditus*, toward a particular *skopos* which is a part or step in the journey of the soul toward eschatological beatitude.

Conclusion

My observations of these tendencies of texts—that they can be dialogical, temporal, communicative, and itinerant—are not in themselves new observations. What makes reading texts according to their appropriate grammar—that is, reading texts that rely on a grammar of participation while assuming a grammar of participation—fruitful and necessary is the insights to which these tendencies can lead when combined. When we understand that a text written assuming a grammar of participation is dialogical, we can see the ways in which the text is shaped by texts readers have previously encountered and shapes readers' further encounters with these text. When we understand that such a text is also temporal, we can see how a text follows liturgical cyclical and progressive views of times which are a truer depiction of sacred time and which reflect liturgical means of bringing the past into the present and demonstrating repetition with difference. When we understand that such a text manuducts us and therefore is interpersonal in specific ways, we can ourselves follow where the focalizer leads us. When we understand that such a text is itinerant, we can follow a particular *ductus* to a particular *skopos*, and thus reach a place of being differently and loving more rightly. And finally, when we understand all of these characteristics together, and therefore read a text while relying on a grammar of participation, we can understand how the text offers an opportunity to move toward the ultimate *telos*, eschatological beatitude, the union of the soul with God.

CHAPTER THREE

From Salvation toward Sanctification: George Herbert's *The Temple*

Our investigation into reading seventeenth-century Good Friday poems while assuming a grammar of participation begins with George Herbert's *The Temple,* not because he is the earliest poet that I intend to examine (he is not), but because *The Temple* both provides a clear poetic example of manuduction in the seventeenth century and stands as a central seventeenth-century text. Herbert's biography is covered extensively elsewhere,[30] but three particular aspects of his life are relevant to this argument. First, despite Herbert's death at the (relatively) young age of 40, he knew or was connected to a number of notable historical and literary figures such as Sir Philip Sidney, John Donne, and Sir Francis Bacon.[31] His particular mode of interacting with texts was not a product of isolation, but could arguably be considered characteristic of his time. Secondly, he served as Public Orator at Cambridge from 1618-1624 and was therefore familiar with rhetoric and the art of persuasion from the perspective of a scholar.[32] Thirdly, and finally, he served as priest at Bemerton from 16 April 1630 until his death on 1 March, 1633, the same year *The Temple* was published. Most biographers agree that he took his calling seriously, no matter their opinions on whether or not being a priest had always been his intention.[33]

The Temple, published posthumously, (though with some ambiguity about Herbert's role in the printing process),[34] had an unprecedented reception throughout the seventeenth century.[35] It eventually lost popularity during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but since the early twentieth century a

steady stream of criticism has been written about Herbert's masterpiece. Many critics have identified characteristics of *The Temple* that, in fact, correspond with the text assuming a grammar of participation; however, such insightful observations have thus far lacked a framework for cohesion which addresses the underlying purpose of the tendencies or characteristics noticed. Reading the Good Friday poems at the beginning of *The Temple* while relying on a grammar of participation provides us with such a framework, and allows us to synthesize accounts of the significance of 1) the poems' dialogue with other texts, 2) experiential reading of the poems, 3) readerly affective engagement, and 4) the inseparable character of the poems' itineraries and ends. By reading the poems in this mode, we can see how the beginning of the temple prepares its readers for sanctification by leading them through Christ's suffering and death and then guiding their response.

The Text

Herbert's *The Temple* is perhaps more familiar to readers than the other texts investigated here, but a brief overview may still be helpful. *The Temple* is a collection of lyric poems, consisting of three main sections: "The Church-porch," "The Church," and "The Church Militant." "The Church-porch" is an invitation to the reader, beginning with a direct address to "thou" (1). The reader is invited to listen to the poem and enjoined to live virtuously. The second section, "The Church," is the largest and main portion of the collection containing around 150 poems, though the exact number depends on which manuscript or printed text any given edition follows. "The Church Militant" concludes *The Temple* with a

long poem recounting the history of Christian religion from the Old Testament, through the New Testament, and onto the Age of the Church.

There are two extant manuscripts of *The Temple*: the Williams manuscript (generally known as W) and a manuscript now in the Bodleian Library (generally known as B). While W is not suitable as a fair copy for printing, B is a fair copy and "bears the license for its publication by the Cambridge University Press and the signatures of the five licensers" (Patrick 5).[36] Most editions today are based on these two editions and extant copies of the first printed edition. The differences in editions and manuscripts are significant as some interpretations of the poem "Good Friday" specifically depend on textual matters.

In order to demonstrate the value of reading *The Temple* while assuming a grammar of participation, I will illustrate the insights which emerge from paying attention to the dialogic, temporal, communicative, and itinerant character of Herbert's seven Good Friday poems at the beginning of "The Church": "The Altar," "The Sacrifice," "The Thanksgiving," "The Reprisall," "The Agonie," "The Sinner," and "Good Friday." As Huntley points out, "Thus Herbert opens his 'Church' with Holy Week" (72), and here readers begin their journey toward union with God. As readers read these poems relying on a grammar of participation, they are manuducted through salvation—in the form of identifying with Christ's Passion and responding appropriately—in order to begin their journey toward sanctification.

A Review of Literary Criticism

Scholars of George Herbert generally fall into four categories: those who emphasize high church and Roman Catholic sources and theology within *The*

Temple; those who emphasize the Protestant and especially Calvinist sources and theology; those who address religious themes within the poem while trying to avoid the extremes of the two previous sets of critics; and those who either only address Herbert's theology in passing or ignore it altogether in favor of focusing on the technical and formal aspects of his poetry. In addition, some observations by critics in all four of these categories reflect observations that might be made while reading the poems relying on a grammar of participation; however, these observations, significant though they are, often lack a larger framework revealing the underlying purpose of the characteristics noticed.

The earliest critics among these four categories are those who note Roman Catholic, high church, or Laudian influences on *The Temple*. Such observations reflect the early printing and reception history of *The Temple*; the early editions' combined printing of *The Temple* with Izaak Walton's *Life of George Herbert* and Christopher Harvey's *The Synagogue* "deliberately fostered" readings which presented Herbert as the ideal Anglican (Doerksen, "Laudian Interpretation" 36-37). Rosemond Tuve in the 1950s and Louis Martz in the 1960s provided further evidence for the perspective of Herbert as a high church Anglican. Tuve, for instance, argues that the arrangement of the poems within "The Church" follows the convention of arranging poems according to the liturgical year and church furnishings used in medieval Roman Catholic texts, citing texts by Durandus, Hugh of St. Victor, Joannes Belethus, and Honorius Augustodunensis as examples (*Reading* 152). She also draws on older Christian thinkers such as St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, to outline the similarities and differences between Herbert's treatment of the human love for God with classic Christian thought ("George Herbert"). Louis Martz further identifies the

uses of Roman Catholic imagery and liturgy in *The Temple*, focusing on how *The Temple* reflects the art of Christian meditation. Concerning the poems in "The Church," Martz says the first four form a united whole, followed by poems which begin "to display its [*The Temple's*] diversity, while maintaining a ritual, liturgical focus so strongly that this whole opening group of fifteen poems forms what may be called a sacramental introduction to the work" (292). Though Tuve's and Martz's readings were challenged in the ensuing decades, their work formed the foundation of an abundance of criticism in the rest of the twentieth century. In addition, some more recent criticism, though often presenting a more nuanced reading, continues to emphasize the sacramental and liturgical aspects (and, by implication, the Roman Catholic or proto-Laudian influences) of *The Temple*. For instance, R.V. Young argues against overly simplistic views of doctrinal issues of the seventeenth century and argues for a view of Herbert's Anglicanism which is particularly Laudian.

Reactions to the claims of Tuve and Martz occupied critics through much of the seventies and eighties. Ilona Bell began the discussion in 1977 with "'Setting Foot into Divinity': George Herbert and the English Reformation" followed closely by Lewalski's influential 1979 book, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Lewalski argues that Herbert's poems demonstrate a post-Reformation rather than medieval interpretation of Augustinian theories of rhetoric and a Calvinist/Post-Reformation view (which she revealingly calls "Pauline") of salvation, original sin, election, calling, justification and other theological concepts (Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics* 15-17). Following her argument, many critics identified "Protestant poetics" in various ways, arguing that the theology and practices in Herbert's poems more closely

resembled those of Continental Protestants than Roman Catholics. Throughout the eighties, other critics advocated an approach similar to "Protestant poetics." For instance, Chana Bloch, in particular, argues that Herbert draws from the Bible directly rather than from biblical text mediated through the liturgy (Bloch 66-77). Richard Strier claims in *Love Known* that Herbert's poetry centers around justification by faith, and Gene Veith argues that the three-part structure of *The Temple* echoes Reformation ideas of salvation—namely, the Law, justification by faith in Christ, and sanctification (55-82). Finally, though critical discussion as a whole eventually turned elsewhere, a few scholars, such as Brian Cummings in 2002 and Daniel Doerksen in 2010, continue to argue for particularly Calvinist Protestant readings of Herbert's theology. Doerksen particularly argues, "The chief *literary* influence of Calvin in England did not involve attacks on the Roman church, controversies over polity, or the doctrine of predestination. Instead, this reformer sought to be an interpreter of Scripture, and it was for this that he became renowned" ("George Herbert" 446). Like earlier proponents of Protestant poetics, much of Doerksen's argument is based on how Herbert uses Scripture, particularly the Psalms.

Thirdly, critics who address religious themes within the poem without directly addressing the question of Herbert's specific theological alliances often present more persuasive arguments than either of the former two sets of critics by not overstating their claims. One way that critics maintain this balance is by keeping silent, as Heather Asals, does or by explicitly negating both sides of the debate, as Harold Toliver does, calling Herbert less Laudian than presented by Izaak Walton and Christopher Harvey, and less Calvinist or Lutheran than presented by recent critics (9).

Another way that critics attempt to avoid extremes is to focus on the perception of Herbert as an Anglican defined by the Book of Common Prayer rather than particularly Laudian or anti-Laudian practices. Earlier critics focusing on the relationship of The Book of Common Prayer to Herbert's *The Temple* include Gayle Gaskill and Rosemary Margaret van Wengen-Shute. According to Wengen-Shute, *The Temple* reflects "The Anglican view of the liturgy as the corporate voice of the Church, serving to unite the personal experience of the individual to that of all believers at all times" (78). More recently, Clifford Davidson argues, "while not a Laudian, Herbert also cannot be reduced to . . . Calvinism" (Davidson 854). Davidson discusses the implications of Herbert's inclusion of liturgical settings as part of the subjects of his poem (857-58). Helen Wilcox in her edition of George Herbert's English poems, sums up the critical debate by suggesting "Herbert favoured the traditional ceremony of the liturgy and sacraments while still maintaining the Calvinist doctrines and biblical focus of the reformed Church of England" (*English Poems* xxxiii-xxxiv). In a lecture entitled "'Comfortable Words': The Book of Common Prayer and English Literature," Wilcox further argues that the language of the Book of Common Prayer had a strong influence over English poetry in general and George Herbert's poems in *The Temple* specifically.

A fourth set of scholars often grant religious questions less significance, as they focus primarily on the form and structure of the poems. Helen Vendler's *The Poetry of George Herbert*, in particular, argues explicitly that a reader does not have to be Christian in order to appreciate Herbert's poetry (4). Vendler claims to want to make an argument for *The Temple*'s complexity and Herbert's skill by addressing the depth of Herbert's work as a whole, but treats the poems as

individual works rather than as part of a whole. Vendler argues that many of Herbert's poems have a "provisional quality. His poems are ready at any moment to change direction or to modify attitudes" (*Poetry* 99). Another critic in the same year, Robert Holland wants to divide the speaker/persona/voice of *The Temple* into four categories and follow each through the text (7-8). Russell Fraser argues that Herbert wants structure, as can especially be seen in his "concrete" poetry, "as a way to give shape to the void" (570), and that

> his syntactic strategies, boiling down to repetition, conjure the reader, taking hold of him by the lapels. . . . Words and phrases, mesmeric on his tongue, make a litany, unifying the poem. Or rather they confer the favor of unity, 'favor' meaning the face of things. (570)

As Fraser's comments reflect the scholarship of the seventies and eighties, so, also, other readings from the same time period, such as those in Fish's *Self-Consuming Artifacts* and Barbara Harman's *Costly Monuments*, conclude with demonstrations of the break down of the structure and the speaker's identity. The readings of these critics all present *The Temple* as fragmented—an artifact that can be taken apart from the outside and rearranged to fit the reader's desires.

In contrast to these critics, Martin Elsky does not lose track of the content of Christian theology and philosophy that informs the poem's structures. For instance, in ""George Herbert's Pattern Poems and the Materiality of Language," Elsky discusses the consequences of the "confluence of two strands of Renaissance linguistic thought: the Humanist interest in language as uttered speech transcribed in written letters, and the cabalist, Neoplatonic interest in words and letters as physical things with symbolic significance" (246) and its implications for understanding the hieroglyphic poems, pattern poems, or

"concrete" poems of Herbert. In another article, he offers a counter to the readings of Fish, Harman, and others by arguing that the deconstruction of voice does not make the poem self-consuming or indeterminate; instead, the poem is held together by the ideas of Psalmic theology of dramatic voice and part music ("Polyphonic" 246). Elsky also claims that the role of Eucharistic liturgy is critical in shaping Herbert's "The Church" section of *The Temple* ("Sacramental" 317). Elsky draws from theology, historical context, the history of philosophy, and structuralist and post-structuralist arguments, offering balance to the other critics in this category by not neglecting the religious content of the poems when focusing on form or post-modern concerns.

Though they do not use the terminology as I have defined it or connected the concepts to a larger framework, critics from all four of these categories have long noted certain tendencies and characteristics that I contend identify the text as assuming a grammar of participation. First, critics often comment on the dialogical character of Herbert's poems. Critics from both sides of the religious debate, for example, particularly note that Herbert's poetry is full of allusions to liturgical and scriptural texts. I have already mentioned critics who examine the connections between *The Temple* and The Book of Common Prayer. In addition, as Bloch argues, the use of Scripture in *The Temple* goes far beyond occasional reference: "There is scarcely a poem in Herbert's *Temple*—one might say scarcely a line—that does not refer us to the Bible. The readers of *The Temple* are assumed to be readers of the Bible as well, a group of initiates with a history and a dialect in common" (1). Martz and Doerksen both elaborate on *The Temple*'s relation to the Psalms—a concept that Asals explores fully. However, none of these critics

take their observations further to note how Herbert's poetry affects readers' further encounters with the Psalms and other key texts.

Secondly, a few critics have noted certain temporal aspects to Herbert's poetry. Brewster Ford, for instance, in "George Herbert and the Liturgies of Time and Space," argues that the arrangement of *The Temple* reflects liturgical time (19-20). Ford particularly links the structure of "The Church-porch" to liturgies of both time and space, arguing,

> Temporally it [the arrangement of *The Temple*] stands for the catechizing process, the preparation for baptism which the Christian must undergo before being admitted to the church proper. Literally and spatially, the first poem represents the preliminary, as the porch through which one enters the church building. (20)

Another critic who highlights the temporal tendencies in *The Temple* is Phillip Donnelly. Donnelly argues for the importance of reading poems in sequence due to the centrality of the "temporal reading experience" ("Triune Heart" 36-37). According to Donnelly,

> The temporal sequences of the poems [he is speaking specifically of 'Sion,' 'Home,' and 'The British Church'] is analogous to the way that time is a necessary medium for the Church, but not its end. Thus the poems' temporal sequence . . . imitates the union of memory, will, and understanding, in the believer and the Church that enables them to incarnate eternal truth within time" (49).

These critics both discuss the significance of the temporal tendencies within Herbert's poetry, but neither develops the connection of these tendencies with a larger framework or other works from the same era.

Thirdly, numerous scholars have noticed the communicative characteristics of *The Temple*, especially regarding the interesting configurations of author-focalizer-text-addressee-reader. Asals, Elsky in "History, Liturgy, and Point of View in Protestant Meditative Poetry," Anne Fuller, Harman, Holland,

and John Lord all discuss the voice, speaker, or point of view in Herbert's *The Temple*. In addition, Bruce Johnson discusses the addressees of the poems and Sean McDowell discusses Herbert's appeal to readers through the poems' affective qualities. Like the temporal tendencies noted by other scholars, these communicative characteristics are not often connected with a larger framework or identified as not unique to Herbert's text within his era.

Fourthly and finally, one of the facets of *The Temple* that critics cannot seem to resist addressing (and I number myself among them) is the *dispositio* or arrangement of the poems in *The Temple*, a facet closely related to the itinerant character of the text. A few critics treat the order as if it is of no importance, including Vendler. Unfortunately, some editors also disregard the sequence of poems entirely in their editions for popular audiences, such as Philip Sheldrake's *Heaven in Ordinary*. However, most scholars do note the significance of the arrangement in some way. First, multiple critics attempt to describe the arrangement. For instance, Martz notes that "the poems tend to run in short sequences thematically linked" (296). Ford argues that that "*The Temple* is shaped by . . . a dominating structure . . . called LEITOURGIA, a pattern of worship" (19). Diana Benet claims the sequences demonstrates a speaker's search for vocation (101-32). Elizabeth Stambler argues that the poems are oriented around the courtly love tradition, with a single protagonist displaying "violently alternating emotions" (252-53). Ceri Sullivan calls "the architecture and fittings of the parish church . . . a mnemonic" which is reflected in the poem's organization (92). Davidson also relates it to the set up of an Anglican Church and the typical church's orientation toward the east (858).

Secondly, other scholars not only attempt to describe the arrangement of the poems, but recognize that the arrangement of the poems is leading toward a specific goal. For instance, Lewalski claims:

> *The Temple* as a whole is also unified by typological symbolism, its three parts related in terms of a radically personalized and somewhat altered version of the traditional symbolism of the three parts of the Old Testament temple—the Porch typifying the external and visible aspect of the church. ("Typological Symbolism" 94)

Similarly, Rosalie Colie argues that, "'verse' and 'rhyme' are noticeably persistent metaphors for divine Creation, for bringing order from chaos, for fitting, for balancing, for satisfying, and for making content" (Colie 194), and that such order out of chaos appears as the text progresses. In "Herbert's Valdésian Vision," Bell argues that Herbert's pattern of theological thought echoes that of Juan Valdés: "Herbert's Valdésian vision highlights the plot, both the broad outline and the hidden spiritual design, of 'The Church'" (324). These three critics not only recognize that the poems are arranged in a significant way, but attempt to identify the purpose of such an arrangement.

Not only have some critics discerned the existence of an itinerary leading to a particular goal—a *ductus* leading to a particular *skopos*—some scholars have identified a path and *telos* very similar to those I contend are present in *The Temple*. For example, John Walker provides numerous threefold structures to account for the threefold structure of *The Temple* in "The Church-porch," "Church," and "Church Militant": He compares it to the courtyard, holy place, and holy of holies in the Jewish temple, to the lower, middle and upper regions in cosmology, and to youth, maturity, and old age in the temporal progression of the speaker (290). More significantly for this study, Walker notes that "on a more

profound level, *The Temple* is a poem of the soul's progress from primal obedience to Christ, to maturity in affliction, to the ultimate destiny of union with God" (291). Walker specifically sees "The Church Militant" as cumulative in a temporal sense, because it is "a view of human existence seen by the soul now united with God" (304). Walker's description of the perspective of "The Church Militant' is dependent upon *The Temple* leading the reader toward a union of the soul with God, by the end of "The Church," whose final poem is "Love (III)."

Michael McCanles makes a comparable argument in outlining how "The Church" provides a transition for "the persona's spiritual life from the simplistic moral categories of 'The Church-porch,' to its becoming a type of the history of the whole Church seen from a God's-eye-view-point in 'The Church Militant'" (75). Within the arc, McCanles claims that the first sixteen poems of "The Church" "establish a pattern of spiritual experience which the rest of the sequence will only refine but never escape" (McCanles 79). According to McCanles, poems from "The Altar" through "The Sinner" "record a psychological curve that begins with the speaker's overt humility and moves on through a meditation on Christ's death starting in joy, only to end in 'The Sinner' with a renewed sense of the speaker's sinfulness" (McCanles 79). Similarly, Malpezzi's article, "Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving' in Context" argues that between "The Thanksgiving" and "Easter-wings," "the persona has move from blindness to insight" (194) and that "as [the persona] progresses through 'The Church'" he moves toward "spiritual perfection [which] comes in 'Love (III)' where the betrothed Soul and her Spouse are finally united" (194). Although I contend that Walker, McCanles, and Malpezzi correctly understand the arrangement of *The Temple*, what their readings are missing is the awareness of

the communicative characteristics of these poems. In their accounts, it is the poet, or the poet's persona, or some indistinct "soul" which moves along the path the poems provide. Their readings do not properly acknowledge that the reader is meant to be led along this same path.

Finally, Fish's retelling of Herbert's work in *The Living Temple* does acknowledge the place of the reader in following the poems along a specific itinerary. Though *The Living Temple* repeats some of the claims he made in *Self-Consuming Artifacts,* and reflects some similar weaknesses,[37] he makes two excellent points. First, that catechizing is a very important part of seventeenth-century religious practice and something that Herbert practiced and promoted. Secondly, Stanley Fish clearly identifies that *The Temple* is attempting to catechize its readers. This catechizing implies a plan to lead them along a particular path (*ductus*) toward a specific end (*skopos*) and that the outcome is a change or difference in the reader, though Fish does not state this clearly. According to Fish, in *The Temple*, what Herbert

> is doing is moving the reader toward a moment of self-discovery. . . . Because the aim of the discourse is always the realization of one's dependence on Jesus Christ, the reader's success will be inseparable from an acknowledgement of personal inadequacy, and that, in turn, will be preliminary to the larger success awaiting him in a union (effected by grace) with God. (46-47)

Fish argues that the poems "bring" the reader to particular answers and ends (27) in a description of a process that seems very similar to manuduction. In addition, Fish accurately identifies the *ductus* of the text as "the project of preparing oneself worthily to receive the sacrament" (123) and the *telos* of the text as union with God (47). In *The Living Temple*, Fish comes close to reading *The Temple* relying on a grammar of participation except for two points: first, Fish

overemphasizes the importance of "self-discovery" (46) and "self-examination" (123) in moving toward the *telos*; and secondly, he sees the itinerant and communicative characteristics of the text as stemming from the practice of catechization rather than as parts of a larger framework spanning multiple texts across centuries.

In light of the work done by all these scholars, this particular study—reading *The Temple* (or, at least, the first poems concerning Good Friday) while relying on a grammar of participation—is significant for three reasons. First, as mentioned earlier, reading such texts while relying on a grammar of participation helps to fill gaps left by scholars such as Candler and Cummings who study the transition between medieval and modern thought and writing. Secondly, commencing this study with a reading of Good Friday poems in *The Temple* when so many critics have already identified in the text at least one of the characteristics of a grammar of participation allows us to more thoroughly understand such a reading in a text which undeniably assumes a grammar of participation in order for us to be able to more easily conduct such a reading when the grammar the text assumes is less evident. Thirdly, I contend that reading this text relying on a grammar of participation will provide opportunities to perceive insights that are only discernable when reading the text relying on a grammar of participation as a whole. Taken together, by reading Herbert's Good Friday poems while relying on a grammar of participation, readers are led through preparation for Christ's sacrifice, identification with Christ's suffering and death, and response to Christ's Passion—in short, salvation—as the first s*kopos* in the longer *ductus* of the works as a whole. Specifically, I contend that these Good Friday poems in their specific sequence

and in their position within *The Temple* as a whole serve to establish the Passion of Christ and the appropriate human response as the necessary starting point for the soul's journey toward eschatological beatitude.

"The Altar"

After praising moral virtue in "The Church-porch," Herbert begins "The Church," with the pattern poem, "The Altar." "The Altar" is probably one of Herbert's most anthologized poems and serves as an introduction to "The Church" as it establishes certain thematic elements that continue through *The Temple*. In "The Altar," the word is not only a thing, not only an image, despite its representative shape. Elsky argues for subtlety in understanding the relationship between words and things, specifically the heart and altar, in the poem:

> The hieroglyphic signification of the heart by the altar is thus part of a series of resemblances inherent in Eucharistic theology, all of which depend on similarities between things whose differences are essential in keeping similarity from becoming identity, if the heresies of the Mass are to be avoided: Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, Christ the Head and Christ the Body; body and blood of Christ, and bread and wine; outward ceremony and inward spiritual sacrifice. The polysemous network of things and their resemblances (as well as their differences) is held together in the poem by the coincidence of altar and heart, by the physical shape of the printed letters arranged in the form of a stone altar, which is simultaneously the uttered speech of the poet in the act of understanding those resemblances. The word as thing and the word as speech intersect in the poem. ("George Herbert's" 257)

Elsewhere, Elsky argues that Herbert's understanding of words blends different schools of thought. Elsky claims that "The Altar" is one of the ways that Herbert demonstrates a combination of Humanist and Hebraic linguistic understanding of words, creating "a textual space in which words could be simultaneously icons and significant sounds and thus be both acoustically and visually

meaningful" (*Authorizing Words* 149). In Herbert's poetry in general, and in "The Altar" specifically, language cannot be reduced to Humanist linguistics or mere representation.

The "network of things and their resemblances" is possible only because readers' apprehension of an altar encompasses more than what is held within the text. The text is in dialogue with Scripture especially as it is mediated through the liturgy of the Church of England, the practices and debates of the seventeenth-century British church, and other literature from the time period. Readers' understanding of "The Altar" is affected by their familiarity with these texts, and their further encounters with these texts will be affected by their familiarity with "The Altar." First, as part of the text's dialogue with Scripture, the poem refers to Old Testament Hebraic altars in the lack of tools used to build them (Exodus 20:25), the idea of stones praising God in the absence of human praise (Luke 19:40), and the importance to God of a broken heart as a sacrifice (Psalm 51:17) among many others.[38] According to Lewalski,

> The fundamental problem for the speaker [of the *Temple*] is posed in typological terms in this first poem: the need for his Old Testament stony heart to be hewn by God's power and wholly transformed into its New Testament antitype, so that it may accept, appropriate, and properly praise the sacrifice of the New Covenant, Christ. ("Typological Symbolism" 92)

Though the connections to specific verses and passages of Scripture are clear connections in themselves, Wilcox points out that, in addition, some of the scriptural phrases are highlighted in the Book of Common Prayer as part of the Anglican liturgy. For instance, Psalm 51:17, which talks about a broken heart and is foundational to the interpretation of the poem, is one of the sentences that can be read before the morning and evening services (*English Poems* 92). Readers

would recognize the scriptural allusions within "The Altar," and more readily accept the poem's premise and theology. In addition, the next time readers attended a morning or evening service where the phrase was read, the memory of the poem would affect their understanding of what it means to have a broken heart.

Secondly, in addition to dialogue with scriptural passages, "The Altar" also carries on a dialogue with the practices and contexts of the British Church. The idea of an altar was fraught in the seventeenth century, with negative connotations often related to the "idolatry" of Roman Catholic practices. According to Peter Marshall, "Quarrels over whether the communion tables in churches should be placed 'altarwise' or 'tablewise' were fueled by the fact that the Elizabethan Prayer Book and Injunctions seemed to contradict each other over the issue" (264). Seventeenth-century parishioners felt strongly about communion tables, which were in many ways the descendants of Roman Catholic altars. In 1633, the year *The Temple* was published, King James' Privy Council summoned the parties of a dispute over where to place the communion table. Five parishioners of St. Gregory, which was beside St. Paul's in London, appealed to the Court of Arches because the Dean and Chapter had put the Table in the East, rather than, as Bishop Williams of Lincoln had ruled just previously, put it in the chancel and moved it when necessary (Gee and Hardy 533). According to Elsky, "the kind of altar represented by the shape of the poem, with a few exceptions, no longer existed in English churches" ("George Herbert's" 256), and the words of the poem make it clear that "they allude to Hebrew (rather than Catholic) stone altars" (256). After having read "The Altar," readers

encountering dispute over communion tables might be more inclined to consider the inward state of the heart as more important.

Thirdly, Mary Rickey points out that poems shaped like altars were actually a pretty common occurrence, identifying two poems in the *Greek Anthology* (of which five editions were published from 1555-1600) and quite a few imitations by Richard Willys, Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas, William Brown, and an anonymous poet in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*, which treated the shape as either classical or classical with Christian usage (10-13). Thus, in addition to Scripture especially as mediated through the liturgy, and Church conflicts and practices regarding altars, the poem is also in dialogue with other literature of its time, both in form and content.

The allusions and references to these three sources contribute toward marking the poem as dialogical. In order to read a poem while relying on a grammar of participation, readers must remember the world outside of the text—in this case, they must remember Scripture, disputes over communion tables, and poetry they may have read before. Then, in turn, when readers encounter any of these texts again, their memories of the poem may affect their understanding of these texts. Unlike texts relying on a grammar of representation, this poem and the ones following it are not monological—that is, they do not assume a unidirectional transmission of information. Instead, as readers assuming a grammar of participation interact with the text in this mode, the text's meaning changes according to their memory of the texts with which the poem is in dialogue. Furthermore, the reading of the poem affects readers' experiences of those texts when they are encountered again.

In addition to being dialogical, "The Altar" is temporally oriented. The shape of the poem, that is, the spatial layout of the poem, holds a number of implications such as the earlier mentioned implications of Elsky's claims about hieroglyphics. In addition, Anne-Marie Miller-Blaise argues, "The silent form of the altar on the page insures the poet of an on-going eloquence . . . even when he stops speaking" ("*Oratio Nostra*" 61). However, I contend that despite the importance of spatial layout, overall, the poem demonstrates temporal tendencies. First, this poem still unfolds temporally, as will be demonstrated later in a discussion of the poem's itinerary. Secondly, the poem is not spatialized to the exclusion of the reader, as will be demonstrated in a discussion of the poem's communicative properties. Thirdly, the poem, as noted, is in dialogue with the historical, temporal context of the church in Britain.

Most pertinently, however, "The Altar" also demonstrates clear awareness of the liturgical view of time. The poem is clearly written in present tense, but not present progressive. "A broken ALTAR, Lord, thy servant reares" (1)[39] begins the poem. That is, in each reading of the poem the altar is reared once more. To read the poem is to rear the altar. The language is descriptive of something happening as the poem is read. Despite this current enactment, the poem (through its dialogic traits) also invokes remembrance of the past in its clear and unavoidable references to both the Old and New Testaments. Finally, the poem ends with a petition: "O let thy blessed SACRIFICE be mine, / And sanctifie this ALTAR to be thine" (15-16). Present, past and future are all essential to understanding the poem, unlike poetry written in a grammar of representation which may convey a single moment or memory abstracted from temporal context. The pattern in this poem—current and continual (re-)enactment,

remembrance of past Works and Words of God, and petition for the future—reflects liturgical attitudes toward time.

The communicative character of this poem can be seen specifically in the web of relationships between the addressee, focalizer, and reader.[40] Before we address that web of relationships, however, we should note the relationship between the focalizer of the poems in *The Temple* and George Herbert. Herbert is unusual in that he as a person has been so thoroughly identified with his speaker. One critic even goes so far as to say,

> I have not always troubled to notice the distinction between Herbert the man and the speaker in the poems. Such a distinction obviously exists in many of the verses, and the intriguing problem of Herbert's varying completeness of identification with his persona merits analysis, along with the cognate question of the audience which he envisioned. Unblushingly I have stated that 'Herbert says' or 'Herbert complains,' and do not feel myself wholly inaccurate, since his voice can be heard almost continuously through *The Temple*, even though sometimes disguised and dramatically pitched. (Rickey xiv)

In order to read these poems relying on a grammar of participation, however, I think the distinction between Herbert the person and the focalizer of the poems is critical. I do not mean simply to insist, as many scholars do, that readers have to be careful not to attribute to authors the ideas of their characters, or to attribute to poems the knowledge or experience of their authors. Instead, this distinction is crucial in the case of *The Temple* because one of the main ways that many of these poems establish their communicative character is that the reader is led to be conflated with the focalizer, as I discussed briefly earlier and will demonstrate shortly. Understanding the distinction between Herbert and the focalizer is important because, while a reader may be subtly led to identify as the speaker or focalizer of the poem, to speak the poem, this is not the same thing as

being led to identify with Herbert the seventeenth-century priest. This, however, is not to say that the poem can be divorced from the historical particularities of its author and time, or that an awareness of Herbert's role as a priest and rhetorician do not influence our readings of his poetry.

The differences between the focalizer and George Herbert aside, the poem's communicative character emerges most clearly through its dramatic tendencies. First, the poem is dramatic in that it speaks to a directly addressed audience—in this case, the "Lord" (1). The addressee remains constant throughout the relatively short poem. Secondly, the poem is not revealed as written in first person until line 10 of 16. The altar is reared by "thy servant" (1) and made of "a heart" (2, 5). Line 10 finally contains "my heart," only at this point revealing that the "thy servant" in the first line is the focalizer speaking of him or herself in the third person. Until line 10, then, the reader may assume external focalization, but at this point the focalizer is revealed to have been internal all along. The effect of having an addressee who is assumed to be present (Lord, as God, is omnipresent) rather than absent, combined with a perceived shift from external to internal focalization, is that of leading the reader firmly to the position of identifying with the speaker of the poem—that is, the person who speaks the poem, rather than the audience who hears it. The "Lord" in the first line, preceding the pronoun "thy," means that there is never a chance for the "thy" to be understood as the reader. The reader is thus prevented from being understood as the addressee and subtly led from being an outside observer to being the speaker by the move from third to first person, from thy to my. The poem is communicative rather than discrete in that it leads the reader to participate in speaking the poem to God, that is, it leads the reader to pray.

Before investigating what the reader is led to pray, however, we need to understand where "The Altar" starts. First, the poem begins where "The Church-porch" ends. The reader begins at "The Altar," already following a certain *ductus*. As discussed in Chapter One, the expressed goal of the poetry in *The Temple* is to "Ryme thee to good" ("The Church-porch" 4). The rest of "The Church-porch" proceeds to give advice about moral virtues: "Drink not the third glasse, which thou canst not tame" (25), "Take not his name, who made thy mouth, in vain" (55), "Be thriftie, but not covetous" (151), "Be calm in arguing" (307), "In Almes regard thy means, and others merit" (373), and "In brief, acquit thee bravely; play the man" (457). The poem is subtitled "Perirrhanterium," which is a "Greek term for a sprinkling brush used in ritual cleansing before a ceremony" (Wilcox, *English Poems* 63). This poem leads the reader up to the entrance of "The Church."

"Perirrhanterium" is followed by a much shorter poem (still part of "The Church-porch) subtitled "Superliminare" which is "Latin for a lintel, the wooden beam or block of stone above a doorway or entrance, in this case the threshold between the porch and the church, or temple, proper" (Wilcox, *English Poems* 85). Wilcox also points out that in the 1674 edition, the entrance aspect of this poem is emphasized "by placing the poem within an arched, decorative doorframe, with the stanzas in reverse order so that the warning came first, nearer to the lintel" (85). The poem warns, "Avoid profanenesse; come not here" (5) in order to "approach, and taste / The churches mysticall repast" (3-4). It ends by stating "Nothing but holy, pure, and cleare, / Or that which groneth to be so, / May at his peril further go" (6-8). In "Superliminare," the end goal, the *telos*, of the text is identified: readers need to be able to "approach and taste;" however, the

instructions of "Perirrhanterium" are insufficient to make readers "holy, pure, and cleare." Therefore, the itinerary of "The Church," is meant to lead readers "who groneth to be so" to that point. The *telos* of "The Church," therefore, is reached in the last poem, "Love (III)", when the Love bids the focalizer to come in (approaches), and the focalizer eventually sits and eats (tastes). This final *telos* is eschatological beatitude, Eucharistic participation in the final Banquet of the Lamb, the union of the Soul with God.

So what is the prayer that readers are led to pray in "The Altar," the first poem of "The Church"? "The Altar," despite being spatially laid out, leads readers along a specific itinerary or *ductus* beginning at the end of "Superliminare" and culminating at the *skopos* in "Love (III)." After "The Church-porch" addresses and exhorts external moral virtues but finds them insufficient to holiness, "The Altar" firmly establishes that "The Church" will be about inward formation, that is, about the "heart." "The Altar" also, as many critics point out, establishes a few images and themes which recur throughout "The Church." Robert Shaw argues, "The structural analogy suggested by 'The Altar' applies to *The Temple* as a whole" (102), pointing out the analogy between poems constituting *The Temple*, words constituting "The Altar," and stones constituting an altar (102-04). Stambler declares, "The poems at the beginning of *The Temple* have death as their theme" (257), and connects this to repeated images of "dead matter, inert, a stone" (257). Phillip Donnelly points out that stones come up again half way through *The Temple* in "Sion." He argues that "the opposition between 'stones' and 'grones' is part of the classic opposition between a temple that is physical and one that is literally 'spiritual,' in the sense of *spiritus,* or 'breath'" ("Triune Heart" 38), a similar opposition to that which is

highlighted in the form of "The Altar" itself. Lewalski ("Typological Symbolism" 91) and Harman (*Costly Monuments* 188) make similar claims. In all of these ways, "The Altar" not only acts as the first step along the *ductus* of the poem, but also to provide a foundation for the rest of "The Church."

"The Altar" begins broken—"A broken ALTAR, Lord, thy servant reares" (1)— and the words of the poem are used to build it and make it complete. The altar is "made of a heart, and cemented with tears" (2) which almost immediately emphasizes the inward and affective character of the formation. The dialogue with the Psalms via the liturgy here affirms the orthodoxy of the image, but also assures both the reader and the focalizer that such a broken altar or heart is appropriate to offer God; as Psalm 51:17 declares, "a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."[41]

The poem then moves to acknowledge the true maker or former of the altar. Despite "thy servant" rearing the altar, the heart's "parts are as thy hand did frame" (3) without other influences: "No workman's tool hath touch'd the same" (4). The significance of this promise is only clear in the context of Exodus 20:25. Next, the tall column in the middle of the poem presents its own *ductus*, moving from isolation to praise. It begins with "A heart alone" (5); moves to discussion of God having power to form the heart: "Thy pow'r doth cut" (8); and ends with readiness "To praise thy name" (12). The transformation from isolation to ability to praise God is only possible because of God's power to form the heart, which is presented in contrast to the workman's tools. In addition, it is this section of the poem which marks the transition of the reader toward "speaking" the poem as noted.

The *ductus* next reveals conflict between the focalizer and his or her own heart, further highlighting the broken character of that heart, despite God's work on it: "If I chance to hold my peace, / these stones to praise thee may not cease" (13-4). The dialogue with Scripture here, particularly with Luke 19:40, ensures the reader that this declaration is reasonable, rather than farfetched. As the "stones" in question are both the words of the poem and the parts of the focalizer's heart, the heart will praise even if the focalizer does not—an odd conflict.

Finally, the poem ends in a petition: "O let thy blessed SACRIFICE be mine, / And sanctifie this ALTAR to be thine" (15-6). The focalizer, whose voice at this point has been conflated with readers' voices, asks for an exchange of a sacrifice for the altar. The focalizer wants the Lord's Sacrifice to be his or hers and wants to give the altar or heart over to the Lord for sanctification. The ending petition for sanctification re-identifies the *skopos*/*telos* of *The Temple* as a whole: sanctification.

In its communicative character as understood through the poem's temporal unfolding, therefore, the poem first requires readers to acknowledge the brokenness of their own hearts in concert with the focalizer, then reminds readers of God's authority, reinforces and acknowledges the struggles of readers, and thus leads them to an internal position where they are ready to acknowledge their need and desire for sanctification.[42]

"The Sacrifice"

Though not the longest poem in *The Temple*, "The Sacrifice" is the longest poem in "The Church," and tells the story of Christ's crucifixion from the

perspective of Christ on the Cross. It, like Herbert's other poems, is deeply dialogical. Like "The Altar," "The Sacrifice" is in dialogue with Scripture, especially as it is mediated through liturgy, Church practices and theological debates, and other literary traditions. As Sister Thekla points out, "The worship of the sacrifice offered on the Altar would be entirely worthless if it were not imputed value by *the* Sacrifice" (59). The poem following "The Altar" is, in fact, a poem about the sacrifice requested in the last lines of "The Altar." There is a clear connection between Christ's sacrifice and the Eucharistic sacrifice and, therefore, the connections between the metaphorical altar of the heart and the Roman Catholic altar established through the dialogical character of "The Altar." If any of Herbert's poems display medieval and Roman Catholic roots, it is this one. For instance, Tuve argues that "The Sacrifice" draws heavily upon a category of poems known as the "Complaints of Christ to His People," many of which drew from the *Improperia* or Reproaches of Good Friday (*Reading* 24).

The poem's references to Scripture also were often familiar to seventeenth-century readers through the liturgical services. For instance, the poem begins with the phrase "*Oh all ye,* who passe by" (1), from Lamentations 1:12, said by the city of Jerusalem: "*Is it* nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted *me* in the day of his fierce anger." In "The Sacrifice," the words are spoken by Christ. Tuve points out that it is their role in the Good Friday and Holy Saturday responsories that make them said by Christ, liturgically (*Reading* 34). She also identifies these lines as present in the Croxton Miracle Play. The liturgical and performance integration pulls the old testament quotation into a new context: "Herbert's 'original' was not a verse in

Lamentations, but a well-known and effortlessly accepted tradition which made a double reference to both Old and New Testament, with all resulting implications, absolutely inescapable" (*Reading* 34).

However, such connections do not have to be only understood in a Roman Catholic sense. Not all critics view "The Sacrifice" as a particularly high church poem despite its dialogue with medieval liturgy. According to Elsky in particular, the poem fit well within accepted Protestant parameters:

> The Reformers vehemently rejected the Eucharist as a real sacrifice of Christ, but sixteenth- and seventeenth-century high churchmen did accept it as a sacrifice in some sense: not as a new sacrifice or as a repetition of the historical sacrifice, but instead as a commemorative or represented sacrifice, that is, a making present of Christ's past oblation through liturgical remembrance, or *anamnesis*. ("History" 70-71)

Elsky continues,

> For English Protestants the extension in time of Christ's past historical oblation is neither effected by a priest (through transubstantiation), nor is it really effected in the Eucharistic elements. Instead, the past sacrifice is made present in the heart of the communicant himself, who in effect becomes the sacrificed body of Christ. (71)

Elsky emphasizes that this interpretation of the Eucharist is stressed by Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, Cranmer, and John Cosin but is also very different from Zwinglian conceptions of the Eucharist, which English Protestants rejected ("History" 70-72). Even the title of "The Sacrifice," therefore, is in dialogue with the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist in the Church of England—a dialogue which continues throughout the poem.

Finally, as far as literary sources go, Elsie Leach identifies Lydgate's "The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun" as an example of a specific tradition of poetry intended to accompany images from Good Friday: "This poem,

apparently intended to accompany the painting of the passion seems chiefly interesting because it renders in English the specific complaint which serves as Herbert's refrain . . . and is the only medieval English poem I have seen which does so" (421). The refrain, "Was ever grief like mine?" which appears in Lydgate's poem, is repeated at the end of every stanza of "The Sacrifice" with the exception of two, which I will discuss later. In writing "The Sacrifice," Herbert is participating in a poetic and artistic tradition that predates the Reformation. Though readers were and are significantly less likely to reencounter "The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun" than they are to reencounter Scripture or liturgical services, by taking part in an ongoing tradition, the reference can still be considered dialogical as future works carry on the tradition which has been enriched by the addition of this particular poem.

In addition to its dialogical tendencies, the poem also enacts a liturgical view of time. "The Sacrifice" is embedded within the historical moment of the Crucifixion, but continually looks to both the past and the future. From the perspective of the reader, "'The Sacrifice' speaks from the historical present that begins the age of the church at the same time that it speaks from the poet's [or the readers'] present within the age of the Church" (Elsky, "Sacramental Frame" 319). Line 3, in the first stanza of "The Sacrifice," reads: "To me, who took eyes that I might you finde." According to Elsky, the "you" "refers not only to the historical witness to the Cross, but also to all the generations after the historical sacrifice, generations whose salvation is effected in the application of the past sacrifice in its liturgical commemoration" (319). Within the poem, Christ is speaking from the Cross, but he also brings to memory both his (relatively) recent ministry and miracles and the Old Testament works. In line 6, he calls

himself the people's Maker, recalling the beginning of Genesis. A few lines later, he claims that without his work, the people around him would have "to this day been an Egyptian slave" (10), recalling the stories in Exodus. Other lines refer to Noah (94-95), Manna in the wilderness (238-39), and the Fall of Adam and Eve (165-66, 202).

The entire poem is dense with references to God's work in Israel (as told in the Old Testament) and events in the life of Christ (as told in the New Testament). Concerning the New Testament, for example, he includes a reference to his birth: "They leave the starre, / That brought the wise men of the East from farre" (50-51). He also mentions specific parts of his ministry and death that occurred just prior to the actual events of Maundy Thursday and Good Friday: "For thirtie pence he did my death devise, / Who at three hundred did the ointment prize" (17-18). This refers both to Judas betraying Christ for 30 pieces of silver, and the story of Mary who washed Jesus feet with ointment and her hair over Judas' objections.[43] Despite the "time" of the story, however, the poem also includes a few references to the time of the Church, such as when he argues "Then they accuse me of great blasphemie, / That I did thrust into the Dietie, / Who never thought that any robberie" (60-63). This clearly echoes Philippians 2:5-6: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

The focalizer is not confused about the order of events—the wise men were "brought," Judas "did . . . prize" the ointment. Past events are spoken of in the past tense. However, the question at the end of each stanza, "Was ever grief like mine?", is persistent in drawing the poem to the present of the poem's action. In addition, the focalizer speaks of himself and the situation he is in in the

present tense. Though he speaks from the cross at the very beginning of the poem, all of the events from the previous night in the Garden of Gethsemane to this point are spoken of in the present: "With clubs and staves they seek me, as a thief" (37), "All my Disciples flie" (49), "*Herod* in judgment sits, while I do stand" (81), "Heark how they crie aloud still, *Crucifie*" (97), "My crosse I bear my self, untill I faint" (197). Though the beginning of the poem sets the action of the poem at a specific historical point, the combination of past tense for some recent events but present tense for all of the events from the Garden to Christ's death, not only increases the feeling of immediacy of Christ's passion, but also pulls the reader to imagine Christ's Passion in the present. This works in a similar way to liturgical celebrations in which the past is made present, and the distant past (the Old Testament and events of Christ's life and ministry) is connected to the narrative present by juxtaposition, comparison, and contrast in a manner that draws readers to participate in the theological truths revealed by these events.

In addition, the progression of narrative events through the poem is not quite straightforward, as we will see shortly. McCanles argues that "the poem takes Christ from the Garden of Gethsemane to the Crucifixion, and this progression provides a substructure for the separate three-line comments, concluding each time with the constant refrain" (87). However, the progression is not quite linear. Both time and space in this poem are characteristic of what Toliver calls "a poem of collapsed distance" (194). According to Toliver, the collapsed distance "shows sacramental rites emerging from Christ's progress toward the cross, in very specifically historic moments to be reenacted later, now being voiced by Christ as part of his dramatic agony" (194).[44] The temporal "distance" that Toliver sees as collapsed need not be interpreted as collapsed, but

can be understood as part of a liturgical view of time in which past events are made present while looking to the future.

What many critics call "voice" in the sacrifice is one of its most complicated aspects, and Elsky and Heather Asals in particular focus on the ways in which the voice is unique within *The Temple*. The focalizer in "The Sacrifice," unlike the other poems in *The Temple* cannot be identified as some kind of poet-persona. Though the lines spoken directly to the audience, "*O all ye,* who passe by" are first found in Lamentations, their inclusion in the Good Friday liturgy, as Tuve argues, place them firmly in the mouth of Christ. The "ye," then, immediately identifies the reader's position—they are part of the audience being addressed. Other instances of the focalizer directly addressing the reader include imperatives "Heark how they crie aloud still, *Crucifie*" (97), "See how spite cankers things" (109), "Behold" (133), "Weep not, dear friends" (149-50). In addition, the reader is the one repeatedly addressed by Christ's question: "Was ever grief like mine?" The constant repetition of the refrain forces the reader to consider the answer; even if the question seems rhetorical, a question supposes the existence of a questioned audience. Rather than "speaking" the poem, as the reader "speaks" "The Altar," then, the reader is instead encouraged to be the addressee of Christ within the poem.

Asals and Elsky, however, argue that understanding the poem as being spoken by the persona of Christ is too simplistic, especially within the context of the consistent speaker (or focalizer) of the rest of *The Temple*. First, Asals argues that *The Temple* is largely modeled after the book of Psalms—an idea supported by Elsky ("Polyphonic" 241), Martz (280), Lewalski ("Typological Symbolism" 93), and Doerksen ("George Herbert" 446) among many others. Asals argues:

> The historical conditions, however—the tendency to justify the writing of poetry by the existence of the Psalms, the tendency to think that the Psalms were a mirror of the inner life of every man—served only as a catalyst in producing the major accomplishment in the use of the Psalms in *The Temple*. The identification which Herbert makes between his own poetic voice and that of the Psalmist is not ornamental but functional and accumulates throughout *The Temple* profound significance. By echoing the voice of the Psalmist, Herbert expands the dimensions of the 'I' of his poetry. (513)

Asals continues on to argue that "The dimensions of the 'I' of 'The Church,' then, are as large as the dimensions of the 'I' of the Psalms" (516). Part of this expanded dimension of the "I," is the "I" in "The Sacrifice." The Psalms, too, contain words spoken from the perspective of or eventually adopted by the yet-to-come Messiah—most explicitly, Psalm 22:1: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Asals draws on Augustine's commentary on the Psalms to argue:

> The voice heard throughout the Psalms as well as the voice from the Cross, is the voice of Christ's Body. . . . However, as Augustine also reminds us, the Church is Christ's Body. . . Thus, the voice of Christ in 'The Sacrifice' is properly in the voice of His Body, which is the voice of the group of poems which Herbert calls 'The Church.' . . . In fact, the 'I' who complains from the Cross and the 'I' who speaks throughout the rest of 'The Church' are one. (515-16)

Therefore, according to Asals, "Although apparently distinct and separate, the various voices heard throughout 'The Church,' all voices of Christ's Body, are the voice of one man—all the 'I's' are one 'I' . . . At the same time, however, the 'I' which speaks throughout 'The Church' is the voice of Christ" (516). The "I," that is, the focalizer, is not *only* the character, Christ. If it were, it would mean that this poem, alone, is separated from the flow of the rest of the poems leading from this point—salvation through Christ's Sacrifice as set on the altar of the heart—to sanctification in "Love (III)." Asals uses the model of the Psalmic "I" to show how this might be possible.

Elsky, on the other hand, works from textual evidence within the poem to come to a similar conclusion. According to Elsky, shifts from first to third person and certain ambiguous lines and phrases work together to establish both Christ and another persona (perhaps the focalizer of the surrounding poems) as separate characters who speak, and at the same time unite their voices ("Polyphonic" 244). According to Elsky, "Though the point of view throughout most of the poem is ostensibly that of Christ speaking in the first person, at times a new point of view is suddenly and unexpectedly introduced" (243). Some examples that Elsky notes of unexpected third person include the fifteenth stanza which reads, "The Priest and rulers all false witnesse seek / 'Gainst him, who seeks not life" (57-58), and the thirty-third stanza which reads, "They buffet him, and box him as they list, / Who grasps the earth and heaven with his fist, / And never yet, whom he would punish, miss'd" (129-31). When suddenly third-person pronouns are used as they are here, Elsky argues that "it will not do to suppose that Christ here refers to himself in the majestic third person. Instead, in both stanzas the point of view seems to have shifted to that of the Church, or the poet, the speaker of 'The Altar'" (244).

This shift in voice is further complicated by the fact that in the 1633 print edition of *The Temple* "Was ever grief like mine" was not continuously spelled out. Instead, the refrains for the first three stanzas is written "Was ever grief like mine?" but the following refrains read "Was ever grief, &c." except for the first stanza on each printed page and lines 216 and 252 which read, "Never was grief like mine."[45] Though editions vary and Wilcox's *The English Poems of George Herbert* spells out each line, in the 1633 edition, at least, Elsky is right to point out that in both of the stanzas switching to third person that he examines, "the

abbreviated form of the refrain . . . contributes to the ambiguity of the speaking voice and makes it tantalizingly uncertain. Do we read the refrain as 'Was ever grief like mine?' or 'Was ever grief like his?'" ("Polyphonic" 244). Elsky concludes that the ambiguity makes it difficult to distinguish who is speaking at these points. In the ambiguity between "mine" and "his," the focalizer is momentarily both Christ and the reader speaking as part of Christ's Body, the Church, as both Elsky and Asals argue.

A second instance of ambiguity that Elsky draws upon to make his argument is found in line 15, where, though the focalizer is speaking from the Cross as established in line 1 as the reader knows because of the poem's dialogical character with regard to the Good Friday service, the focalizer refers to the cross as "there" rather than "here." Elsky contends,

> The point of view of "there" is the poet's, and this point of view has merged with that of Christ's "I." The grief mentioned in the refrain is that of both Christ and the poet, who is both watching Christ's reenacted death and reenacting it in himself in this antiphonal dialogue between Christ and his Mystical Body. ("Polyphonic" 244)

Finally, a third instance of ambiguity (which William Empson also notes) is that of the last line of the poem. It is unclear whether the last line is indirect or direct discourse: "Onely let others say, when I am dead, / Never was grief like mine" (251-2). As Elsky points out, "If we think of the refrain as indirect discourse, then the 'mine' simply refers to Christ on the cross" (244). Wilcox supports this view, pointing out the phrase "Now all is finished" and arguing for what may be the most clear view: "that Christians may say, in thanksgiving, that Christ's grief was unique, suffered 'once' for 'the sins of many'" (*English Poems* 110).

There are alternate readings, however. For instance, Empson wonders if the "mine" is that of others so that there is an element of retribution to Christ

wanting others to claim great grief (228). I contend Elsky's alternative is more persuasive: "If we think of it as direct discourse, then the refrain is the refrain of the liturgical recitations like this very poem, recited by the poet as the Body of Christ grieving as he reenacts as well as witnesses the reenacted Passion. The 'mine' in that case refers to the poet as well as to Christ" ("Polyphonic" 244). Elsky holds his observations together by identifying the ways in which Herbert uses the "image" of "part-music." Elsky identifies the "part" in line 210 as referring to "part-music":

> Seen in this light, the lines distinctly envision the possibility of man's voice uniting with Christ in the expression of Christ's pain on the cross and the voice of the poet who introduces 'The Sacrifice' in 'The Altar' and who represents his own spiritual anguish in most of the poems of *The Temple*. (242)

While Asals starts with a comparison to the Psalms and concludes that the poem is speaking both as the Body of Christ as the Church and as Christ, Elsky begins with a close examination of the pronouns and ambiguities and arrives at the same conclusion.

The reader, therefore, participates in a complicated progression. First "The Sacrifice" immediately positions the reader as the addressee. Secondly the poem conflates the voice of Christ and the voice of whom Asals and Elsky call "the Church." Thirdly, both Asals and Elsky also identify this as the same voice as that of "the poet" who speaks "The Altar," what I earlier identified as the focalizer of "The Altar." Fourthly, the focalizer of "The Altar" works to conflate the reader with the focalizer of the poem, to position the reader as the "speaker" of the poem, as I argued earlier. The overall effect, then, is for the reader to be pulled not only into the position of those being addressed in "The Sacrifice," but, insofar as the voice of Christ and the voice of Christ's Body in Asals and Elsky's

argument are distinct at some points but united at others, to be part of the person/voice/speaker known as "The Church." The poem leads the reader to identify with the suffering of Christ, and thus to participate in the life of Christ through his suffering. That is, in reading "The Sacrifice," after reading/speaking "The Altar," the reader is drawn to be a part of the Church's voice through Christ's Sacrifice, just as in the Christian faith an individual becomes a part of the Church through Christ's death and resurrection. In this way, "The Church" brings the reader away from the external moral virtue of "The Church-porch" and to Salvation as the beginning of the *ductus* or itinerary through "The Church."

After establishing the dialogic, temporal, and communicative tendencies of "The Sacrifice", our next step is to follow along the poem's *ductus*. The poem's opening line not only establishes the character of the speaker and position of the reader, as discussed, it begins the poem *in medias res*. The first stanza establishes the context, then returns backward to recount how Christ came to be on the Cross. The next stanza turns to that moment when the leaders of the Jews sought to kill him: "The Princes of my people make a head / Against their Maker: they do wish me dead" (5-6). This is followed by discussion of Judas's betrayal and references to the Garden of Gethsemane, Christ's sweating drops of blood and his prayer, "*O let this cup passe, if it be thy pleasure*" (24). The poem then continues with references to the Disciples sleeping (29), Judas betraying Christ with a kiss (41) and Christ's appearing before the Sanhedrin, Pilate, and Herod. Finally, in stanza 51, the line "*O all ye who passe by, behold and see*" (201) is repeated, and the poem returns to the rendering of the action at the point of time at which the poem began.

A few stanzas later, the stanza I contend is the climax, stanza 54 reads:

> But, *O my God, my God!* why leav'st thou me,
> The sonne, in whom thou dost delight to be?
> *My God, my God* ------
> Never was grief like mine. (213-16)

This stanza is key for at least three reasons. First, it is a quotation of Christ who is quoting Psalm 22:1, thus reemphasizing the connection of *The Temple* to the Psalms through Christ. Secondly, the shortened line is unique. The silence after "*My God, my God* -------" is resounding. Thirdly, this is the first and only stanza besides the last one, which has a differing refrain: "Never was grief like mine" (216). This stanza narrates a kind of spiritual death before the physical death in the last stanza, when God has "forsaken" Christ (as it says in Matthew 27:46). The story continues with the events that occurred while Christ was on the Cross: Christ is fed vinegar and gall (237) and lots are cast for his clothing (241-42). Finally, the poem ends with a stanza beginning "Now all is finished" (249), echoing John 19:30 and ending with a repetition of the changed refrain from stanza 54: "Never was grief like mine" (252).

Overall, "The Sacrifice" consists of 63 stanzas, each made of three rhyming lines followed by the refrain. Generally speaking, the stanzas seem to follow a pattern identified by Thomas Merrill, where many stanzas consists of two lines which can be understood historically or purely morally, but the third line "suddenly infects the stanza with an odd taint," that is, there is a theological claim that affects the readers' understanding of the previous lines (75). In each stanza, the reader is told of an event, a description, a truth or a claim, usually of the physical world, which is then bolstered, explained, or contrasted with a spiritual reality, followed by the refrain. Merrill demonstrates his claim on the

first stanza, but similar principles work elsewhere as well. For instance, in talking about Barabbas in stanza 29, the stanza reads "They choose a murderer, and all agree / In him to do themselves a courtesie: / For it was their own cause who killed me" (113-15). The first lines could be a description of a particular action, but this historical event reveals a deeper spiritual truth—that the people pardon Barabbas who is a murderer, and they themselves are murderers of Christ through their sin, thus, by pardoning another murder they are revealing their own guilt for Christ's death and their own hope of pardon for their murder. By the end of 63 stanzas, therefore, the reader has been led through the same pattern numerous times, and has been "trained" to look at the human reality and then see the theological truth surrounding it. This reading and understanding would not be possible without the dialogical character of the poem. Many of the references are suggestive of larger events in a way that requires the reader to be familiar with Scripture to understand them fully. The reader is also repeatedly asked and then told about the extent of Christ's suffering, which confirms the centrality of Christ's grief and suffering to theological understanding of events in the Old and New Testaments. The stanzas' formula as Merrill describes it—a historical event, a theological truth, and then the reiteration of the refrain highlighting Christ's suffering—makes Christ's suffering a filter for understanding theological truths.

In this particular poem, the narrated events are central to reaching the *skopos*, as is the reader's experience of them and imagined participation to a certain extent through the poem's communicative characteristics. The poem's dialogues with Scripture, liturgy, and literature assist in understanding the dense allusions which reveal the liturgical character of time within the poem, that is,

the poem's temporal character. These two traits then work together to reveal the intricacies of voice within the poem, so that the communicative character of the poems can involve and draw the reader into communion with the Church in sharing a voice. This communion is possible only after the reader has been led through "The Altar." Finally, "The Sacrifice" leads the reader particularly through a *ductus* of the events of the Passion narrative so that the reader can reach the *skopos* of being drawn into the Church and into "The Church" as the first step of salvation and the movement toward sanctification.

"The Thanksgiving"

"The Thanksgiving" picks up immediately where "The Sacrifice" leaves off, as the next poem in what is commonly referred to as the "Sacrifice sequence," that is, the series of poems which follow "The Sacrifice." As Esther Richey points out, "lyric speakers that succeed 'The Sacrifice' must find a way to respond to this dying God" (301). "The Thanksgiving" is the first of a series of poems which attempt to respond directly.

Even the title of the poem is deeply embedded in dialogue with the Church. First, as Elsky points out, the English translation of the Greek word, "Eucharist" is "Thanksgiving" ("Sacramental Frame" 319). Secondly, within the liturgy of the Church of England, the story of Good Friday is almost immediately succeeded by "Thanksgiving"—a selection of prayers. Elsky asserts, "Placing a poem entitled 'The Thanksgiving' directly after 'The Sacrifice,' then, makes perfect sense in the liturgical arrangement of the poems" (319-20). Elsky further emphasizes the meaning that the title would have for members of the Church of England: "There is . . . a close connection between the two senses of the word—

thanksgiving as the Eucharistic rite as a whole and as the final section of post-communion prayer. For the Anglican thanksgiving prayers attempt to explain the meaning of the entire service" (320). Within the poem, the references to specific passages of Scripture are much less dense than in either "The Altar" or "The Sacrifice," though a thorough knowledge of biblical stories and situations is still assumed.

In addition to being in dialogue with Scripture and liturgy, "The Thanksgiving" also demonstrates temporal tendencies. The poem's emotional impact depends on the impression that "The Sacrifice" has just taken place. The historical present of the reader and focalizer of the poem is no longer in the first century as in the preceding poem, but a sense of immediacy—of "The Sacrifice" having been recently enacted and needing a quick response—permeates the poem. More interestingly, however, the poem's temporal character can be seen in the way that it unfolds seemingly extemporaneously. In line 29, the focalizer runs into a mental block, stops, puts it aside to return to, and then does return to it, not having found an answer. The temporal character of the poem can be seen both in its sense of liturgical immediacy and in the way that the poems itinerary unfolds rather than being presented as a finished thing.

The communicative character of the poem is very different from that in "The Sacrifice." In fact, this poem's focalizer immediately establishes his or her difference from that of "The Sacrifice" by naming the poem's addressee in the first lines: "Oh King of grief! (a title strange, yet true, / To thee of all kings onely due)" (1-2). The "King of grief" is clearly linked to the character in the previous poem who declared "Never was grief like mine," even without the reference to the "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief" from the prophesy in Isaiah

53:3 commonly understood to be talking about Christ. Next, the focalizer immediately establishes his or her own identity: "Oh King of wounds! how shall I grieve for thee" (3). Unlike both "The Altar" and "The Sacrifice," there are no troubling third-person pronouns. However, readers are still prevented from considering themselves the addressee, as the addressee is explicitly God. At the same time, however, the reader is prevented from being understood as merely "overhearing" the poem because of the extemporaneous feel and similarity to public oration. Bruce Johnson compares this poem in particular to public prayer. He notes the two points where the speaker hesitates as important for drawing the audience to pay close attention: "If a priest were offering a public prayer to God . . . and momentarily lost his place in the prayer, struggling for words, the whole audience would come to attention and be acutely aware of the tortured presence of the speaker" (98). As a congregation listening to a priest is not merely overhearing the Priest talking to God, but participating in the prayer, that is, praying along with the Priest, so the reader in this poem is led to be not merely an auditor, but a participator in the prayer. There is not necessarily a conflation of focalizer and reader here, but it is not precluded either.

"The Thanksgiving" begins with the focalizer attempting to respond properly to the events in "The Sacrifice." Lines 1-16 are questions about how to properly grieve for the King of grief: for instance, "Shall I be scourged" (7) and "Shall I then sing" (11)? Oftentimes the focalizer answers the question or includes in the question the reasons that the response will not be sufficient. Regarding being "scourged, flouted, boxed, sold" (7), for instance, he says "'Tis but to tell the tale is told" (8). Some of these answers are similar to the paradoxes or contrasts brought up in the stanzas of the previous poem. The focalizer finally

asks, "how then shall I imitate thee" (25), before moving on from questions to statements of intent. The focalizer declares "Surely I will revenge me on thy love / And trie who shall victorious prove" (17-18). In lines 19-28, then, the focalizer proposes what he or she will give or do with the blessings God has given—wealth (19), honor (21), a family (23), and friends (25) will be given back to God in various ways. However, when the focalizer moves from these blessings to Christ's death on the cross, what he or she calls "thy passion" (29), the focalizer falters, before setting it aside momentarily and planning to address it later. The focalizer then begins to consider how to repay Christ for his other blessings: "predestination" (31), "musick" (39), and "wit" (43). In line 47, the focalizer declares once again his or her intention to offer the equivalent of God's love and gifts back to Him. From the idea of "revenging" God's love (17), the focalizer moves to believing his plans will allow him to win a contest of love: "O my deare Saviour, Victorie!" (48). The victory is only momentary however, as the focalizer remembers the last gift of love with which he or she has not yet dealt: "Then for thy passion---I will do for that--- / Alas, my God, I know not what" (49-50). The poem ends on a note of defeat.

In effect, the reader is led alongside the focalizer from uncertainty, revealed in the questioning form of the first proposals, to confidence when he or she believes he or she has figured out the pattern, to faltering in the midst of confidence, to building confidence and over confidence, before failing at the end. Stambler points out that the focalizer "cannot conceive the full meaning of Christ's action" (257). Colie explains the reason for the failure of the focalizer: "To suffer in his own body the sufferings endured by Christ at this trial and crucifixion would be, in mere man, both an act of temerity and a work of

supererogation" (205). Though the reader is not led, within this poem, to a clear understanding of the proper way of responding to "The Sacrifice," an understanding of the failure is just as important. As Malpezzi argues, within this poem, "Herbert strategically reveals to us the initial spiritual condition of the persona of 'The Church.' Within the context of 'The Church,' 'The Thanksgiving' dramatically manifests the speaker's inability to follow in Christ's footsteps" ("Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving'" 185). After being led to present their hearts as altars and being led through Christ's Passion in a way that both allows the readers to participate in Christ's grief and leads the readers into being participants in the Church, the readers of "The Church" are then led alongside the focalizer as he or she learns the futility of human effort to reach the goal of sanctification, or union of the soul with God, the desire for which was expressed at the end of "The Altar." Strier argues, "What is at issue in 'The Thanksgiving' is not the sincerity of the speaker but the adequacy of his conception of the Christian life. A poem which began as a meditation on the crucifixion has gradually become . . . an enumeration of the speaker's resolutions" (*Love Known* 51). The importance of the *ductus* in reaching this point is that readers are led to affectively experience the frustration of attempting to be "even" with God, so that they are better able to accept the final *skopos*.

"The Reprisall"

"The Reprisall" continues the pattern or sequence of the previous poems. It is so closely related to its precursor, that in W it is entitled "The Second Thanks-giving" (Wilcox, *English Poems* 116). Like "The Thanksgiving," "The Reprisall" is less dense with scriptural and liturgical allusions and references

than are "The Altar" or "The Sacrifice." The last stanza, however, evokes a few key passages. The first line, "by confession will I come" brings to mind ideas of the Catholic Sacrament of Confession or Penance, and the continual urging of the Old Testament for Israel to confess.[46] However, perhaps more applicably, it also evokes New Testament declarations of the means of Salvation and both senses of the word confession: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Romans 10:9) and "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (I John 1:9)[47] In addition, the last two lines of "The Reprisall,"— "in thee I will overcome / The man, who once against thee fought" (15-6)—also link together at least three scriptural references. First, 1 John 4:4 asserts, "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them [in this case, false prophets and spirits of the antichrist]: because greater is he that it is in you than he that is in the world." In "The Reprisall," the same "greatness" that is against false prophets and spirits not of God is marshaled against "the man who once against thee fought." As Wilcox points out, the last image suggests the story of Jacob wrestling with the angel in Genesis 32:24-32 (*English Poems* 118). In addition, the "man" referred to is the "old man," or the pre-salvation version of the focalizer (that it is the "old man" is indicated by the "once" which indicates a past man). This is the phrase Paul uses in the New Testament to indicate a pre-salvation person: "Seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Colossians 3:9-10).[48] Each of these passages not only affect readers' understandings of the poem, but also have a strong change of being reencountered by the reader in the future,

when this poem may affect readers' understanding of the Scripture. For instance, upon reading or hearing Colossians 3:9-10 after reading this poem, readers might recall "The Reprisall" and consider that it is "by confession" that they are changed from old to new.

This poem, like "The Thanksgiving" includes an impression of immediacy. First, the first lines—"I have consider'd it, and finde / There is no dealing with thy mighty passion" (1-2)—are an immediate reaction or continuation of the theme of the previous poem which ends with the conclusion that the focalizer does not know how to respond to Christ's Passion. Secondly, the title again has Eucharistic overtones. According to Elsky, "The 'Reprisall,' or repayment, refers to the very being of the poet given over to Christ and made clean by being made part of the historical saving action of Christ" a very Anglican interpretation of the Eucharist ("Sacramental Frame" 320). Even without awareness of the alternate title, the poem is clearly connected to and a continuation of "The Thanksgiving," with all of its liturgical overtones. Thirdly, the poem is in the present tense throughout. Fourthly, the poem's itinerary unfolds in temporally and experientially significant ways, as we will discuss shortly.

The poem's focalizer follows the pattern of that of "The Thanksgiving," with the "I" in direct address to God and the reader led alongside (manuducted by) the focalizer to address God, that is, to pray, alongside. The "I" and "thy" are established in the first two lines and do not seem to change throughout the poem. One other interesting part of the poem's communicative character can be found in the last stanza. The focalizer realizes that "confession" is the key to the victory that he or she was so eager to claim in "The Thanksgiving." Confession in

both senses as found in the text's dialogue with Scripture applies within this context: a confession of sin—an admittance of guilt and trespass—and confession of faith. Confession of faith in the context of this poem is not only confession of belief in doctrine and in Christ's lordship, but also confession of faith in the divine love that "The Reprisal" and the preceding poem, "The Thanksgiving," have established. In both cases, confession does more than state facts. Confession of sin and confession of faith are both construed as "performative utterances" in J. L. Austin's meaning of the phrase; that is, these kinds of confessions do something rather than just assert something.[49] Confession, in particular, of either kind, transforms the confessor's soul and, therefore, the relations of the soul to God, as indicated by the verses I noted in the discussion of the dialogical character of the poem. As readers are manuducted through this poem, then, they are also manuducted through confession and through this transformation, and therefore, through the means of salvation.

As Barbara Harman points out, "The Reprisall" begins with the *skopos* of the previous poem, which is an "exhaustion of possibilities" (*Costly Monuments* 59). Malpezzi points out that at the beginning of this poem, the focalizer "continues his stance of pride and willfulness" despite the disheartening ending of the previous poem ("Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving'" 191). The focalizer begins by proclaiming "there is no dealing with thy mighty passion" (2), for even if the focalizer were to give the ultimate gift of death, it would not be enough because it would not negate the impact of the focalizer's sin (3-4). The focalizer then backs up to petition for innocence (5-6) before realizing that that still would not even the score (7-8). In the third stanza, then, the focalizer complains that Christ already won in terms of having "eternall glorie" (10) and that now he has won a

contest about "griefs" (11) as well. In the contest between the focalizer and Christ, the focalizer finally realizes that Christ has "all vict'ries" (12). However, the focalizer has another realization concerning how to win something at least: "Yet by confession will I come / Into the conquest" (13-4). The reader is led to realize with the focalizer that the conquest is not against Christ, which would be useless anyway—"I can do nought / Against thee" (14-5)—but against the focalizer's self, the "old man" as discussed earlier. In this way, in the humility of preparing to defeat himself with Christ through confession, the focalizer has moved away from the pride of the beginning of the poem. Without understanding the texts with which this poem is in dialogue, the temporally unfolding character of the poem, or the communicative aspects of confession, we would not be able to see how this poem has moved readers further along the overall *ductus* toward sanctification. In both "The Thanksgiving" and "The Reprisall," Young argues that the focalizer does not reject attempts to respond to Christ's suffering, but instead demonstrates the importance of seeing how these attempts fail in order to learn a proper response, that is, confession (113). The *ductus* of both poems lead through failure to the beginning of a plan of action—confession in both of its meanings leading to the defeat of "the man, who once against thee fought" (16). The ultimate defeat of that "old man" is realized in the sanctification the focalizer is seeking, that is, the overall *telos* of "The Church."

"The Agonie"

"The Agonie" once again is in dialogue with Scripture, liturgy, earlier poetry, and social contexts. Wilcox claims that much of the criticism regarding this poem focuses on the sources of the images and emblems within the text

(*English Poems* 118). Tuve argues that in these poems in particular, the seventeenth-century immersion in the practices and images of the Church made readers familiar with the images that seem shocking to today's readers (*Reading* 112). She argues that the very familiarity of the images and language makes a significant difference to a readers' experience of reading the poem. Engel's article, "Christ in the Winepress" discusses the many ways in which the image of a winepress was a traditional image within the Church. Engel cites passages from numerous theologians from Alain of Lille to Bonaventure to Joseph Hall. He concludes that the winepress, the action of the winepress, and the man pressed have all had been interpreted in multiple ways, but "the conflation of the image of Christ as true vine crushed, sole provider of the Eucharistic wine, and of Christ trampling the Grapes of Wrath . . . is rare" (50), though this is the image presented in "The Agonie." Overall, Wilcox identifies the scriptural source as that from Isaiah: "Wherefore *art thou* red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winevat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people *there was* none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury" (Isaiah 63: 2-3). This is, as with many of the earlier noted scriptural references, mediated in dialogue with the readers' liturgical experiences of the passage, which is scheduled to be read the Monday before Easter (Wilcox, *English Poems* 118). Upon hearing this passage from Isaiah read, after having read "The Agonie," perhaps readers would be more inclined to follow Herbert's logic in conflating the two images of Christ as both pressed and presser and pick up on the Eucharistic overtones of the scriptural passage.

In addition to the central image of the winepress, the poem is dialogical with regard to Scripture, liturgy, and poetry in other ways as well. The first line

mentions mountains, and focuses on the Mount of Olives in the second stanza and the mountain of Calvary in the third. Baird Whitlock argues, however, that the true "Agonie" that the title refers to "takes place not on the Cross, which provides the blood wine of Communion, but in Gethsemane, where Christ's humanity is most apparent" (49). In addition, Whitlock points out that since Gethsemane is actually at the foot of the Mount of Olives, the same event serves as at least a partial referent to the "depths" mentioned in the second line. The last stanza begins, "who knows not Love" which seems to refer, at least obliquely, to a combination of two passages of Scripture. First, in Ephesians 3:17-19, Paul prays:

> That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, May be able to comprehend with all saints what *is* the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.

The focalizer links this inability to measure love to I John 4:8: "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love." The poem ends with the lines: "Love is that liquour sweet and most divine, / Which my God feels as bloud; but I, as wine" (17-8). The Eucharistic implications are both the *skopos* of this particular poem, and also in dialogue with readers' familiarity with liturgical and sacramental practices. In regard to literature, Young argues that the poem has "specific parallels" to two poems by Robert Southwell, "Sinnes Heavie Loade" and "Christs Bloody Sweat" (120-21). Finally, in addition to the winepress imagery mentioned by many authors, J. Max Patrick identifies the shape of the stanzas as vaguely suggesting "the instrument of torture called a Press" (17). Such a visual association reinforces the title of the poem.

This poem is unique so far among the poems we have examined in that it is not only temporally oriented, but also presents an insistent corrective to spatialization. The first stanza draws attention to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century preoccupation for measuring and mapping things,[50] that is, focusing on how much space they occupy and in what manner. The focalizer is insistent, however, that such a view of measuring, fathoming, walking with a measuring tool, and tracing is not enough to comprehend "two vast, spacious things" (4), which are "Sinne and Love" (6). In order to understand, or "sound" (6) sin, the focalizer says that a person must "see" (8) Christ's experience of agony in the garden of Gethsemane (7-10). In order to "sound" Love, however, a person must not just "see" Christ's agony, but participate in his death by "tasting" (14, 16) Christ's blood (13-16). The presentation of Christ's actions at Gethsemane and Calvary implies that they are simultaneous and ongoing events. Unlike similar disregard of sequence and time in other texts, this does not work to make them ahistorical. Instead, the content and context serve to place both Christ's agony in the garden and his agony on the Cross as historical and eternal and eternally significant events that are not limited by space or time. Rather than the events happening outside of time or disregarding time, because of the Eucharistic overtones, the events instead encompass time, emphasizing Christ's identity as the God who created time and space and therefore transcends them even as he is present in them.

After the very personal "I" of the focalizer in the previous poems, this poem starts off having taken a step back. There is no specific addressee, and the focalizer does not reveal his or her presence until the very last line. The vague person who the focalizer is teaching is referred to in the third person, but even

these pronouns do not show up until the second stanza: "Who would know Sinne, let him repair" (7). The focalizer's tone is that of teaching, until the very last line when the knowledge becomes personal through experience. This poem's focalizer echoes that of "The Altar," in that it starts out in the third person on the surface, but the presence of a person speaking is revealed by the end. As in "The Altar," here, too, the reader is drawn in to be more and more involved: from speaking about abstract "philosophers" (1) in the first stanza, to "who would know Sinne" in the third person in the second stanza (the introduction of a person or character), to the presence of an "I" in the third stanza. The focalizer explains what "one who would know" should do to comprehend Sinne and Love, and then presents definitions—"Sinne is . . ." (11) and "Love is . . ." (17). By presenting the definitions, the focalizer reveals that he or she has already "seen" and "tasted," and this is reinforced by the last line: "Which my God feels as bloud; but I, as wine" (18). The absence of a second person, an addressee, in this poem means that this is neither truly a prayer, addressed to God, or a lesson addressed to the reader. The use of "let him," rather than "let you" or an imperative with an implied "you," is significant. The reader is clearly not the one who is addressed, but, in addition, neither can the reader quite fulfill the role of eavesdropper, as the poem does not directly address anyone in particular. Instead, the reader is again nudged to identify with the focalizer, with an important caveat. The reader can identify with the focalizer only if he or she has participated in the Eucharist, or if—in meditation on Christ's suffering that the focalizer has been avoiding in the previous poems as Malpezzi discusses ("Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving'" 191) —he or she imaginatively engages the senses in meditation about Christ's suffering as Martz indicates (84-85). The

present tense of "my God feels" (18) and the lack of verb in "I, as wine" (18) invite a reader to imaginatively participate in the Eucharist.

"The Reprisall" ends with a plan for confession and a new identification of who the focalizer ought to be in conflict with. The "two vast, spacious things" (4), "Sinne and Love" (6) that the focalizer sounds within the poem can be understood as relating to the two meanings of confession in "The Reprisall": confession of sin and confession of faith in divine love. The poem first establishes the extent of human knowledge and measuring (1-3), and then identifies two limits in particular (4-6). Next, the poem presents an image that shows the effects of sin: "A man so wrung with pains, that all his hair, / His skinne, his garments bloudie be" (9-10). Following the image, the focalizer provides the definition, demonstrating that he or she has already experienced the image and knows what the reader is being led to know. The focalizer proclaims "Sinne is that press and vice, which forceth pain / To hunt his cruell food through ev'ry vein" (11-2). Rickey points out the pun in "vice" (73) and Arnold Stein proclaims that "sin is brilliantly abbreviated to the instrument physically binding man and God in pain" (95). Next the poem encourages "him" to "taste that juice, which on the crosse a pike / Did set again abroach" (14-5), that is, to taste Christ's blood. The poem ends with a clear juxtaposition between Christ's suffering (in God's feeling it as blood) and the focalizer's (and the readers' if they allow themselves to be manuducted through these poems) salvation (the sweet liquor that tastes like wine). In "The Agonie," readers are manuducted through a lesson about two sides of confession as they are led toward the *skopos* of "The Reprisall." The formal and distant beginning is slowly turned into identification of focalizer and reader once again. Sin is shown to result in pain, but Love is shown to transform

that pain, at least for the focalizer and potential reader. The *ductus* of the poem leads the reader through a realization about confession as a means to participation in the Eucharist.

As I have demonstrated, reading this poem relying on a grammar of participation leads to an interpretation of this poem which is deeply personal and emotionally engaging, specifically as a result of an understanding of "conquest" "by confession"("The Reprisall" 14, 13) established in the previous poem. This subsequent poem is thus an excellent example of the importance of reading this poem according to the appropriate grammar. Reading this poem while assuming a grammar of representation could lead to an understanding of this poem as an intellectually detached proposition for someone who wanted to understand sin and love. If the text is understood to be spatialized rather than temporal and discrete rather than communicative, the poem can: 1) be misread as advocating for measuring Sin and Love (6), and 2) be misunderstood as describing situations that have nothing to do with the reader. If this poem assumed a grammar of representation, "Who would know Sinne, let him repair" (7) would not necessarily engage the reader or the focalizer. Finally, if this poem is understood as cartographic rather than itinerant, the options presented in stanzas two and three can be understood as spatialized choices. By reading the stanzas, however, as sequential, we can understand that they do not present a binary choice between either "Sinne" or "Love" (as a grammar of representation would suggest). Instead, we can understand the stanzas as presenting a sequence that requires understanding "Sinne" before understanding "Love." Reading this poem while relying on an inappropriate grammar, therefore, while not

completely fruitless, misses some of the nuances that arise from reading it while relying on the appropriate grammar.

"The Sinner"

"The Sinner" is dialogical with respect to its engagement of Scripture. This dialogical character appears in the poems' reference to the Sabbath (3-4), its mention of humans made in the image of God (12) in Genesis 1:26, and its oblique allusion to God writing the Law of Moses in stone (14). These three scriptural references are particularly interesting (though there are a few others) because of the way that they are connected to each other within a single passage. Specifically, Exodus 31:12,16-18 reads:

> And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it *is* a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that *ye* may know that I *am* the Lord that doth sanctify you. . . . Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, *for* a perpetual covenant. It *is* a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed. And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.

Not only does this one passage connect the observation of the Sabbath with God writing in stone, it also links the observation of the Sabbath to creation, when God made man in his image on the sixth day, and also gives the reason "that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." "The Sinner" is also dialogical with respect to other poetry in that it is a sonnet—the first sonnet in *The Temple*, in fact. Wilcox (*English Poems* 123) and Wood (24-25) point out that the poem is also in dialogue with Augustine's discussion of memory in Book Ten of his *Confessions*.[51] With regard to the Sabbath, the poem claims, "If my soul

make even with the week, / Each seventh note by right is due to thee" (3-4). As the passage from Exodus informs readers' understanding of this line, so this line suggests a certain interpretation of what it means to keep the Sabbath. The poem implies that a seventh of what belongs to the focalizer, rather than a tenth as is traditional, belongs to God, and that this seventh is not limited to material goods. Thus, the next time readers encounter a discussion about keeping the Sabbath or a discussion about properly tithing, the poem could affect their understanding of what is due to God.

"The Sinner" shows its temporal character largely in its use of memory, as Wood explains. Remembrance is repeated often in Scripture, both from the perspective of asking people to remember God's works and the covenant, and adjuring God to remember the covenant and his past mercies. The last line of this poem, "Remember that thou once didst write in stone" (14) is similar to verses like Psalms 25:6-7: "Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies and thy loving kindnesses; for they *have been* ever of old. Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions: according to thy mercy remember thou me for thy goodness' sake, O Lord." The type of remembrance here is the counterpoint to that in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 when Paul quotes Christ in exhorting the church to partake in the bread and wine of the Lord's supper, "in remembrance of me." Neither remembrance—of God remembering man or of man remembering God—is simple intellectual recollection. As I pointed out in Chapter One, Carruthers identifies this type of *sacra memoria* as "a call not to preserve, but to act" (67), and this type of memory is related to the liturgical process of making the past, present.

In contrast to "The Agonie," the focalizer in "The Sinner" does not start out as detached and somewhat impersonal. Instead, the focalizer begins passionately, with direct address followed almost immediately by a first-person pronoun: "Lord, how I am all ague" (1) and ends the first sentence with an exclamation point (2). The previous poem led the reader to identify with the focalizer, to the point of speaking the poem, and this poem continues that close relationship. The poem also repeats the descriptor of a "hard heart" (13) from "The Altar" and compares the heart to a stone once again, though indirectly this time, thus further strengthening the association of the reader with the poem that they have already spoken before, about their heart.

"The Reprisall" ends by coming to confession; "The Agonie" briefly gives context for both kinds of confession, and here, in "The Sinner," the focalizer and reader confess their sins. The readers' expectation of the poem's itinerary is influenced by its form, as the poem is in dialogue with other sonnets. "The Sinner" is neither a Petrarchan nor a Shakespearean sonnet. The rhyme scheme runs ababcdcdeffegg. The pattern of indentations and rhyming seems to suggest that it should be grouped into two quatrains and two tercets: abab—cdcd—eff—egg. The focalizer/reader begins with self-examination, looking internally at "memorie." The most basic criteria that the focalizer acknowledges is that one seventh of the soul is due to the Lord (3-4). However, internally the focalizer finds "vanities" (5) and "shreds of holinesse" (6) that only make up "about the many hundredth part" (11) as opposed to one seventh. The two quatrain, two tercet structure is further supported by the fact that the volta seems to take place in line 12 rather than 9 or 13 as expected. Here Herbert moves from looking inward at his memories to addressing God about what he has found: "Yet, Lord,

restore thine image, heare my call: / And though my hard heart scarce to thee can grone, / Remember that thou once didst write in stone" (12). Without the dialogical character of the poem, the fact that God wrote in stone once would only be an argument that he can do so again if the focalizer's heart is like a stone. With the context provided by the dialogical character of the poem, readers can understand the implications of referring to the law and Covenant and the connection between this last line of the poem and the earlier image of the soul being like a week (3). In the *ductus* of this poem, the reader has been led from wanting to confess in "The Reprisall"; to encountering the effects of sin in the second stanza of "The Agonie"; to, finally, making a confession of unworthiness, repentance, and asking for restoration in "The Sinner."

"Good Friday"

As discussed earlier, the source texts for today's editions of *The Temple* include two manuscripts (W and B) and the earliest printed edition. Though some small differences in details of editions have been discussed in regard to "The Sacrifice," the most important difference between the two manuscripts important to this study is the differences between versions of the poem that in the first printing is entitled "Good Friday." According to Patrick, in W, the first five stanzas are absent and the last three are entitled "The Passion." In B, the last three stanzas are on a new page, but not under a new title, as they are in the printed editions (18). According to Huntley, in W, "Good Friday" is two separate poems, the first five stanzas named "Good Friday," and the last three "The Passion." The latter poem is placed directly after "The Reprisall" (Huntley 67). Helen Wilcox explains that in W, the last three stanzas come before

"Redemption" and the first five stanzas come after, while in B and in the print edition of 1633, they are one poem, both before "Redemption" (*English Poems* 125). Finally, John Wall Jr. proposes that they should be presented in the order given by B and 1633, but that in both cases a title at the top of the last three stanzas (as they are on a new page) has been accidentally omitted (152-53).[52]

The confusion over whether or not "Good Friday" should be considered one or two poems arises in a large part because of the shift in form between the first five and the last three stanzas. In my reading, I treat "Good Friday" as a single poem for four reasons. First, I find Patrick's argument concerning B as a fair copy for the publication of the printed copy of 1633 convincing. Secondly, "Good Friday" is not the only poem with a dual structure. Indeed, the dual structure seems to be part of a pattern for Herbert—"Easter," "Offering," "Christmas," and "The Church-floore" have similar structures (Huntley 71).[53] Thirdly, the itinerary of the poems toward a particular end supports reading this poem as a single whole. Finally, reading the poem as a single unit has been the most common way that readers have encountered this poem in the context of *The Temple* as a whole since the first print publication.

Whitlock investigates how the double form is in dialogue with other works of the time and with number symbolism. According to Whitlock, the two-part structure was common in a particular kind of music:

> It arose in the various dances that made up the baroque suite, and any lutenist, like George Herbert would have been used to it. . . . In this form, a composer sets up a key signature and melody, usually in two parts, which is repeated anywhere from two to four times; then the key is changed, the melody is altered and the second part is repeated an equal number of times. (43)

"Good Friday" is, as I have said, not the only two-part poem in *The Temple*, though it is the one most complicated by differences in manuscripts. Whitlock contends that "Herbert uses this form for those events in the church in which paradox is central to the meaning" (43). According to Whitlock the five stanzas in the first part represent the five wounds of Christ and Herbert draws the readers attention to the importance of counting and numbers in the first stanza so that they notice this numerological connection: "How shall I measure . . . / How shall I count . . ." (2-3). The number (five) of Christ's sorrows is the number of Christ's wounds, which is the number to be written in blood in the focalizer's heart (21-22). According to Whitlock, the three stanzas of the second part relate to the number of the Triune God who "can supply the grace to fill Herbert's heart in place of his sins" (46). The focalizer asks God to "keep possession with thy grace" (30). Whitlock says the presence and filling-up with grace is shown in the way that the shorter lines are filled out in the second part of the poem so that the lines are even (46). The tradition concerning the five wounds of Christ and the importance of the number three demonstrate the way that the poem is in dialogue with the practices and beliefs of the Church. In addition, though Whitlock does not address this, "Good Friday" as one poem has a total of eight stanzas—a number associated with the Resurrection (Dunlop 512). As a single poem with eight stanzas, the form of the poem implies that though it is about Good Friday, it gestures toward Easter.

The poem also, as throughout *The Temple*, is in dialogue with Scripture. Line 7 refers to Christ's birth and the Epiphany or visit from the Magi in Matthew 2. The fruit in stanza three, line 11, evokes the passage about good and evil fruit in Matthew 7:17-20 and Luke 6:43-5 as well as that of the fruit of the

spirit in Galatians 5:22-3. The true vine in the following line (12) evokes John 15:5-6. In line 29, Wilcox connects "No room for me" to the story of there being no room at the inn for Mary and Joseph in Luke 2 (*English Poems* 129), but this seems a bit inappropriate in the context. Instead, the poem arguably provides the alternative to the story of the unclean spirit who leaves and returns in Matthew 12:43-5 and Luke 11:24-6, which Wilcox links to line 31 (*English Poems* 129). Finally, the "blot" in connection to writings (32) evokes Revelation 3:5, "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels."[54] Lawrence Lapidus argues that within the poem, the focalizer "ransacks his own store of inventions in an effort to quantify sorrow, but produces instead words out of Scripture, God's words, which point not to the witty poet, but to Christ" (171). As for each of the poems we have examined thus far, this is not an exhaustive discussion of scriptural allusions, but a demonstration of the dialogue between the poem and Scripture. Again, reading the poem can have impact on readers' future encounters with scriptural texts. For instance, upon hearing again the story of the unclean in spirit in Matthew 12, the reader may consider Herbert's interpretation of what should fill the space to prevent the spirit's return: Christ's whips, nails, wounds, and woes (26).

The temporal character is again visible in the liturgical time and the importance of remembrance within the poem. According to Elsky, the internal focus within "Good Friday" reflects a Protestant version of making Christ's sacrifice present ("History" 73). The focalizer throughout the poem is aware of the passing of time. He or she mentions birth and death (7-8), Autumn (10), and "each houre" (13). In addition, this poem, just like "The Agonie," demonstrates

the limits of "measuring" and "counting" in understanding Christ's Passion, subtly warning against the tendency to spatialize our conceptions of grief or sin.

The focalizer and reader in this poem continue, mostly conflated, from the previous poem, "The Sinner." The first line is directly addressed to God—"Oh my chief good" (1)—with an embedded first-person pronoun. The combination establishes the focalizer as the same as in "The Sinner." In addition, the continual questions of the focalizer to God insistently remind the reader of God's presence despite his silence within this poem. Strier connects these questions to those in "The Thanksgiving," but argues that these are rhetorical while the focalizer in "The Thanksgiving" actually desires an answer (*Love Known* 54). In the second part of the poem, the focalizer moves away from questions and proposes a course of action.

In "Good Friday," the focalizer continues the investigation into sin and confession within the context of still thinking about Christ's passion. The poem follows a similar itinerary to that of the last few poems together, moving from focus on Christ's grief in his Passion to focusing internally on individual sin. In addition, the poem reflects "The Agonie" in its movement away from measurement and counting and toward questions of quality rather than quantity. "Good Friday" begins, as Vendler identifies, by looking for what she calls "sparkling notions" and "lovely metaphors" (*Poetry* 148). The focalizer begins by "*questioning* his ability to tell Chris's story: stanzas one through five make it clear that suffering is not subject to human measurement, and that, because it is not, Christ's story cannot adequately be told by the poem's human speaker" (Harman, *Costly Monuments* 56). The focalizer asks about counting Christ's grief (4), woes (5), and foes (6). The focalizer then tries to ask whether stars (7-8),

leaves (9-10), fruit (11) or even hours (13-4) can help him comprehend the grief of Christ. In lines 15-6, the focalizer compares Christ's distress to the focalizer's sun. The focalizer then realizes that rather than trying to imitate Christ's grief, he or she can experience the sorrows that are the results of his or her own sin (17-20).

At the end of this first part, the focalizer "abandons the external measurements and turns to a new idiom to 'tell' Christ's suffering" (Elsky, "History" 74). This "new idiom" is the internalization of Christ's sorrows, so that "Christ's grief is 'told' in the poet, not in external objects. . . . To meditate on Christ is therefore to meditate on oneself. Or more precisely, meditating on Christ results in the making present of Christ in oneself" (74). Malpezzi also notes the inward turn in the second part of the poem— "He wants to internalize the story" ("Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving'" 193)—as does Harman (*Costly Monuments* 57). As Harman points out, the focalizer begins by wanting to "tell" Christ's grief in line 4; however, by the beginning of the second part the focalizer is asking the Lord to do the writing (57). The focalizer in the second part asks the Lord to write on his or her heart in blood (21-24), so that sin will be driven out by Christ's suffering (25-28), and God will fill the focalizer's heart with grace (29-30), which will prevent sin from returning (31-32). As Lapidus explains, the focalizer in "Good Friday" "concludes his deliberations by deciding to write no poem at all but to remember what God has already written, that is to have Christ write in his heart" (173).

Generally speaking, in "Good Friday" the reader is led through a refresher of a few lessons already learned in the poems following the readers' induction into the Church via Christ's suffering and death in "The Sacrifice" in order to bring these lessons together. The manuduction of the reader through the same

lessons in slightly different ways reinforces the poems' temporal character; re-commencement is one of the indicators of the temporal unfolding of the *ductus* of a poem as discussed in Chapter Two. This poem reiterates the futility of trying to completely comprehend Christ's suffering and sacrifice as the focalizer discovered "The Thanksgiving" and "The Reprisall," the limitations of measuring and counting and the impact of sin and its relationship to suffering as the focalizer found in "The Agonie," and the importance of the inward/internal heart in restoration as the focalizer realized in "The Sinner." The *skopos* of "The Sinner" is that of a request of restoration of God's image, and that request is repeated here in the second part of the poem, along with a plan of action. The focalizer asks God—and thereby leads the reader to ask God—to write on his or her heart and to fill him or her with grace, so that sin will stay gone—the next step along the *ductus* toward sanctification and union of the soul with God.

Conclusion

Overall, the first poem in "The Church" manuducts readers through preparation of their hearts for "The Sacrifice." "The Sacrifice" both leads the reader to identify with Christ's suffering and death and impresses upon the reader the ineffability of that grief. "The Thanksgiving," "The Reprisall," "The Agonie," "The Sinner," and "Good Friday" then lead the reader through the process of learning the proper response to and acceptance of Christ's sacrifice. The poems' dialogue with Scripture and liturgical practices especially ensure that these poems are entwined in the experiences and life of readers who are part of the Scripture-reading, liturgy-practicing Church. The poems' temporal characters resist spatialization, underscore the temporally unfolding character of the

reading experience, and demonstrate a liturgical view of time. The poems' communicative tendencies provide the connection between the focalizer and the reader that draws the reader to participate in the poems' itineraries rather than just observe them. Finally, the itinerant characteristics of the poems reveal the larger itinerary of *The Temple* as a whole: the movement from salvation to sanctification.

Eventually the *ductus* of "The Church" will lead to the last poem in the collection, "Love (III)," Herbert's most celebrated lyric. Just as the focalizer has difficulty properly responding to Christ's passion, so the focalizer in "Love (III)" (as Schoenfeldt points out) realizes the "immense difficulty of responding properly to God's overwhelming beneficence" (117). The poem is ultimately about the union of the soul with God. As Helen Vendler notes, the poem brings the Soul and Love closer and closer together: "The distance between God and the soul . . . here shrinks, during the actual process of the poem, to nothing" (*Poetry* 274). The focalizer moves from "drawing back," (1), to Love drawing nearer (5), to Love taking the focalizer's hand (11), and then leading the focalizer to sit down (17), and finally to the focalizer actually tasting Love's meat (18). The last lines, "You must sit down, sayes Love, and taste my meat: / So I did sit and eat" (17-18) are supremely Eucharistic, echoing both the "taste" (16) from "The Agonie" and the invitation to "taste / the churches mysticall repast" (3-4) in "Superliminare" in "The Church-porch." They are also eschatological as the focalizer sits down at the Wedding Banquet of the Lamb. Finally, the lines celebrate the ultimate union of the soul with God, as the focalizer literally eats Love's meat.

Davidson argues that Love (III) is "both Eucharistic and eschatological in that it reflects both the earthly banquet of communion and the banquet to be served by the King of Heaven to those who enter into bliss at the last day of history following the Second Coming of Christ" (859). In addition, the poem is followed by a reference to Luke 2 "*Glory be to* God *on high, and on earth / peace, good will towards men*." Davidson notes this is part of the Eucharistic rite in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer (859-60), further emphasizing its Eucharistic character.

In the same way that many critics focus on "The Altar" as an introductory poem, many critics have seen this poem as a conclusion. Fish writes:

> This poem [Love III] concludes "The Church" but it also returns us to its beginning, to "The Altar" where a broken heart finds the offering of a broken body, to "The Sacrifice" and the act in relation to which the heart must prepare itself, to "The Thanksgiving" where the communicant find that preparing himself is a task more difficult than he had imagined, and finally to "The Reprisall" where the difficulty is overcome by admitting that *he* cannot overcome it. (*Living Temple* 119-20)

Though Fish stops his re-telling at "The Reprisall," and his reading highlights different aspects of the poems, the basic principle applies and continues throughout "The Church" as a whole. Quite a few of the lessons are repeated, just as individuals may need to be reminded of important truths more than once in their life time.

What makes reading *The Temple* assuming a grammar of participation desirable is something more than the new insights into particular lines of text or even new connections between poems, although those certainly exist. Looking particularly at the way a poem is dialogical, temporal, communicative, and itinerant provides focus and does allow new perceptions to emerge. What makes

reading *The* Temple relying on a grammar of participation most desirable, however, is the way that assuming the text is manuducting the reader along a particular *ductus* and toward a particular *skopos* allows us to pull together many disparate and accurate observations into a cohesive whole. "The Altar" sets up both the prayer for the reader/focalizer to obtain Christ's sacrifice and for Christ to sanctify the reader/focalizer's heart in turn. *The Temple* does not merely describe the path from salvation to sanctification, but models the path in ways that gently lead the reader to participate. The soul is manuducted through this process of sanctification (or at least provided with the opportunity to be led to sanctification) through the texts of the lyric poems in order to end at the ultimate *telos*—the union of the soul with God. Through the particular Good Friday poems we have considered here, readers are led to internalize the salvific knowledge of Christ's sacrifice and to begin moving along the *ductus* of sanctification that continues through the remaining poems.

CHAPTER FOUR

Acceptance of Suffering and Death: Robert Herrick's Passion Poems in *His Noble Numbers*

Like George Herbert's *The Temple*, Robert Herrick's *Hesperides: Or, The Works both Humane and Divine of Robert Herrick, Esq.* is a collection of poetry selected and organized by the author. As Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly point out, Herrick's *Hesperides* is the first time "Works" was applied to a collection containing only English poetry (*Complete Poetry* 1:lxxiv). As such, it is fitting that it seems to be a comprehensive collection of Herrick's works—only one poem that we know of was written after the publication of *Hesperides* and therefore not included, despite the fact that Herrick lived twenty-six years past the year of *Hesperides'* publication (1:lxi).

Robert Herrick is not nearly as well known as either George Herbert or John Donne, the two other major subjects of this study, though his reputation is greater now than it was in his lifetime. According to Cain and Connolly, no recent and reliable biography exists for him (1:vii), but they have somewhat rectified this problem in their 2013 two-volume edition of *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick* by including a substantive biography in the introductory material. Early biographical accounts were complicated both by his lack of fame during his lifetime, and by early biographers such as Anthony á Wood confusing Herrick with a cousin of the same name who attended Oxford rather than Cambridge (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:lxivi). Even Cain and Connolly's biography has a few weaknesses, however. As James Mardock and Eric

Rasmussen note, Cain and Connolly are sometimes guilty of contradictory reasoning (191-92). As an example, Cain and Connolly rightly point out that Herrick's poems are unreliable as autobiographical accounts; for instance, he wrote a poem about the death of his maid when she was very much alive (*Complete Poetry* 1:xv). However, despite this repeated caveat, Cain and Connolly still use the poems' content to make judgments about Herrick's emotional states and relationships. While the historical claims are detailed, well researched, and persuasive, Cain and Connolly's claims concerning Herrick's personality seem to have a less firm foundation.[55]

We do now know quite a bit about Herrick's life from public records and from copies of many of his letters to his uncle from Cambridge, quite apart form questions regarding his semi-autobiographical poetry. Herrick was born to a merchant family in 1591 and baptized on August 24, St. Bartholomew's day (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:xviii). When he was fifteen months old his father (almost positively) committed suicide by throwing himself out a window. Despite the suicide laws which would have caused everything in the estate to revert to the crown, his family fought in the court and was able to keep the inheritance. His mother kept two of their six children with her and Herrick and three siblings went to live with uncles (1:xviii-xxi). His upbringing was most likely moderately Puritan and Calvinist (1:xxii-xxiii). After giving up on his goldsmithing apprenticeship, Herrick attended Cambridge. Cain and Connolly argue that Herrick very likely met George Herbert at some point as they lived in neighboring colleges from 1613-16 and both remained in Cambridge until the 1620s (1:xliii). In the 1620s, Herrick was involved in literary circles in London which brought him in contact with Ben Jonson and the other "sons of Ben."[56] In

July of 1627, he was a chaplain on Duke Buckingham's campaign to support the Huguenots at La Rochelle, a gruesome failure: "Nearly 5,000 Englishmen and Irishmen had died in battle or from disease in four months" (1:xli).

After the campaign, perhaps as a reward, Charles I presented Herrick with Dean Prior as a living on 30 September 1629, when the previous priest was promoted (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:xli). He was instituted on 26 October 1629 (1:xlii), but did not move to Dean Prior until after the previous resident left in November 1630 or later (1:xliii). Though Dean Prior was a moderate parish, it paid enough, along with Herrick's remaining inheritance from his father, to "represent comfortable security" (1:xlv). During the time he lived in Dean Prior before the Interregnum, he travelled back to London frequently, but there is enough evidence of his presence in Dean Prior that he should not be considered one of the absentee ministers the Puritans ranted against. There is suspicion, however, that he may have fathered a child born in 1640 during one of his stays in London. The suspicion comes from a report that "Thomsen Parsons hath had a Bastard lately" near a notice that Herrick was lodging in the house that she lived in; the proximity of the notices possibly implies that he had something to do with the child (1:li).

In 1642, Herrick signed the Protestation, along with all the male members of his parish, which stated that he would uphold the doctrine and power of the Church of England and Parliament (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:liii). As a royalist, then—even if not such an uncomplicated one as is sometimes implied considering some of his poems and appeals for patronage (1:li, lviii-lix)—Herrick was eventually driven out of Dean Prior by the New Model Army (1:lv). Herrick is thought to have lived largely off of the generosity of his friends and relatives

during this time (1:lv-lvii). It was while he was in London that he started working on publishing his poetry. As Cain and Connolly argue convincingly, more of his poetry than is usually assumed had been circulating among literary circles before this. Cain and Connolly posit that he began working on compiling *Hesperides* in the summer of 1646, and worked on it right up until the last minute in 1648 (1:lviii-lix). He was 57 when his poems were finally published.

After the Restoration, Herrick returned to Dean Prior as soon as the "Act for Settling Ministers" had passed (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:lxi-lxii). There are few details about the last fourteen years of his life. However, some—admittedly unreliable—details are revealing. An 1810 review of a reprint of Herrick's poetry, published soon after interest in Herrick began to grow, includes an account of the author's trip to Dean Prior in order to search out further biographical material. The author—Barron Field (Press 103)—says that some of the residents of Dean Prior could quote some of Herrick's poems, and knew him as a former priest, poet, wit, and "a hater of the county" (Rev. of *Select Poems* 171). One woman in particular, named Dorothy King "repeated to us, with great exactness, five of his 'Noble Numbers'" (172). At ninety-nine years old, Dorothy was the daughter of a woman who worked for Herrick's successor in the parish (172). She referred to the poems as her prayers, did not know that the poems had been printed, and—according to the author—"could not have read them if she had seen them" (172), thus lending credence to them being passed on orally. This suggests that Herrick used his poetry in teaching those in his parish. As Rollin claims,

> The congregation in his small country church might well have been a fair representation of the audience for his poetry in the seventeenth century. . . . The main body of his verse . . . would have

> been readable on some level by almost any literate individual of average intelligence. Some of his prayers, for example, are simplicity itself. (*Robert Herrick* 129)

Dorothy King's particular knowledge and use of the poems certainly supports Rollin's characterization of Herrick's verse. Dorothy King's knowledge of Herrick, as passed down from her mother, from Herrick's successor (indirect knowledge, it is true) included such bizarre details as his "pet-pig, which he taught to drink out of a tankard" and the fact that "he one day threw his sermon at the congregation, with a curse for their inattention" (Rev. of *Select Poems* 172). Herrick eventually died in Dean Prior, and was buried on 15 October 1674, at 83 years of age. It is unknown where he was buried (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:lxii-lxiii).

Details regarding Herrick's biography are important to note for two reasons. First, as Herrick is less well-known and his biographical accounts less plentiful than for Herbert or Donne, such details are more likely to be unknown by readers of this project. Secondly, having a general picture of Herrick's life will hopefully allow readers to place his poems in their political and personal context, while maintaining the distinction between Herrick and the focalizers or personas in the poems.

Reading Herrick's poetry while relying on a grammar of participation is particularly important for this argument as, despite the few similarities and overlaps with George Herbert noted so far, Herrick is not primarily considered a devotional or meditative poet as Herbert and Donne are. This perception is not only due to Herrick's choice of subject matter, but to the styles and forms of his poetry as well as his connection to Ben Jonson. By reading Herrick's Good Friday poems while relying on a grammar of participation, therefore, I demonstrate that

the benefits of reading certain seventeenth-century texts in this mode are not limited to texts usually falling into the categories of metaphysical poetry or meditative poetry. In particular, I contend that reading Herrick's Good Friday poems leads readers to deeper affective engagement with the story of Christ's suffering and death and to the focalizer's, and therefore readers', acceptance of suffering and death for the sake of Christ.

The Text

*Hesperides: Or, The Work*s *both Humane and Divine of Robert Herrick, Esq.* is composed of two parts—the non-religious (humane) and religious (divine) poetry—and contains 1,402 poems, many of which are two line couplets. Cain and Connolly argue that placing "*Hesperides*" before the entire alternate title means that it was intended to cover the work as a whole, but most critics use it to apply exclusively to the "humane" poetry (*Complete Poetry* 1:lxxii). The fact that the title originally was intended to refer to both parts is supported by the first poem in *Hesperides*, "The Argument of His Book" (1).[57] After describing the many topics of poetry covered in *Hesperides*, the focalizer concludes by declaring, "I write of *Hell*; I sing (and ever shall) / of *Heaven*, and hope to have it after all" (13-14). Thus, the second, religious, part of the collection is included within the *Hesperides* as a whole.

The inclusion of the religious poetry within the whole of *Hesperides* is especially important to point out, as this section of the collection has its own title page, actually dated a year earlier, 1647 (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:408-14). Despite this, the section was never published separately from *Hesperides*. The section is fully entitled *His Noble Numbers: Or, His Pious Pieces,*

Wherein (Amongst Other Things) He Sings the Birth of his Christ: and Sighes for His Saviours *Suffering on the* Crosse. This is not to say that many of the poems in the first part of the book are not in some way religious. The last two lines of "The Argument of His Book," for instance, introduce beliefs about Heaven and Hell in the very first poem in the collection. Not only that, but as Roger Rollin points out, these lines also mark the first time that "a distinctively personal note is sounded" (*Robert Herrick* 7-8). In many of Herrick's poems the personal note is absent, so it is significant that it appears here in conjunction with faith.

Herrick's Good Friday poems are the final ten poems of *His Noble Numbers*: "Good Friday: *Rex Tragicus*, or Christ going to His Crosse" (1393), "His words to Christ, going to the Crosse" (1394), "Another, to his Saviour" (1395), "His Saviours words, going to the Crosse" (1396), "His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse" (1397), an untitled poem in the shape of a Cross hereafter called the cross pattern poem (1398), "To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion" (1399), "His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher" (1400), "His coming to the Sepulcher" (1401), and the untitled final couplet (1402). In reading these poems while relying on a grammar of participation, readers are led from a previous stance of mostly intellectual acknowledgement of Christ to a more affectively engaged understanding of Christ's suffering. In effect, I argue that in reading these poems while relying on a grammar of participation, readers are led to the spiritual place where Herbert begins "The Church." That is, readers are led from a cognitive knowledge of God, Christ, Scripture, and Christian beliefs to Salvation via the acceptance of and affective comprehension of Christ's suffering.

A Review of Literary Criticism

Despite the fact that *Hesperides* was not published until 1648, Cain and Connolly present evidence that he was known as a poet (he was mentioned by name by other poets) and his poems were circulating in manuscript form in the 1620s (*Complete Poetry* 1:xl). There is not much evidence concerning the immediate reception of his book of poems; printed as they were at a politically unstable time with sentiments that seemed to support the losing side of the war, this is not particularly surprising. The original run was of 1500 copies, so the printers must have expected some level of success (1:lx). Herrick was mostly ignored until the 1790s, and since then he has become steadily more popular despite almost all reviewers exhibiting mixed judgments about the quality of his poetry (1:lxiv-lxix).[58] In the last decade of the twentieth century and the beginning of twenty-first century, Herrick has become frequently anthologized and somewhat more familiar, though most criticism concentrates on the "humane" poems rather than the "divine" poems.

In making a distinction between Herrick's humane and divine poems, I do not mean to imply that there is an absence of religion in the first part of *Hesperides*. In fact, as I noted, religion appears within the very first poem in the book. In addition, there are quite a few religious aspects to other poems within the humane portion of *Hesperides*. For instance, "The Christian Militant" (323) and "The Fairie Temple" (223) both draw on the religious controversies of the Civil War (115). William Oram, coming from a slightly different perspective, argues that, "When Herrick incorporates sacred materials into [the non-religious part of] his work he changes them radically" (211). Oram goes on to argue concerning *His Noble Numbers* that "few of its poems contain the public rituals so

noticeable in the rest of *Hesperides*" (213). Rollin argues that in other ways as well, "readers who return to Herrick's complete works for the second time may well perceive foreshadowings of *His Noble Numbers* throughout . . . his secular poems" especially in poems like "Mattens, or Morning Prayer"(320) and "Evensong" (321) (*Robert Herrick* 122). Finally, Achsah Guibbory, in "*Hesperides,* the Hebrew Bible, and Herrick's Christian Identity" draws further attention to the religious language and imagery within *Hesperides*, arguing against a complete pagan interpretation of the poems.

In addition to the presence of religious themes within the first part of *Hesperides*, the connection between the two parts of the work is strengthened by the fact that in some key ways, *His Noble Numbers* parallels the construction of the "humane" section of *Hesperides*. For instance, the nine introductory poems in *His Noble Numbers* echo the eight introductory poems at the beginning of *Hesperides* (Rollin, *Robert Herrick* 113). Rollin also identifies the unexpected complexity, use of wit, and the ending couplets as similarities between the two parts of the texts ("Witty" 145). Finally, like the humane part of *Hesperides*, *His Noble Numbers* contains many two-line couplets, or epigrams, which are often ignored and rarely anthologized. However, their presence in *His Noble Numbers* serves to establish a more didactic tone in *His Noble Numbers* as a whole (Rollin, *Robert Herrick* 132), emphasizing the pedagogical character of his "divine" poetry. These parallels both highlight the similarities and connections between the two parts of the book, and establish the sections as two distinct texts.

Critics writing about *His Noble Numbers* often focus on two issues which happen to echo the critical concerns of Herbert scholars: what the poems reveal concerning Herrick's theology and the *dispositio* or arrangement of the poems.

First, Herrick's particular theological beliefs are quite ambiguous. Neither Herrick's re-appropriation of Scripture and Christian rituals in romantic and erotic poetry, nor his inclusion of more straightforward religious poetry is unique to Herrick. Such a combination is also present in the works of John Donne, Henry Vaughan, and other seventeenth-century poets. Some critics, however, doubt the sincerity of Herrick's Christian faith based on the numerous romantic and erotic poems in ways that they do not usually doubt other seventeenth-century poets who wrote both secular and religious poetry. As Rollin points out, however, "to doubt the sincerity of a priest who was expelled from the vicarage he occupied for 17 years because his principles prevented him from submitting to the Puritan regime, and who served in that same vicarage for 14 years after the Restoration, is to put the burden of proof on the doubter" (*Robert Herrick* 115). Despite Rollin's argument, however, the dialogue with Scripture or Church practice in the supposedly secular section of *Hesperides* reflects more the pervasive character of the Church of England, arguments concerning it, and reactions to it in the seventeenth century, than it does about the particular piety of Robert Herrick.

Rollin provides more support for Herrick's theological sincerity when he claims that despite "the apparent eclecticism and randomness of *Hesperides*," *His Noble Numbers* shows "the poet's determination to create a more traditional body of devotional verse" (*Robert Herrick* 129). Rollin continues, arguing that Herrick's "persona—in contrast to the array of lovers, wits, lyrists, philosophers, courtiers, patriots, social critics, etc., on display in *Hesperides*—seems very much to be that of the vicar of Dean Prior (although, somewhat surprisingly, he never explicitly identifies himself as a priest in *Noble Numbers*)" (129). The lack of self-

identification of Herrick as a Priest may also be related to the oddly "deinstitutionalized quality" of *His Noble Numbers* (134). Unlike other religious poets of the day, the church's rituals and practices—though present in the other part of *Hesperides*—are mostly absent from *His Noble Numbers*: "Even the clergy and ecclesiastical hierarchy are conspicuous by their absence, as is any continuing emphasis on the Bible" (134). On the other hand, David Landrum argues that *His Noble Numbers* specifically addresses the concerns of the parishioners in the Church of England regarding the character of God at the time of publication.

This "deinstitutionalized quality" also contributes to ambiguity about Herrick's theology. Of the 271 poems in *His Noble Numbers*, only 37 are about Christ to some extent: 8 about the Nativity, 16 about the Passion, and 13 more abstract (Rollin, *Robert Herrick* 141). Rollin also observes that *His Noble Numbers* as a whole "is grounded in a Christian's unequal struggle with a God who seems as angry as he is loving, a collection that progresses in fits and starts from a mood approximating religious melancholy to one of calm acceptance of a Heavenly Father and of feeling accepted by him" ("Witty" 144). In order to reconcile these different views of God, Rollin in his entry on Herrick for the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* ("Robert Herrick" 179-80) and in his article on "Robert Herrick's Fathers" (55-58) suggests that there is a certain progression in the collection. Rollin argues that "In the first third of *His Noble Numbers,* God tends to be a remote figure who is both threatening and benign" ("Robert Herrick" 179). This changes in the second section: "The Son of God figures more prominently in the middle section than in the first, and the effect is to soften the image of the Almighty as a punishing father" ("Robert Herrick" 179). Finally, *His*

Noble Numbers concludes with yet another depiction of God: "The final third of *His Noble Numbers*, like the rest of the collection is made up mainly of sacred epigrams. . . . But what most marks this final group of religious poems is its emphasis upon a more human and humane deity" ("Robert Herrick" 180). According to Rollin, then, the various depictions of God's character in *His Noble Numbers* reflect a progression of the focalizer's view of God rather than ambiguous theology.

The disparate characters of the persona in *His Noble Numbers* and the historical Herrick—that is, the unreliability of Herrick's poems for theology just as for autobiography—can also be seen throughout *His Noble Numbers*. Graham Parry provides one possible explanation: "When one tries to locate the doctrinal position of a seventeenth-century poet, the situation is often confused by the habit of using poetry to explore the uncertainties of belief in the mind and heart of the writer" (276-77). Despite the celebration of ritual, royalist sentiments, and what others have interpreted as Laudian practices in Herrick's poetry, Parry points out that within the Church in Dean Prior,

> There are no surviving signs of any alterations that were characteristic of High Church ministers. Such men usually raised money, or used their own means, to install new fittings to make the church more decent, or to emphasize the various degrees of sacred space within the building. (281)

This lack throws doubt on the depiction of Herrick as exclusively Laudian in theology and practice. John Creaser further notes that the Bishop who was Herrick's addressee in *Hesperides* was not Archbishop William Laud, but Bishop John Williams, Laud's leading antagonist (325). In addition, Herrick's own Bishop, Joseph Hall, was also Laud's opponent (325).

All of this may seem a little odd for a poet who some have seen almost exclusively in "ceremonial" terms,[59] though it does not completely negate arguments which depict Herrick as a high church royalist. Herrick was, indeed, pushed out of Dean Parish for being a royalist and returned in the Restoration. In addition, Herrick claims to "sing the birth of Christ" on the title page of *His Noble Numbers*, when nativity festivals had been banned, which would seem to indicate a pre-civil war high church allegiance (283). Janie McCauley convincingly argues for a more complex view of the political and ecumenical loyalties at work during the time directly preceding the civil war: "Herrick need not have been Puritan, anti-royalist, or anti-archaist to take Williams' part against Laud, nor does his high praise for Laud's enemy conflict with his love of ceremony and country sports" (89). Herrick's poetry does not provide us with enough evidence to determine precisely his theological beliefs. However, by reading Herrick's Good Friday poems relying on a grammar of participation, readers can be manuducted through at least some specific beliefs regarding Christ's Passion.

Besides Herrick's theology, the other area of concern for Herrick scholars is the *dispositio* or arrangement of the poems in his collection. Evidence suggests that Herrick organized his poems for the press to some extent, but to what extent is uncertain (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 1:416). Cain and Connolly note offhandedly at one point: "As is often the case in *Hesperides,* this poem is followed by one that is related" in topic but very different in tone (*Complete Poetry* 1:xlix). Overall, Cain and Connolly suggest that the order of verse deliberately reflects that of the manuscript culture of the time. Cain and Connolly contend that "in the peak decades of his poetry's circulation (*c.*1620-*c.*1650),

Herrick was a reasonably but not excessively widely copied poet in manuscript circulation" (*Complete Poetry* 2:3). They go on to argue,

> Where it [Herbert's circulation in manuscript] did exert a formative influence is in its shaping of Herrick's style. Manuscript collections of poetry made by Herrick's peers consistently demonstrate a preference for the brief, witty, allusive piece that could be endlessly recycled and 'reset' in new collections. (*Complete Poetry* 2:19)

In another article, Cain and Connolly explain,

> The manuscript poetic miscellanies and songbooks of this period are collections ranging from casual compilations of verse accumulated over several years and entered by a single or several hands, to more careful productions constructed from a series of smaller collections borrowed from others. ("Herrick's Communities" 9)

Cain and Connolly see this as similar to the haphazard order of most of Herrick's *Hesperides*: "Its construction speaks in multiple ways to the ethos of sociable and literary exchange with which the practice of collecting verse is imbued, as well as the play of contradictory pleasure offered by a typical representative of the genre" (12). Though few manuscripts survive, they present evidence that Herrick's poems did indeed travel through these social circles.

Another influence besides that of manuscript culture on the *dispositio* of *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers* from the literary circles of his time is that of Herrick's concern with "wit." Rollin identifies Herrick as

> the first poet—and still the only important poet—to gather practically all of his verses into one elaborately designed volume and see it through the presses. From the beginning of that volume Herrick makes it plain that he expects his audience to read his entire book, to read it in the order in which it is printed, and, above all, to read it with understanding and appreciation. ("Robert Herrick" 173-74)

Rollin argues that the humane part of *Hesperides* demonstrates the seventeenth-century view of wit in its interlocking structures ("Witty" 141-43). He argues that

"wit" "is in a sense cumulative, becoming apparent only after sequential reading" (144). Rollin points that Herrick sees himself as having wit (135-37) and goes on to demonstrate the presence of wit as an organizing influence in the design of *His Noble Numbers* as well.

A few alternate suggestions to the practices of manuscript culture or the display of wit concerning the order of the poems suggest that the poems are intentionally disordered. One critic argues that "Herrick loves to juxtapose poems that jar incongruously in tone" (Maus 29). Katharine Maus argues that Herrick intentionally prevents a narrative sequence between poems from forming, not only between poems but within poems (31). Instead of a narrative or dramatic plot, Maus proposes that the collection is brought together by reiteration of the same themes and poetic forms (32), which she connects to Herrick's concern with rituals and the cycles of the seasons (33). Creaser also argues against the existence of some kind of sequential order or unnecessary depth and significance sometimes granted to Herrick's poems, arguing instead for a lighthearted play that he sees as its own end. These views of purposeful disjointedness seem to echo Herrick's sentiments concerning art in one of Herrick's best and most anthologized poems, "Delight in Disorder" (83), in which "a sweet disorder" (1) is more interesting and appealing "then when Art / Is too precise in every part" (13-14).

In addition to these systems of organization which account for the relationships between sequences of poems, a few critics have proposed overall itineraries which start at the beginning of *Hesperides* and culminate at the end of *His Noble Numbers.* These itineraries are possible because the poems at the beginning of *His Noble Numbers* work as a bridge to connect the two parts of the

work. In addition to a change in subject matter, *His Noble Numbers* also demonstrates a change in tone and other aspects of the poems. *His Noble Numbers* begins with "His Confession" (1131) which contains an apology for writing the poems preceding it. As Rollin notes, modern readers conclude that either 1) he is a bit of a hypocrite in apologizing for the poems he has just celebrated, 2) the poem is merely following convention, or 3) the poem is there to provide a transition between parts (*Robert Herrick* 144). Rollin does not immediately provide an alternative, although he seems to suggest that he disagrees with these readings. However, I contend that these alternatives see all the poems as "happening at once." That is, while readers understand Herrick's poems to have been written at different times and for different situations, they do not see the sequence of poems as unfolding in a temporally-reliant reading experience. *His Noble Numbers* clearly come after the poems the focalizer is apologizing for in the arrangement of the text. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to understand these poems of confession and apology as taking place after the earlier poems as the text temporally unfolds in the reading experience. In this reading, the focalizer—as distinct from the poet—can be viewed as once being proud of his poetry but is now, at the point of the first two poems in *His Noble Numbers*—"His Confession" (1131) and "His Prayer for Absolution" (1132)—sincere in his regret.

Two critics' suggestions of arrangement culminating in the Good Friday poems stand out. First, L. E. Semler argues that *His Noble Numbers*

> a directed art-work guided by a constant aesthetic towards an achieved goal. . . . As Herrick reaches his goal in *Noble Numbers* he has found his graceful God, achieved the pastoral goal of his vocation, and enacted the apotheosis of his art as pretyped in *Hesperides*. (55-56)

Semler argues that this goal is "artifice" or "artistic excellence," which is "enacted in the most incidental of poems right through to its ultimate achievement in Herrick's concluding Passion drama" (43). Secondly, and perhaps most persuasively is the suggested arrangement in Anthony Low's 1978 book, *Love's Architecture*. Low argues that we need to approach *His Noble Numbers* through the humane part of *Hesperides* (208). He characterizes the humane poems as celebrating sensual pleasure and articulating a feeling of revulsion toward ugliness. Overall, he identifies *Hesperides* as particularly Epicurean in character. Low contrasts Epicurean philosophy's acceptance in England with that of Stoicism or Platonism (which were more widely accepted), and argues that the poems in *Hesperides* glorify Epicurean versions of pleasure (209-12). Low argues that the religious poetry then reshapes that emphasis into "the pursuit of pleasure, guided by God, to its uttermost limits—into Heaven itself and 'Life Eternal'" (212). Low claims that in *His Noble Numbers*, the focus on pleasure is seen in the poems' preoccupation with pain and suffering, or in the depiction of pain in life or pleasure after death (212-13). He argues that this leads to a kind of "Christian Epicureanism," with stress not on balance or moderation (as with Stoicism or Platonism), but on intensification and of attention to "higher pleasures" rather than lower, where the higher pleasures are religious pleasures (216). Low concludes his argument with a series of observations about the Passion poems. He contends that Herrick's desire to avoid pain and suffering makes the short poems following "Rex Tragicus" more meaningful, as they embrace suffering for Christ's sake (230), and end with a poem in which "Herrick reveals that if put to the choice, he prefers the Person to the place" (232) and is willing to remain in Hell if Christ is there.

No matter the arrangement or scheme proposed, readers of Herrick can only paint the progression with broad strokes, unlike the tight progression visible in Herbert's *The Temple*. In addition, no matter the overall arrangement proposed by various critics, the loose arrangement of the poems suddenly coalesces and resolves into a tight sequential focus in the last ten poems of the collection. The importance of these last ten poems within Herrick's poetry is accentuated by: 1) the previously noted way that Herrick uses *His Noble Numbers* to demonstrate or display his facility with producing a traditional body of devotional poetry (Rollin, *Robert Herrick* 129), 2) the way that multiple critics read these poems as the *telos* of *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers*, and 3) the way that these poems coalesce into a tightly connected sequence in a manner that has previously been absent. I contend that to advocate reading Herrick's poems, and these Good Friday poems specifically, while relying on a grammar of participation is not merely to advocate for another arrangement of Herrick's poems for three reasons. First, I am not claiming that all of *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers* should be reading assuming a grammar of participation in the same way as Herbert's *The Temple*. Though many of Herrick's poems display characteristics consistent with a grammar of participation—that is, they tend toward being dialogical, temporally oriented, communicative, and itinerant—these characteristics may also be obscured or even absent, especially in the many couplets or epigrams throughout both parts of his work.[60] Even though I contend that Herrick's book tends more toward assuming a grammar of participation than it does toward assuming a grammar of representation, the tendency toward the earlier mentioned "disorder," "repetition," and "juxtaposition" in the arrangement of his poems make sequential explorations of Herrick's itinerary

difficult. This is true despite the fact that the effects of these types of arrangements still rely on sequential and temporal experiences of reading for effectiveness.

Secondly, reading these last ten poems relying on a grammar of participation does not primarily reveal or depend on arrangement. In fact, the sequence of these poems is based largely on narrative events, though that does not guarantee that it is itinerant. I do find Low's arguments for the pattern of arrangement of Herrick's whole text both persuasive and relevant, and much of my own argument concerning Herbert's *The Temple* was based on identifying the itinerary of *The Temple* as a whole and how Herbert's Passion poems fit into that itinerary. However, the tight sequential arrangement of Herrick's last ten poems is unusual in *His Noble Numbers* rather than the norm.

Thirdly, and most importantly, to advocate reading texts while relying on a grammar of participation is not the same thing as to advocate for the presence of a particular pattern of arrangement. The patterns of arrangement identified by scholars of *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers* apply only to these works in a specific way. In arguing that both *Hesperides* and *The Temple* should be read while assuming a grammar of participation, I hope to continue to demonstrate the extent of the assumption of a grammar of participation among texts in the seventeenth century. That is, by demonstrating the value of reading different texts while assuming the same underlying grammar of participation, I hope to persuade readers that reading texts according to their appropriate grammar is crucial to properly reading texts and that the concept should be applied to other texts as well.

Finally, one of the main criticisms of Herrick's work is that it lacks depth compared to other seventeenth-century devotional poets. Parry argues that comparison to Herbert's work "shows up the relative shallowness of Herrick's spirituality" and that his religious verse has "a lack of introspection or intimate response" and does "not seem to possess the affective power that the better-known writers of sacred verse express so memorably" (285). Despite these charges, which may have some truth to them, I contend that the last poems of *His Noble Numbers* are actually much more introspective and affective than they may appear at first reading. The first part of *Hesperides* often reflects classical, Hebraic, or pagan values, focusing on pleasure and beauty. *His Noble Numbers* is brimming with statements about Christian beliefs, poems concerning the character of God, and a few narratives recounting scriptural stories. Though particular doctrinal allegiances remain hidden, reading the text in this mode provides insight into some of the texts views of God, Christ, and Christ's relationship with people. Thus, the insights gained from reading the text in this mode pertain to both major questions investigated by Herrick scholars. In short, in reading Herrick's final poems concerning Good Friday while relying on a grammar of participation, the focalizer manuducts the reader from emotional detachment toward acceptance of suffering and death for the sake of union with Christ.

"Good Friday: Rex Tragicus, or Christ going to His Crosse" (1393)

Herrick's first Good Friday poem, "Good Friday: *Rex Tragicus,* or Christ Going to His Crosse" (1393) is Herrick's most discussed passion poem. Critics often shorten the name to "*Rex Tragicus*," and in doing so, highlight the theatrical

aspect of this poem. The poem presents Christ as an actor playing a tragic king in the scene of Christ's Passion, saying: "The *Crosse* shall be Thy *Stage*" (17), and "Begin, great King! ascend Thy Throne, / And thence proceed, to act Thy Passion" (28-29). This poem, as the rest of Herrick's Passion poems, evinces tendencies of texts assuming a grammar of participation—it is dialogical, temporally oriented, communicative, and itinerant.

First, the poem is dialogical in that it depends on the readers' knowledge of the story of the crucifixion for comprehension. Though "*Rex Tragicus*" refers to specific occurrences in the crucifixion story, these references are not limited to a specific gospel or specific biblical phrases, but instead draw on readers' knowledge of the events. For instance, the poem refers to a "Robe of *Purple*" (1) that Herod's soldiers put on Jesus to mock him. The robe is mentioned in all four gospels, but it is identified as purple only in Mark and John.[61] The poem also talks about Christ ascending "Not as a Thief" (15) in implicit contrast to being crucified between thieves and the "poor Theeves that act their parts" alongside Christ (24)—a detail about the men being crucified with Christ that only appears in Matthew and Mark.[62] On the other hand, the Roman soldier who checks that Jesus is dead by thrusting his spear into Christ's side (9), is only mentioned in John.[63] Herrick treats his readers as if they are familiar with the story as a whole and with the details of the story from multiple sources, rather than relying on a single biblical narrative.

The dialogical character of the poem allows Herrick to use "dramatic irony to intensify the emotional atmosphere: the reader knows what the Roman with the spear will do, for example, although the soldier himself as yet does not" (Rollin, *Robert Herrick* 144-45). The focalizer knows the implications of the soldier

and the spear, and assumes readers also know the future actions of this character, but does not recount the action within the poem. Finally, the poem is also in dialogue with the traditions surrounding the Passion which are not actually recorded in the gospels. For instance, the poem is 39 lines long—a strange length, unless readers are familiar with the fact that traditionally Christ was thought to have received 39 lashes.[64] In this poem specifically, familiarity with the story of Good Friday not only enriches readers' experience of the poem, it is essential for understanding it.

In addition, and perhaps more significantly for this particular poetic sequence, "*Rex Tragicus*" evokes theatrical productions in four ways: 1) in its form and title, 2) in its controlling metaphor, 3) in its echo of medieval miracle plays and Good Friday rituals, and 4) in its implicit address to English Puritan controversies concerning theater and ritual. First, as Rollin points out, the poem is "one of the rare 'Pious Pieces' written in iambic pentameter" (*Robert Herrick* 144). This is a very common verse form for theatrical productions. In addition, in the absence of props or scenery, it was not unusual for seventeenth-century plays to describe an event being played out, as "*Rex Tragicus*" does. The form thus echoes theatrical forms.

Secondly, Marlin Blaine points out that the phrase "*Tragicus Rex*" is among the proverbial expressions that Erasmus identifies in *Adagia*. Blaine claims that there is a very high probability that Herrick encountered *Adagia* at school (30) and that "knowledge of this proverb adds resonance" to "readings of the poem" (30). Seventeenth-century readers may have encountered Erasmus's *Adagia* as well; however, a reader would not have to be specifically familiar with

Erasmus' account of the adage in order for the familiarity with it to affect their understanding of "*Rex Tragicus*." In *Adagia,* Erasmus says the phrase *Tragicus Rex*

> can be applied either to a proud and pompous man, or to one who is a king in name alone but has little power, as the French proverb uses "a paper king" of a rule who is a king in name rather than in wealth or power. . . . For in a tragedy on the stage a king's power lasts only till the play is finished. The mask is then laid aside, and the man who just now was Agamemnon or even Jupiter goes home, dear at threepence. (Erasmus 276; *Adagia* II v 79)

Blaine argues that in addition to the obvious connection between the title and Herrick's metaphorical conceit of Christ as an actor on a stage, the title of the poem draws further attention to the people who mock Jesus by believing

> that their victim is not the king of the Jews in any real sense, [and who] seek to exploit a disparity between his grandiose title and his actual powerlessness. . . . Jesus Christ, whose kingdom is not of their world, appears to his tormenters as, in Erasmus's words, one who is "king in name rather than in wealth or power. (Blaine 31)

Blaine illuminates the multiple levels of ironies that invoking such a phrase implies. On one level, the mockers do not understand the true character of Christ's power: "Christ did not demonstrate his power on the cross in the way his tormentors expected an earthly king would do, but, for believers, he exhibited a greater power than any earthly king ever could by suffering and defeating death" (33). On another level, in the incarnation, Christ's displayed power is not commensurate with his actual power. On a third level, any actor playing Christ in a miracle play is actually a king in name only. By understanding that dramatization of the Passion and presenting the Passion as a drama are not the same things, the layers of irony become clearer. In addition, the dramatic irony present due to the different understandings of the reader, the focalizer, and the characters in the poem contributes to the poem's affective engagement of the reader.

Thirdly, the poem's theatrical character is further emphasized in the way that certain details reflect Roman Catholic Good Friday productions and medieval miracle plays. Edward Muir describes a typical ritual in his discussion rituals during Holy Week:

> On Good Friday the performance of "laying Christ in the grave" took place, during which an image of the crucified Jesus or a crucifix itself was placed in a sepulcher and guarded until Easter morning. In Venice this performance became a vast public funeral for the savior. Bells were muted, churches were draped with mourning cloths, and citizens wore black. One of the civic confraternities carried a coffin containing the body of Christ in the form of the consecrated host, which was later buried in a tabernacle in the great basilica of St. Mark, and the little symbolic tomb was official sealed by the doge, who was the head of the republic. (71)

These elaborate rituals were enacted with the purpose of moving participants and viewers from a mere intellectual apprehension of the events of Good Friday to emotional and affective involvement. Muir argues that:

> Holy Week rituals attempted to simulate believers to an intense emotional pitch. In many places we read how many actually experienced the blackest grief and the most horrible apprehension from witnessing the symbolic nailing of Christ to a cross, imagining his cries, acknowledging the moment of his death. (72)

The perspective of the focalizer strongly resembles someone watching a ritualized presentation like the one Muir describes. Herrick's poem is not a dramatization of the events of Good Friday in the same way that these rituals or miracle plays were, but the existence of such rituals and traditions legitimizes Herrick's metaphor.[65]

Fourthly, the poem is in dialogue with the historical and political context of controversies about rituals and theater. Thomas Moisan argues that the poem as a whole "would have called to mind [to its seventeenth-century readers] the turmoil and controversies enveloping, not one, but three institutions that claimed

Herrick's allegiance and affection: not just the church, and not just the crown, but the church and the crown and the stage" ("Robert Herrick's" 350). This dialogue with the three major controversial institutions is further reflected in "Christ's three-fold characterization in the poem as God and actor and king" (350). As Moisan points out, the poem was published the year after "An Ordinance for Abolishing of Festivals" was passed on 8 June 1647, which specifically banned the celebration of Easter (364). The ordinance states:

> Forasmuch as the Feasts of the Nativity of Christ, Easter and Whitsuntide, and other Festivals commonly called Holy-Dayes, have been heretofore superstitiously used and observed Be it Ordained, by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, That the said Feast of the Nativity of Christ, Easter and Whitsuntide, and all other Festival dayes, commonly called Holy-dayes, be no longer observed as Festivals or Holy-dayes within this Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales, any Law, Statute, Custome, Constitution, or Cannon to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. (Firth and Rait 954)

The ordinance goes on to assign the second Tuesday of every month as a replacement day off for what workers would normally get off for holidays (954). Though Good Friday is not mentioned by name, Easter is, and Easter is "the event which theologically completes and redeems the business of Good Friday" (Moisan, "Robert Herrick's" 364). Herrick's poem not only observes Good Friday, but "*Rex Tragicus*," by treating the events of Good Friday as a drama, highlights some of the aspects of Good Friday celebrations that lawmakers liked least.

The celebration of Festivals was not the only thing abolished in 1647. Later in the year, on 22 October 1647, Parliament passed "An Ordinance for the Lord Major and City of London, and the Justices of Peace to suppress Stage-playes and Interludes" which declared that actors should be thrown in jail (Firth and Rait

1027). This strengthened the earlier "Order for Stage-playes to cease" in 1642 (26). Early in 1648 (according to the new-style calendar), on February 11, Parliament passed further laws declaring actors to be "rogues" and ordering officials:

> to pull down and demolish, or cause or procure to be pulled down and demolished all Stage-Galleries, Seats, and Boxes, erected or used, or which shall be erected and used for acting, or playing, or seeing acted or plaid, such Stage-Playes, Interludes, and Playes aforesaid, within the said City of London and Liberties thereof, and other places within their respective jurisdictions. (1070)

The law also established fines for spectators and determined that the money thus collected would be given to the churches for the good of the poor (1070-72). Thus, casting Christ as an actor—and the readers as spectators as we shall discuss shortly—was a particularly controversial move for the year it was published and carried a certain amount of shock value.[66] The shock of such a comparison works in the poem to further engage readers' attention and affections. Such a comparison demands a response. Even if the poem were composed long before the date of publication, the decision to include this poem as a text which presents Christ's Passion in a dramatic form and presenting Christ as an actor is clearly a gesture of opposition against the authorities.

The dialogical character of Herrick's Good Friday poems means that understanding "*Rex Tragicus*" requires that readers be familiar with the story of the Passion. Furthermore, readers' experience of reading the poem is enriched by the poem's use of an adage that was well-known enough to be included in Erasmus's collection, its evoking of rituals no longer practiced in England but still thriving on the continent, and its engagement with current controversies over festival days and theater. The dialogical character of "*Rex Tragicus*"

expresses itself in a manner that echoes, in some ways, the dialogical character of Herbert's "The Altar." In addition to adding new dimensions to readers' encounters with the story of Good Friday, the poem has the potential to shape the ways that readers think about certain religious controversies of its time. For instance, upon encountering the idea of a 'paper king' or powerless king elsewhere, readers could think of Christ's apparent powerlessness. Or, where readers encountered the banning of theater and stage plays in London, this poem could encourage them to see theater in a more positive light.

The theatrical connections not only reveal the dialogic tendencies of "*Rex Tragicus*," they also impact the temporal character of the poem. The poem is in the present tense and imperative mood. As a list of commands, it can be understood as orders as to what Christ should do next, in a manner reminiscent of a stage director: "Put off Thy Robe of Purple" (1), "Ascend Thy Throne" (28), and "Act Thy Passion" (29). As such, it can be understood that these actions have not yet happened: "What we happen upon is a moment of stasis, with Christ 'still' in his purple robe of derision and with the action of the passion in a lull, poised before what we take to be the imminent but as yet unstaged play of the crucifixion" (Moisan, "Robert Herrick's" 357). This is not to say that Herrick paints a still picture in his poem. There is no description of the current positions of all the characters. However, the poem takes place in that moment of potentiality before the action occurs. By referring to the main events from the Passion to Christ's burial without stating that any of them have happened yet, the poem turns "the historical event of the crucifixion itself [into] a prologue, . . . to be reprised in the present, in 'our' time, in the play to be enacted in this poem" (358). This timely reprisal of the story is further emphasized by the "theatrical

topoi" which present the Passion as "not only an efficacious historical event, but also an exemplary fiction, . . . an action designed to both liberate us and to ensure that liberation by representing it as a lesson we must continually absorb" (355). In the year after festivals are banned, Herrick's poem implies that enactments or dramatizations contribute toward human understanding of Christ's Passion and therefore salvation.

In using the present tense for the whole event, and therefore placing the focalizer during the time of the Passion, Herrick is continuing a pattern he uses elsewhere. For example, in "A Christmas Caroll" (1226), Rollin observes "the great event is presented in mythic time, as if it has just occurred, collapsing the distant past into the lyrical present" (*Robert Herrick* 142), and this is similar to the sequence of Passion poems, in that the focalizer seeks "to draw readers into mythic time, where . . . they become witnesses to the Passion and thus learn about its implications for themselves through vicarious experience" (*Robert Herrick* 146). As the liturgy and the Eucharist in Herbert's *The Temple* serve to make the past events of the Passion present, so the theatrical and dramatic character of "*Rex Tragicus*" serves a similar purpose. Frances Malpezzi argues, concerning other feast poems of Herrick's, "Through ritual, Herrick and his audience transcend the present and return to sacred time by making the tropological significance of each feast a reality" ("Feast" 38). The dramatic portrayal of ritual, which is only heightened in "*Rex Tragicus*," can deeply affect a reader at least partly because of its temporally centered tendencies: "In dramatically portraying a feast in the Christian calendar, Herrick leads his audience through an active, participatory meditation. The event transcends time as it reoccurs within the poem, through the poem, within the Christian soul" (29).

When the liturgy has changed dramatically and attitudes toward the Eucharist are drastically different, Herrick finds another way to accomplish something similar.

The dramatic character of the poem also contributes to its communicative tendencies. Drama assumes an audience in a more insistent way than other genres. Rollin argues that "*Rex Tragicus*" is "inherently dramatic; it is perceived and presented by the poem's speaker in theatrical terms, . . . and the speaker himself, with whose mental state the reader is to identify, is both actor and audience, an unwilling party to and observer of the tragic action" (*Robert Herrick* 144). In a similar manner to the positioning of the reader in many of Herbert's poems, the reader here is led to identify with the focalizer. First, the insistent use of "thine," "thy," and "thee" establish direct address and the presence of an addressee. The poem is clearly directed at someone other than the speaker, rather than merely presenting self-addressed speech. Secondly, despite the imperative mood in lyric poetry often serving to position the reader as the addressee (for example, John Donne's "Song," beginning "Go and catch a falling star"), the commands here are clearly directed at Christ, in a manner that excludes the reader. In the absence of the first person at the beginning of the poem, the reader could be an indirect listener to the focalizer's commands to Christ. However, this changes in the last four lines when the focalizer uses first-person-plural pronouns:

> And we (Thy Lovers) while we see Thee keep
> The Lawes of Action, will both sigh, and weep;
> And bring our Spices, to embalm Thee dead;
> That done, wee'l see Thee sweetly buried. (36-39)

The use of a first-person pronoun indicates the presence of the focalizer within the action of the poem. Furthermore, the use of plural implies that though readers are led to see from the perspective of the focalizer, they are not necessarily conflated with the focalizer. The readers are instead part of a group or community along with the focalizer. The plural implies multiple people, and, as no other characters within the poem seem to belong, the other people in the scene must be the readers. Thus, the reader is brought in as a character within the theatrical and dramatic scene, to be a fellow-witness with the focalizer of Christ's Passion. Furthermore, the focalizer is not merely an observer, but a director of the action due to the imperative mood; therefore, the focalizer is—in a way—responsible for the events of Christ's Passion. In the use of "we," the focalizer draws the reader to participate with the same culpability.

As noted earlier, the itinerary of this poem, at least on the surface, follows the narrative of the Crucifixion, even as the mood and plan for the future in the last line mean that the poem actually captures a moment of potential before all of the action begins. The change from the imperative of the whole to the declarative in the last four lines also reveals, however, a change internal to the focalizer. The tone at the beginning seems to suggest a kind of imperious arrogance that—in combination with the stage-theater motif—shocks the reader into paying attention. Readers are likely surprised by the focalizer who commands Christ. As the poem progresses, however, the focalizer slowly establishes that Christ is different from the others surrounding him. The other players in the scene are "Th'inconstant, and unpurged Multitude" (6), "this scumme, the Souldier, with his speare, / And that sowre Fellow, with this *vineger*" (9-10), "the *Skurfe* and *Bran*" (12), and "those poor Theeves that act their parts with Thee: / Those who

act without regard, when once a *King*, / And *God*, as Thou art, comes to suffering" (23-25). In contrast, Christ is addressed as "Thou guiltless man" (13) who goes to Calvary "like a Person of some high account"(15) and he "Whome all the flux of Nations comes to see" (22). As the focalizer comes to perceive Christ more accurately, the tone of the poem becomes less imperious. By lines 28 through 31, though these lines are still in the imperative mood, the focalizer's instructions are more like exhortation than orders:

> Why then begin, great King! ascend Thy Throne,
> And thence proceed, to act Thy Passion
> To such an height, to such a period rais'd,
> As Hell, and Earth, and Heav'n may stand amaz'd. (28-31)

This passage also serves to differentiate the speaker from those mentioned a few lines earlier "who act without regard" (24) in the face of Christ's suffering. The focalizer praises Christ, calling him "great King!" and anticipating his capability of fulfilling his role to its tragic end. The focalizer next blesses Christ: "God, and good Angells guide Thee; and so blesse / Thee" (32-33). The blessing shows a different attitude as the narrative of the poem reaches its climax. The focalizer then goes on to ask "that those, who see Thee nail'd unto the Tree, / May (though they scorn Thee) praise and pitie Thee" (34-35). The focalizer asks that the rest of the witnesses—the mockers and all those mentioned earlier—may eventually have the proper response to Christ Crucified. Immediately after this prayer for right responses, the focalizer includes first-person-plural pronouns, as discussed previously, so that the readers, as witnesses and participants in the scene are among those for whom the focalizer prays that they would respond correctly.

Finally, the last four lines are no longer in the imperative mood, and shift the focus from the events and Christ's actions to the focalizer and readers' responses.

> And we (Thy Lovers) while we see Thee keep
> The Lawes of Action, will both sigh, and weep;
> And bring our Spices, to embalm Thee dead;
> That done, wee'l see Thee sweetly buried. (36-39)

Among these lines is a comment about Christ keeping "The Lawes of Action" (37) which seems to refer to the neoclassical interpretation of Aristotle's comments in *Poetics*. Aristotle's *Poetics* comments on the importance of unity of the action or plot (80-81; 1451a); however, Renaissance commentators, particularly Lodvico Castelvetro, altered Aristotle's meaning, developing the idea of the three unities: of time, place, and action (Castelvetro xxxix-xl).[67] The one unity Aristotle does discuss is the unity of action, so though there may be no evidence of the three unities or even Aristotle's descriptions of the unity of plot being referred to as the "lawes of action," it is reasonable to interpret these lines as further drawing attention to the theatrical quality of Herrick's presentation of Christ's Passion.[68] In addition, reference to the importance of unity of action may add more weight to the action within the poem. For instance, Low argues that the reference to the unity of plot or action emphasizes the necessity of the Crucifixion: "The Passion is a tragic necessity in obedience to the plot and rules of the Divine Dramatist. It cannot be altered without destroying the play's unity, meaning, and its effect on its audience" (Low 229). Throughout both Aristotle's *Poetics* and in Castelvetro's commentary, the effect on the audience informs all parts of the analysis of tragedy. "*Rex Tragicus*" implies that seeing Christ keep the "Lawes of Action" (37) is instrumental to the focalizer's and readers'—as can

be seen in the "we" (36)—emotional response to Christ's death. Finally, the focalizer ends with a promise to Christ: "wee'l see Thee sweetly buried" (39). The "sweetly" stands out oddly, but emphasizes the emotional attachment of the focalizer and the change in attitude from the beginning of the play.

Overall, the focalizer, through the itinerant and communicative tendencies of the poem, leads the reader from external and indifferent observation and arrogance, toward participatory affective engagement. The dialogical character of the poem ensures that the poem must be read in the context of the church in order to be understood, but also challenges the current views of theater and the stage. Though the poem begins with an arrogant and impatient tone, the focalizer moves toward accepting emotional attachment, eventually positioning himself as a member of the community of Christ's "Lovers" (36) who will "sigh, and weep" (39). The poem ends with Christ's burial in a last bit of dramatic irony, as readers who know the story of Christ's Passion well enough that they can follow details from multiple sources, know the story of Christ's resurrection as well—though neither the poem, nor *His Noble Numbers* as a whole, reaches that point in the narrative of events.

"His words to Christ, going to the Crosse" (1394)

The first poem following *"Rex Tragicus"* is a short, four-line poem entitled "His Words to Christ, Going to the Crosse" (1394). Despite its brevity, the indicators of a grammar of participation still appear. The poem reads:

> When Thou wast taken, Lord, I oft have read,
> All Thy Disciples Thee forsook, and fled.
> Let their example not a pattern be
> For me to flie, but now to follow Thee. (1-4)

The poem's dialogue with Scripture is similar to that in "*Rex Tragicus,*" in the sense that it depends on a readers' familiarity with the story for comprehension. It refers to a particular narrative event in the Garden of Gethsemane on Maundy Thursday, the night before the Crucifixion, but the story is the same in both Matthew and Mark. In addition, the gospels are actually particularly *present* here, as texts that the focalizer has often read and could reasonably be expected to read again in the future.

Despite the poem's brevity, its temporal character is still evident. The perspective of the poem can be understood as coming from either the time of the focalizer or the reader, and it looks both backward and forward. The focalizer specifically notes that he has often "read" about the past event of the Disciples forsaking Christ and in musing about this past makes a request or petition regarding his own future behavior. The drawing of past scriptural events into the present in order to learn from them reflects liturgical concepts of time, and also typifies a common use of Scripture in preaching. This relatively simple understanding of time within the poem, however, is complicated by the poem's title: "His words to Christ, going to the Crosse." The words of the title seems to imply that this is something that the focalizer says to Christ in the process of his walk toward Calvary. When the title is taken into account, a reader can see that once again, the past event—Christ going to the cross—is made present via the focalizer who, having "read" the story, is firmly contemporary.

This poem and the rest of the poems in the sequence are not communicative in the same sense that Herbert's are. Like "*Rex Tragicus,*" they do not draw the reader in to be conflated with the focalizer, nor do they generally address the reader. Some characteristics seem at first to mirror many of Herbert's

poems; for instance, the poem's title very clearly positions Christ as the addressee. This is solidified by the use of the direct address of "Lord" (1) and the second-person pronouns. Between the addressee, and the "Let" in line 3 which indicates a petition, the poem can be read as a prayer. However, the role of the reader is complicated by the title of the poem. Linda Gregerson, in speaking of Marvell's poem "To His Coy Mistress," argues that the "his" in the title is significant: "The body of the poem is written in first- and second-persons; the lover addresses his lady directly. And yet in the title of the poem, he coolly acknowledges another audience" (Gregerson 163). Though Herrick's poems are not love poems, a "His" is found in the title of the second part of his book, *His Noble Numbers*, and seven of the last ten poems (only eight of which have titles at all). The texts of the poems do not speak of the focalizer in the third person, but use first-person pronouns quite comfortably and pervasively. The rhetorical consequence of the "his" in the title, then, is the insistence of another audience besides the addressee.[69] The words (and the Savior) are "his," not the readers'. The presence of the "his," like the use of plural first person in "*Rex Tragicus*," prevents the conflation of focalizer and reader, despite the direct address to God that signifies prayer, which in Herbert's poems can draw the reader to pray as the focalizer.

If these observations are accurate, can the poems still be said to demonstrate communicative tendencies? I argue, yes. In an earlier chapter I explained that for the purposes of this argument, "communicative" means that the poems draw the reader into participate and thus to be led. Whereas in Herbert, the reader is led to follow the focalizer often by praying or speaking the focalizer's words, in Herrick's poems, the reader is led to observe the focalizer

and learn from a more external standpoint. However, this is still different from the role of indirect listener that readers might take in poems relying on a grammar of representation in two ways. First, the poem is part of a clear sequence which establishes readerly participation through first-person-plural pronouns and the use of "His" in poems in other parts of the sequence—in "*Rex Tragicus*" and the Cross Pattern Poem in particular. This feature ensures that readers are present and participating—only in a different capacity, that of an audience or observer. Secondly, due to the poems being a part of the sequence and the implication of the presence of a community for which the focalizer speaks, the relationship between the focalizer and the implied reader is similar to the relationship between a priest and parishioners; that is, the focalizer is a kind of authoritative model for readers to imitate.

Finally the poem, though short, is still itinerant. The theatrical and dramatic character of "*Rex Tragicus*" sets up this poem and the rest of the following poems as "semi-dramatic" (Parry 297) and makes them "constitute a kind of dramatic narrative in which the poet (and his reader) seem to be physically present at the Passion" (Rollin, "Witty" 144). As mentioned earlier, "*Rex Tragicus*" is in some ways like a prologue. As such, it runs through the entire story that is then re-told broken down into shorter poems with differing emphases. "*Rex Tragicus*" ends with a promise to bury Christ. However, as discussed, the poem is actually a depiction of a potential moment. "His Words to Christ, Going to the Cross," though still taking place in the present, looks further back to the Garden of Gethsemane before moving forward again. As "*Rex Tragicus*" moves from discussing the Crucifixion to a petition that witnesses would have the proper response, so this poem moves from a specific incident,

that of all the Disciples fleeing, to a petition that the focalizer would have the proper response in a similar situation rather than the response that the Disciples had. The focalizer concludes the poem by not only wanting to not emulate the Disciples, but wanting to "follow" Christ.

"Another, to his Saviour" (1395)

The next poem in the sequence, "Another, to his Saviour," (1395) is a little longer, at 10 lines. It, too, is in dialogue with the Passion story, covering events from the Garden of Gethsemane to Christ being scourged, though the references are quite oblique. For instance, it does not distinguish between characters such as Caiaphas, Herod, or Pilate, but just says "*Judge*, and *Judgment-Hall*" (6). However, the poem still depends on the reader's knowledge of the story for comprehension, and in turn influences the reader's response to or understanding of the original story. Though the poem does not directly refer to having read the gospel narrative as the previous poem does, the focalizer does compare his projected actions with what "others did" (2) within those narratives.

The temporal character of the poem is more complex than first appears. The focalizer demonstrates knowledge of the gospel narrative and speaks of the disciples' actions in the past tense—"others did" (2)—thus establishing his position in time as contemporary with the reader. Furthermore, the focalizer demonstrates familiarity with what happened to Christ previous to the crucifixion, mentioning, "the *Judge,* and *Judgment-Hall*" (6) and the whipping Christ received (7-8). However, the focalizer uses a counterfactual conditional to also place himself within the story, referring to his own actions as occurring in the future:

If Thou beest taken, *God* forbid
I flie from Thee, as others did:
But if Thou wilt so honour me,
As to accept my companie,
I'le follow Thee, hap, hap what shall,
Both to the *Judge* and *Judgement-Hall*. (1-6)

The focalizer thus uses the contradictory-seeming knowledge of past events and present and future verb tenses to establish personal participation in a past event, mirroring what happens when past events are made present through liturgical memory. Finally, the "another" in the title, "Another, to his Saviour," implies that Christ is still "Going to the Cross" as he is in the previous poem, thus establishing the poem's position within Herrick's sequence.

The communicative character of this poem is also similar to that of the previous poem. The addressee, God, is spoken to by the focalizer in prayer, yet the "his" in the title and the very independent tone in the poem again distinguish this type of communicative character from the communicative character of Herbert's prayer poems. One interesting difference between this poem and its precursors is that instead of referring to Jesus by "Christ" in the title of the poem as the focalizer has in the previous two poems, the poem's title designates the addressee of the poem with the phrase "to his Saviour." The title thus establishes from the beginning the relationship between focalizer and addressee; Christ is the Savior of the focalizer. In addition, this shift in title establishes the focalizer as part of the narrative of the Passion—that is, as participating in the narrative of the Passion—through his relationship to Christ as the main character.

The itinerary of "Another, to his Saviour" begins with a two line restatement of the whole of the previous poem: "If Thou beest taken, *God* forbid / I flie from Thee, as others did" (1-2). Though these lines have a tone of a

statement or promise, the "*God* forbid" (1) keeps it in the category of prayer or petition despite their role as an interjection. The next few lines display a much more humble attitude than that of "*Rex Tragicus*": "But if Thou wilt so honour me, / As to accept my companie" (3-4). The focalizer then repeats the desire to follow Christ (5-6), but then takes it farther, declaring that he will follow Christ into suffering. The focalizer claims, in a kind of resurgence of arrogance, "I'le take my share" of the whipping (9), before relenting a little and ending with a promise of comfort and an end to the suffering, perhaps even with a little vengeance: "Thy stripes I'le kisse, or burn the *Rod*" (10). The focalizer's desire to participate in Christ's suffering by taking his share is reminiscent of the desire of the focalizer in Herbert's "The Thanksgiving" or "The Reprisall." As with the previous two poems in this sequence, Herrick's focalizer is at least partly concerned with a proper response to the situation—in this case, to Christ's being scourged. Despite the odd jarring note of the presumption of the focalizer wanting to take his share of the "whipping-cheere" (8), the general movement toward participation in Christ's suffering within this poem reflects a movement of the focalizer toward Salvation via "his Saviour"; though the focalizer is expressing desire to participate in Christ's suffering, he has not yet expressed desire to participate in his death.

"His Saviours words, going to the Crosse" (1396)

The next poem in the sequence, "His Saviours words, going to the Crosse" (1396), provides a change in perspective. Rather than the focalizer speaking to Christ, this poem, in a perspective reminiscent of Herbert's "The Sacrifice," is from the point of view of Christ speaking on the way to the Cross—at least, at

the beginning. Compared to Herrick's other poetry, this poem spoken by Christ is more full of direct scriptural reference, as Herrick includes references to multiple verses spoken in Christ's voice. For example, the poem opens with "Have, have ye no regard, all ye / Who pass this way" (1-2), which is reminiscent of Lamentations 1:12, and also used in Herbert's "The Sacrifice" and the Good Friday liturgy. Christ calls himself a "man of misery" (3), echoing Isaiah 53:3's "man of sorrows." Christ also declares himself "both bruis'd, and broke," (4) which is a reference to Isaiah 43:3, quoted in Matthew 12:20: "A bruised reed shall he not break." Another allusion is found when the focalizer claims Christ has "Drunk up the wine of God's fierce wrath" (11), echoing Revelation 16:19, which talks about "the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath." Other references to the cup of God's wrath can be found in Isaiah 51:17 and Jeremiah 25:15. The presence of these scriptural words in Christ's mouth means that they are re-spoken so that Scripture is in dialogue with the action of the reader implied by this poem.

The temporal character of this poem follows that of the previous two, with a few small differences. The title establishes that these words are to be read as spoken while Christ is on his way to the Cross. However, the words of the first line from Lamentations are traditionally understood to have been spoken by Christ *on* the Cross. Either way, the tense shifts in the third stanza from present to past as the focalizer (that is, the perspective through which the narrative is focalized) shifts from Christ to a further focalizer who is not in the dramatic present. Instead, the focalizer speaks from a time after that of the action of the poem. This, as in the previous two poems, suggests that this poem is from a time

subsequent to the opening action of the poem, making present the past event in the lyric.

This poem from the perspective of Christ is rare if not unique in Herrick. The title clearly claims this poem as "His Saviours Words." Despite this claim, and a clear beginning in this vein, however, stanzas three through five refer to Christ in the third person. I contend that the poem makes more sense if the first two stanzas are read as direct quotation of Christ's words, and the rest of the poem acts as the frame. Though the problem understanding the relation between the single focalizer suggested by the title and the dual focalizer suggested by the content can be resolved by arguing that Christ is speaking about himself using the third person in the second half of the poem, I find this reading unsatisfying. The first two stanzas seem to be addressing witnesses which, as established in the preceding poems, includes the focalizers of the other poems and the readers (via the plural pronouns in "*Rex Tragicus*"). The third stanza begins to address "*Sion's Daughters*" (7),[70] and addresses them for the rest of the poem. As Sion's Daughters are witnesses along Christ's path to Calvary to whom Christ prophesizes Jerusalem's doom (see Luke 23:28), the readers as witnesses are also being addressed in these lines. In both parts of the poem, the addressee remains the same general group of people which includes the readers, but the identity of the speaker changes. The reader, directly addressed, is manuducted by both Christ and by the other focalizer who takes on a didactic role.

Narratively, the previous poem in the sequence ends with Christ's scourging. The itinerary of "His Saviours Words, Going to the Crosse" therefore continues with the next point of the narrative, that is, the *Via Dolorosa*. More specifically, the previous poem ends with the focalizer desiring to share in

Christ's suffering or to alleviate it somehow. This poem then goes on to demonstrate that impossibility. The first two stanzas emphasize Christ's sufferings, ending with a claim that it is "for My friends *transgression!*" (6). The last three stanzas reiterate the theme that we do not have to experience the same suffering as Christ as he has done it for us. We do not need to fear all of the instruments of crucifixion and death (8-9), because Christ has "drunk up the wine of God's fierce wrath" (11) for us, just leaving a little so that we know that from which we have been spared (12-15). This poem leads the focalizer and reader from the somewhat prideful desire to help Christ by taking our share of suffering, to realizing what that would actually mean, toward gratitude and deeper understanding. The end of the poem, in its mild accusatory tone "He . . . drank them up for *you*" (15) also works toward increasing the humility of the reader as the addressee. In addition, the wine imagery in the last two stanzas evokes images of the Eucharist. In this way, the *skopos* of this poem is the participation in Christ's suffering through Eucharist rather than through physical suffering.

This poem provides a particular example of the importance of reading texts while relying on the appropriate grammar. If this poem is read while assuming a grammar of representation, the poem can come across as distinctly self-righteous and shallow. First, though the title of the poem identifies the speaker, the third stanza's speaking of Christ' in the third-person confuses the issue. Therefore, if readers do not understand the beginning of the poem as dialogical, then the identity of the focalizer, which we know in part because Christ is speaking the words from Lamentations which are included in the Good Friday liturgical service, is obscured. This can lead to confusion when the poem

states that Christ "suffers not here for mine own, / but for my friends *transgression*!" (5-6). Even if readers do understand who is speaking, however, if readers ignore the communicative aspects of the work, the last three stanzas sound as if the focalizer does not include himself among those for whom Christ is suffering. The focalizer addresses the stanzas to "*Sion's Daughters,* " (7) and encourages them by saying "*Christ,* your loving Saviour" (10) has "drunk up" (11) "what bitter cups had been your due, / Had he not drank them up for *you*" (14-15). If these lines are read while assuming a grammar of representation, the focalizer's words here sound as if the focalizer does not accept any blame for Christ's suffering or admit to any need for salvation.

"His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse" (1397)

The subsequent poem in the sequence, "His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse" (1397) is a song. As such, it is in dialogue with the music of the time.[71] In addition, it also, like its precursors, is in dialogue with the story of Good Friday and its details, relying on readers' knowledge of the story of Christ's Passion to fill in the gaps of narrative in the poem. It also again refers to the cup of God's wrath.

Concerning the poem's temporal character, "His Anthem, to Christ on the Cross" is completely in present tense, unlike the previous poems. It begins "When I behold them, almost slain" (1). The focalizer speaks to Christ as if he is on the Cross the whole time. The poem is not like "*Rex Tragicus*," which covers quite a range of events, even if from the perspective of a single moment in time. Instead, this poem presents a picture of Christ on the Cross who is "almost slain" (1), "full of pain" (2), with "Heart . . . / Pierc't through, and dropping bloud" (4).

The rest of the poem does not consist of further narrative, but of introspection on the spiritual meanings of this image and, again, the proper response to it. The meditation on this image that the focalizer "behold[s]" (1) is a kind of *sacra memoria* which makes the past of a single moment present to the focalizer.

The focalizer here once again reverts to the same mode of the previous poems before "His Saviours words, going to the Crosse." Christ is once again the addressee, there is a "His" in the poem's title, and the reader participates as a witness or member of a group for whom the focalizer speaks. This poem is also the most personal and intimate so far in this sequence of poems.

Finally, the narrative itinerary here begins with Christ on the Cross, where the previous poem finished. In addition, the previous poem finished with a Eucharistic reference and Christ drinking the cup of God's wrath for us. After the image of Christ on the Cross, this poem mentions the appropriate response: "I'le call, and cry out, Thanks to Thee" (5). Next, the poem continues the imagery of the cup of wrath. The focalizer bemoans the fact that Christ must drink for his sin "the *bitter cup* / of *furie* and of *vengeance*" (8-9). The focalizer is still determined to participate in Christ's suffering, or at least to taste it, so concludes "I will sip a little wine" (12), which once again evokes the Eucharist. In the *ductus* of this poem, the focalizer moves from looking at Christ at the beginning of the poem, to tasting the wine at the end; that is, from beholding to participating. Finally the poem ends on an ambiguous note: "But I will sip a little wine; / Which done, Lord, say: *The rest is mine*" (12-13). The ambiguity lies both in who is "saying" "The rest is mine"—the Lord, or the focalizer—and in what meaning of rest is considered. While italicized text often was used in the seventeenth century to indicate direct discourse, such a purpose is obscured in this poem by the fact that

other words, not part of the direct discourse, are italicized, such as "*bitter cup*" (8), "*furie*" and "*vengeance*" (9), and "The *Vinegar*, the *Myrrhe*, the *Gall*" (11). If we read this last line as purposefully ambiguous, "*The rest is mine*" not only could mean that the rest of the cup is Christ's, it could also mean that the focalizer will be at rest in Christ, having sipped wine from the cup and participated in the Eucharist. Overall, the poem, while not following the progression of a narrative, still moves from the image of Christ on the Cross to working out the correct response to Christ's suffering and death, concluding with acceptance.

The Cross Pattern Poem (1398)

The succeeding poem is the untitled Cross Pattern Poem (1398). As with other pattern poems of the seventeenth century, this poem is printed in a particular shape.[72] In this case, the shape is that of a Cross. There are four short four-syllable lines, five longer Alexandrine (twelve syllable) lines, followed by thirty four-syllable lines. Like "*Rex Tragicus*," this poem is 39 lines long. The poem describes the work that Christ does on the Cross. Again, references to specific parts of the story of the crucifixion, such as the "ninth hour" (8), when "dark Clouds do dull, or dead the Mid-dayes Sun" (9), demonstrate the poem's dialogue with the Gospel narrative and require that the reader be familiar with the details of the story. In addition, the poem is in dialogue with Christian traditions, especially in the last lines which draw on the tradition that the Cross was set in the location of Adam's grave (Cain and Connolly, *Complete Poetry* 2:803). Furthermore, the poem is in dialogue with the other pattern poems and emblematic literature of that time, as discussed briefly in Chapter Three in relation to Herbert's "The Altar."

Like some of the previous poems in this sequence, the poem speaks of the events of the crucifixion, the "work" of salvation and healing that was done by Christ on the Cross in the present tense. The focalizer imparts a sense of urgency: "Here all things ready are, make hast, make hast away; / For long this work wil be, & very short this Day" (5-6). As explained in previous examples, speaking in present-tense of past events both makes them more vivid, and also reflects the liturgical views of time and *sacra memoria*. The theatrical motif of the opening poem of this sequence also is subtly reinforced in this poem, when the focalizer urges Christ, "Why then, go on to act" (7) and "Act when Thou wilt" (10). As discussed in the section on "*Rex Tragicus*," the theatrical motif further echoes liturgical practices.

The communicative character of this poem more closely reflects that in "*Rex Tragicus*" than that of the intervening poems. The addressee of this poem is, again, Christ, though this is not clear from the beginning. The first few lines speak of Christ in third person: "This Cross-Tree Here / Doth Jesus beare" (1-2). However, the italicization of these first lines might mean they ought to be taken more as an epigraph, or even as a title. Their position within the shape of the Cross is also reminiscent of the sign that Pilate hung above Jesus declaring him "King of the Jews." The longer lines shift to imperative with an implied addressee being asked to act before the ninth hour. The implication that the ninth hour is a kind of deadline, when that is when Christ died, further implicates Christ as the addressee. In line 24, the focalizer finally exclaims "O! Deare Christ," making the addressee explicit. The position of the reader in this poem further echoes that of "*Rex Tragicus.*" Unlike in the intervening poems, there is no "his" in the poem to establish the reader as an observer. Instead, the poem

eventually utilizes first-person-plural pronouns which draw the reader to the speaker's side at the foot of the cross: "Look down, and see / Us weepe for Thee" (26-27). The focalizer goes on to lament that "Thy dreadfull Woes / Wee cannot ease" (29-30). However, the final sentence and line shift to a first-person-singular pronoun:

> Mean while, let mee,
> Beneath this Tree,
> This Honour have,
> To make my grave. (36-39)

The shift from plural to singular marks out the limitations of the contrasting plural readers' role. The reader is a fellow-witness to Christ's suffering and presumably desires to ease that suffering. However, the final declaration is more individual than communal. The reader is witness both to Christ's suffering and death and to the focalizer's devotion and decision. Though the focalizer is not speaking as a representative of the community here in this last individual petition, he can still be understood as speaking as a model for the community, in a relation that mirrors that between a clergyman and his parish.

In contrast to the previous poem beginning with a static image of Christ on the Cross, this poem, after the four line epigraph, begins with a depiction of movement. The focalizer says the work will be long (6), encourages the addressee (eventually identified as Christ) to act (7), and declares "Here's wonders to be done" (7). The poem then goes on to detail what that work is: "Bloud will be spilt; / Pure Balm that shall / Bring Health to All" (11-13). The poem describes the balm's contents: the aforementioned blood (11), reinforced by Wine which is blood in the celebration of Eucharist (16), and "Oyle" which evokes images of anointing, blessing, and holiness (21). Next, the focalizer draws attention to the

focalizer and readers' sorrow and presence at the foot of the Cross, even as Christ dies (25). The focalizer reiterates the theme from earlier poems regarding the frustrated desire to spare Christ grief (30). The focalizer also sets out conditions for Christ' forgiveness and extension of the salvation and healing discussed in the poem:

> Yet doe Thou please,
> Who Mercie art,
> T'accept each Heart
> That gladly would
> Helpe if it could. (31-35).

According to the focalizer, penitents must desire to help Christ suffer less, even if they cannot actually do anything about it, to receive Christ's mercy. Finally, the poem ends with the focalizer discussing his own grave. This seems a bit sudden, as it is Christ dying on the Cross, but in asking for Christ's acceptance, the reference to the focalizer's death as Christ dies echoes scriptural passages such as Romans 6:3 and 6:6: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? . . . Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." The grave at the foot of the Cross will not only be the location of Adam's grave (as according to Christian tradition), but also the grave of the focalizer's "old man." Furthermore, the focalizer may reasonably hope that his own body would be buried with a cross as a grave marker.

In this manner, then, the *ductus* of the poem as a whole moves: 1) from an impersonal identification of the object of the Cross, 2) to an explanation of Christ's work of salvation, 3) to pity for Christ's suffering and acceptance of Christ's mercy, 4) to identification with Christ in his death. The poem generally moves from an external view point to intimate involvement. The focalizer of this

poem still exemplifies problematic tendencies toward arrogance in commanding Christ, but by the *skopos* of the poem, Christ has died, the focalizer has met the conditions for acceptance by Christ, and the focalizer is planning a grave for his "old man." All of these elements together seem to establish that it is at this point that the focalizer is led to the point of salvation.

"To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion" (1399)

The next poem is the first of three poems dealing with Christ's tomb. "To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion" (1399) is a flowery and lively praise of a tomb. The discrepancy between tone and subject matter is jarring. The poem is in dialogue not only with Scripture, but also with classically influenced love poetry, more like the "humane" poems in *Hesperides*. As an example of the poem's dialogue with Scripture, the focalizer talks of taking off his shoes to walk on the holy ground of the tomb, similar to the way Moses was ordered to take off his shoes at the burning bush. In regard to being in dialogue with love poetry, the focalizer promises to kiss the stone (10), give the tomb flowers (13), and compares it with classical and exotic locations in smell (15-16).

Regarding the poem's temporal character, the poem is written as if the focalizer is just now approaching the tomb: "Here I come" (2). The focalizer's encounter with the tomb seems new, but he also establishes that he knows it "was Thy *Grave*" (23), implying that he is aware it is no longer Christ's grave and thus placing the poem historically later in time than immediately after the crucifixion. If read while assuming a grammar of representation, there is a disparity between the fact that the focalizer approaches the tomb as if the events of the crucifixion are recent and the focalizer's awareness of the historical

passage of time. However, this disparity is resolved if the poem assumes a liturgical view of time, as in a grammar of participation, which recognizes the passage of historical time even as significant events are continually re-made present.

The addressee of the poem is mostly clear, but changes toward the end of the poem. The title identifies the poem as being directed toward Christ's tomb, and the poem opens with a direct address: "Haile holy, and all-honour'd Tomb" (1). However, in lines 22-25, there is a subtle shift and the focalizer moves from addressing the tomb to addressing Christ, calling the tomb "Thy *Grave*" (23). The focalizer, the use of "His" twice in the title, and the role of the reader seem to be the same as that of previous poems in the sequence, excepting "*Rex Tragicus*" and the Cross Pattern Poem. The communicative tendencies are also present in the same ways.

Finally, the *ductus* of the poem leads from energetic celebration to calm contentment. As the previous poem ends on a solemn note, with the death of Christ and the predicted death of the focalizer, the cheerful and celebratory tone of this poem contributes to a general sense of discrepancy between subject matter and attitude. The focalizer declares his plans to enter the tomb respectfully (1-7), declares that he contains "full affection" (9) for the tomb, promises to kiss the stone and decorate it with flowers (12-13), compares it to beautiful and exotic locations, and concludes with a desire to live in the tomb: "Let me live ever here, and stir / No one step from this *Sepulcher*" (18-19). The focalizer then declares that he is overwhelmed and desiring rest: "Ravisht I am! and down I lie, / Confus'd, in this brave Extasie. / Here let me rest" (20-22). The focalizer's confusion matches the readers' confusion at the exuberance of praise for a tomb.

The final lines exhibit a marked slowing down and muting of the "extasie" at the same point that the addressee shifts from the tomb to Christ:

> Here let me rest; and let me have
> This for my *Heaven* that was Thy *Grave*:
> And, coveting no higher sphere,
> I'le my Eternitie spend here. (22-25)

The focalizer concludes his praise of the tomb by comparing it to Heaven, even though Christ is no longer in the tomb, expressing his belief that he deserves no "higher sphere," but that being near Christ by being in his tomb is enough. More than sharing in Christ's suffering, sharing in Christ's grave—and therefore, symbolically in his death—is another way of identifying with Christ. It is fitting that the poem's subtitle is "His Devotion," as this request displays personal devotion in an intimate and passionate way that is often absent in Herrick's other religious poetry.

"His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher" (1400)

The subsequent poem is again a short one, only six lines long, entitled "His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher" (1400):

> To joyn with them, who here confer
> Gifts to my Saviours Sepulcher,
> Devotion bids me hither bring
> Somewhat for my Thank-Offering.
> Loe! Thus I give a Virgin-Flower,
> To dresse my Maiden-Saviour. (1-6)

Besides the existence of Christ's tomb and the women who brought spices to the tomb on Sunday morning (Mark 16:1: Luke 24:1), there is really only one other scriptural reference—that of the Thank-Offering, called the "Thanksgiving" in Leviticus 7. This is significant for similar reasons that Herbert's title "The Thanksgiving" is significant. That is, "Thanksgivings" are connected to the

celebration of Communion in the Anglican Church, especially as the Eucharist means Thanksgiving.[73] In recognizing this connection then, we can see that the poem, despite its brevity and frivolous-seeming subject matter, has more serious undertones, visible when it is understood that this poem is in dialogue with Scripture and liturgy. In addition, similar to the previous poem, "His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher" is in dialogue with seventeenth-century love poetry: "Loe! Thus I give a Virgin-Flower, / To dresse my Maiden Saviour" (5-6) continues the promise in the previous poem to "Dresse Thee [the tomb] with flowrie Diaper" (13). The dialogue this poem has with love poetry also works to redeem or excuse the awkwardness of Herrick's characterization of Christ as a "Maiden-Saviour" (6).

This poem's temporal tendencies are observable in the same ways as the previous poem, except that the historical time from which the focalizer is speaking and whether or not the tomb is empty is unclear. The focalizer treats Christ's death as a recent thing, which still calls for a response—in this case, a Thank-Offering (4).

The communicative aspects of the poem are a little different from previous poems in the sequence. First, the addressee is unspecified. No one is directly addressed except for implicitly when the focalizer exclaims "Loe!" (5). Secondly, though the title still contains the "his," it also contains the phrase "with the rest." Who are "the rest"? The poem declares he will "joyn with them, who here confer / Gifts to my Saviours Sepulcher" (1-2). One possible interpretation is that he is talking about the women who went to Christ's tomb on Sunday only to find the tomb empty. Another interpretation is that "the rest" are other Christians, who—as specified in the Cross Pattern Poem—have been

accepted by Christ and now come to offer their own Thank-Offerings. With this interpretation, Herrick is joining in this poem with other members of the Church.

Finally, this poem's *ductus* moves from a communal focus to an individual focus which is a little possessive. First, the poem's attitude toward the tomb seems to pick up where the previous poem ended. Next, the poem opens with the intention to join with others, but the particular Thank-Offering that the focalizer offers, a "Virgin-Flower" (5) is unique and more individual. Such a gift is also characteristic of the Herrick persona we often find in *Hesperides*. Finally, the focalizer identifies Christ as "my Maiden-Saviour" (6). With the inclusion of the "Virgin" and "Maiden," the "my" in the last line takes on somewhat possessive overtones.

"His coming to the Sepulcher" (1401)

The last poem, except for an ending couplet, is "His coming to the Sepulcher" (1401). It, like the previous poem, is relatively brief:

> Hence they have borne my Lord: Behold! the Stone
> Is rowl'd away; and my sweet Saviour's gone.
> Tell me, white Angell; what is now become
> Of Him we lately seal'd up in this Tombe?
> Is He, from hence, gone to the shades beneath,
> To vanquish Hell, as here He conquer'd Death?
> If so, I'le thither follow, without feare;
> And live in Hell, if that my Christ stayes there. (1-8)

In addition to the poem's dialogue with the beginning of the resurrection story, the poem is also in dialogue with the Apostle's Creed, though not the English versions. Neither the version of the Creed in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer (Church of England 127), nor the version of the Creed in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (392) include the line "He descended into Hell." However, Christ's "Harrowing of Hell," occurs as a somewhat frequent subject of medieval

popular literature and art.[74] The phrase "he descended into Hell" is generally considered the most controversial phrase in the Apostle's Creed, and here Herrick does not take a stance on the matter. His description of Christ vanquishing Hell is in the form of a question, and his response is based on an "if." The poem is also in dialogue with another of Herrick's poems, "No Coming to God without Christ" (1375). In this poem, the focalizer proclaims, "To Hell I'd rather run, then I / Wo'd see Thy Face, and He not by" (5-6). "His Coming to the Sepulcher" dramatizes this claim.

Like the two previous poems, this poem reacts as if the crucifixion was recent. The focalizer asks "what is now become / of Him" (3-4) and the presence of the angel at the tomb suggests that the setting of the poem is Easter morning. However, by Easter when the angel spoke to the women at the tomb, Christ was already resurrected and in Hell no longer, throwing the timeline of this poem off once more. The situation at the tomb is not depicted as a historical event in the past, but the focalizer's questions about Harrowing Hell, like his earlier knowledge in "To His Saviours Sepulcher: His Devotion" that the grave only used to be Christ's grave, assumes a perspective from later in history. However, the focalizer's questions to the angel and conditional statement, "If so" (7), complicate this explanation.

The title of the poem contains the now familiar "his," still separating the reader and focalizer. The addressee in this poem is the "white Angell" at the tomb (3) whom the focalizer questions about Christ's absence. Again, the communicative tendencies can be seen in the way the reader is led to ask the same questions as the focalizer, observe the focalizer's responses to situations, and reflect on the focalizer's journey.

Finally, the *ductus* of the poem moves from questioning where Christ has gone, to celebrating Christ's presumed victory, which will "vanquish Hell, as here He conquer'd Death" (6). Then the poem concludes with a promised plan of action, to follow Christ, even into Hell. That the poem's *skopos* is ostensibly Hell is a bit of a contrast to the expected *telos* of eschatological beatitude. Marjorie Swann, however, interprets the situation incorrectly when she reads it as despairing in the presence of a silent angel and unresurrected Christ so that "neither the angel nor Christ himself can aid the speaker" (39). In a similar vein, Low calls the last lines of this poem "less triumphant than open-ended" (232). More hopefully, however, Low ties this ending in with his reading of Herrick as a Christian Epicurean:

> Modern critics as well as ancient philosophers and theologians express doubt about the religion of pleasure, with considerable justification. A man whose ultimate goal is pleasure in heaven—pleasure than can never fade—is only too likely to prefer that pleasure to its Giver. . . . His ladder of self-gratification leads finally to self-less love" (232).

In this sense, the ending of "His coming to the Sepulcher" is a triumph of rightly ordered loves. The focalizer here has gone beyond his frustrated desire to suffer for Christ in the previous poems, to stating his desire to die with him and, even further, go to Hell with him.

The willingness to live in Hell with Christ is the culmination of Herrick's desperation 1) to follow Christ rather than fly in "His words to Christ, going to the Crosse," 2) to follow Christ even into being whipped in "Another, to his Saviour," 3) to follow Christ in drinking at least a little of the cup of God's wrath in "His Saviours words, going to the Crosse" and "His Anthem, to Christ on the Crosse," 4) to follow Christ into death by claiming the Cross as the place of his

grave in the Cross Pattern Poem, and 5) to follow Christ to and into His tomb in "To his Saviours Sepulcher: his Devotion" and "His Offering, with the rest, at the Sepulcher." Throughout this sequence of poems, the focalizer repeatedly demonstrates his determination to follow Christ and join him wherever he is and whatever he is doing, particularly in regard to Christ's suffering and death.

The Final Couplet (1402)

Even in this reading, however, there is uncertainty. The lack of direct discussion of Christ's resurrection at the end of this sequence of poetry might raise questions about Herrick's profession of faith on that point. However, the final two line couplet (1402) alters the ending of the previous poem and ensures that rather than being open ended, the *telos* of the text is actually the union of the Soul with God, regardless of other factors. The couplet reads: "Of all the good things whatsoe're we do, / God is the ΑΡΧΗ [*archē*], and the ΤΕΛΟΣ [*telos*] too" (1-2).

This couplet is in dialogue not only with Scripture as Herrick's other poems are, but also with Herrick's own earlier poetry. First, the "whatsoe're we do" echoes 1 Corinthians 10:31: "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." The second line then echoes Revelation 22:13, in which Christ declares, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Secondly, the first part of *Hesperides* also ends with a couplet. The final poem in the "humane" section of *Hesperides* is "The Pillar of Fame" (1129), followed by a final couplet (1130) reading "To his Book's end this last line he'd have plac't / *Jocund his Muse was; but his Life was chast*" (1-2). While the end of the "humane" section of *Hesperides* focuses on Herrick, the end of *His Noble Numbers* focuses on Christ.

The couplet presents a universal claim that is not limited in scope to a particular time. While the character of moral maxims and epigrams make the couplet seem didactic, the use of the plural first-person pronoun draws the reader among those about whom the focalizer is speaking. While the ending of the previous poem seems to eschew the usual *telos* of texts assuming a grammar of participation by ending its itinerary in Hell, this couplet literally reminds the readers that God is the origin and final goal of "all the good things" (1). Thus, the focalizer's following Christ into Hell is still in union with Christ—the ultimate *telos*, despite the location.

Conclusion

Despite the empty tomb in the last substantial poem in *His Noble Numbers*, Christ is not risen; instead, he is in Hell. The lack of Easter or Resurrection poems following the series of Passion poems is very peculiar. In fact, this ending in death reinforces Herrick's depiction of Christ's Passion as a tragedy, and therefore Christ as a tragic King. This sense of tragedy is further compounded by the lack of resurrection in one of the other narrative poems in *His Noble Numbers*, which tells the story of Dorcas, a woman who the apostle Peter raised from the dead, "The Widdowes Teares: or, Dirge of *Dorcas*" (1253). The focus of the poem is on Dorcas's good deeds and death. Her resurrection is not included as part of the story.[75] As previously noted, this might lead to readers wondering about the place of resurrection within Herrick's theology, but two of the poems in *His Noble Numbers* deal specifically with the resurrection. One, "The Resurrection Possible, and Probable" (1338) concerns the general resurrection at the end of time. The second, entitled "The Resurrection" (1377) states: "That *Christ* did die, the *Pagan*

saith; / But that He rose, that's *Christians* Faith" (1-2). Herrick does assert that belief in Christ's resurrection is an essential characteristic of Christian faith, but in some ways this ending without a depiction of the resurrection reinforces the "pagan" character of Herrick's poems at the beginning of *Hesperides*.

In *His Noble Numbers*, the focalizer talks a lot about Christ's death, but only obliquely his resurrection. The complication of knowledge of the resurrection without depiction of the resurrection in these poems could be explained by the focalizer knowing the whole story but being unsure about his position within it. That is, just as the focalizer knows about Christ's resurrection from a context contemporary with the potential reader, but is located temporally before confirmation of his resurrection within the time of the narrative, so the focalizer locates the reader as looking forward to and living in knowledge of the final resurrection. Finally, the ending of the poems also reflects the dramatic characterization which Herrick gives Christ's Passion; as the focalizer and as Herrick's readers know that Christ is raised from the dead—despite the seemingly tragic ending—the series of poems presents readers with one last instance of dramatic irony.

Overall, our investigation addresses both main critical concerns of scholars discussing *His Noble Numbers*: Herrick's theology, particularly his soteriology, and the significance of the sequence of at least some of the poems and of the particular place of these poems within the whole. When read while assuming a grammar of participation, these ten poems lead the reader right up to the point of Salvation, through the possible consequences of the decision to follow Christ and to the realization that Christ is truly the *telos* of the focalizer's journey, no matter where Christ is. Though the focalizer spends *Hesperides* in

search of pleasure, and begins the sequence of Good Friday poems with a certain amount of emotional indifference in "*Rex Tragicus*," the Good Friday poems lead the reader through and to affective acceptance of suffering and death for the sake of Christ. Thus, Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* ends where Herbert's *The Temple* begins—with salvation through identification with Christ in his suffering and death. Herbert's readers are drawn from the moral law of "The Church-porch," into "The Church" and along the beginning of the path of sanctification. Herrick's readers do not begin with the piety found in Herbert's "The Church-porch," but in a condition more like the pagan and epicurean pleasures depicted in *Hesperides*. Thus, the *telos* of Herrick's collection is not sanctification, but salvation through union with Christ.

CHAPTER FIVE

A Cyclical Path toward Union with God: A Selection of John Donne's Good Friday Poems

As with Herbert's biography, John Donne's life has been well-documented in a number of places, and from a number of different perspectives.[76] Though I will not rehearse the details of his life here, presenting a basic overview and a few pertinent facts for the biographical context of the poems I will discuss seems fitting. John Donne was born "into a family notable for its passionate attachment to the Catholic faith" (Lein 117) in early 1573 (116). As a result, his education was influenced by Catholic tutors toward an "affection for medieval thinkers and . . . great familiarity with medieval devotional traditions" (117). In addition, his Catholicism meant that though he attended Oxford, he did not then receive a degree, as that would have required an oath of allegiance to the British monarch. He next attended the Inns of Court where he studied law. In 1597 he began a promising career in public service as Sir Thomas Egerton's secretary. However, in 1601, he eloped with 17-year-old Ann More, Egerton's late wife's niece, ruining his career and leaving him without a steady income for almost the next fifteen years (120). Over the next few years, they had to move out of London and continued to struggle financially, especially as they went on to have 12 children, including two who were stillborn.

Donne's friend, Thomas Morton, "offered Donne employment in the church around 1607" (126), but Donne resisted. Clayton Lein argues that the following years, from 1607-1613, may have been "Donne's busiest years as a

writer" (121). At some point, he left the Roman Catholic Church for the Church of England. His publication in 1610 of *Pseudo-Martyr*, a prose work intended "to persuade English Catholics to subscribe to the Oath of Allegiance established by Parliament in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot" (122), earned him an M.A. from Oxford (123). After *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Conclave Ignati*—which was written late 1610, and ready to print the next February with an English version following almost immediately afterwards (124)—King James noticed him, but decided he should be a clergyman rather than being a part of the court as Donne wished. Donne still resisted ordination, despite the prospect of a steady income (126). All three of the poems that I intend to discuss were written in this time period—after Donne had first been encouraged to become a clergyman, but before he was ordained in January of 1615 (131). Ann More died in childbirth in 1617 (A. Smith 92), and Donne became Dean of St. Paul's in 1621 (Lein 131). He died on March 31, 1631 (136).

Like Herrick, Donne was a part of the literary society in London, though some years earlier. According to Lein, "dabbling" in writing poetry and other literature was common among men at the Inns of Court where Donne studied law (117). His "training in dialectic at Oxford" influenced his prose writings (118). His prose works reflect both "the deep conservatism of Donne's worldview, which insists on the primacy of the authority of the past" (125) and Donne's "absolute mastery of contemporary divinity" which included everything related to the Jesuits, nearly all the Church Fathers and "a detailed knowledge of church history, a solid comprehension of the chief points of controversy between the Roman and Reformed churches, an understanding of liturgical and devotional traditions, and a mastery of controversial technique"

(129). This conservatism and familiarity with medieval thought possibly contributed to his works relying on a grammar of participation. Though many of his prose works were published, "most of Donne's poems circulated in manuscript, remaining in Donne's private circle for years after they were written and not appearing in print until after Donne's death" (Bell, "Gender Matters" 202). In fact, "no more than seven poems and a bit of another poem were published during his lifetime, and only two of these publications were authorized by him" (A. Smith 82). Unlike Herbert or Herrick's poems, Donne's poems cannot be read as if they reflect a particular arrangement (82). Donne's poems were collected and published in 1633, two years after his death (82). Examining Donne's poetry while relying on a grammar of participation is particularly fruitful, then, for this project, due to this lack of overall arrangement as it will permit us to investigate how relying on a grammar of participation provides insights regarding shorter works that are not part of a larger sequence. Despite the fact that these poems are not sequentially linked to others, Donne's focalizers each manuduct readers through an itinerary that reflects the medieval account of the journey of the soul toward union with God, by positioning readers as members of the church.

The Texts

Though Christ's Passion is a recurring theme in Donne's religious poetry, three poems in particular include the Passion as a controlling event or image: "Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day," "Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day," and *La Corona*. Robin Robbins, whose edition of *The Complete Poems of John Donne* this chapter utilizes

for quotations of Donne's poetry, relies heavily on manuscripts rather than printed versions of the texts (xvii). In addition, Robbins' edition follows the *Variorum Donne*[77] practice in labeling the poems with 'headings' rather than 'titles,' as few were actually included by Donne (xviii). Because of the lack of titles, numerous variations for these particular poems exist. For instance, while *La Corona* remains consistent, "Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day" is also often labeled "Upon the Annunciation and Passion Falling upon One Day, 1608," and "Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day" is also labeled "Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward." "Upon the Annunciation," as the alternate heading proclaims, is thought to have been written around or shortly after March 25, 1608,[78] when the moveable feast of Good Friday and the immovable feast of the Annunciation coincided. "Good Friday" is thought to have been written on, around, or shortly after Good Friday in 1613. *La Corona* is often ascribed to the years 1607 or 1608. It was probably presented to Magdalen Herbert, George Herbert's mother in a letter.[79] David Novarr points out that *La Corona* and "Upon the Annunciation" have a number of similarities, especially in their use of circular imagery, and suggests that the coincidence of the Annunciation and Passion may have inspired *La Corona* ("Dating" 265).

A Review of Literary Criticism

As the critical discussions regarding Herrick's *His Noble Numbers* emulate critical discussions of Herbert's "The Church," in scholars' concern with the theology of the poems and the sequence of their arrangement, in the same way, much of the critical discussion regarding Donne's religious poetry seems to focus

on issues which concern Herbert scholars as well; namely, the theology of the poem and the ways in which certain characteristics of a grammar of participation have already been discerned by multiple scholars. In fact, critics may be even more preoccupied with the particulars of Donne's theology than they are with Herbert's, for three reasons. First, Donne's change from Catholicism to the British Church provides irrefutable evidence for Catholic influence on his writing, providing fodder for those who wish to discuss the extent of his theological changes and alliances; secondly, Donne's many surviving sermons and prose works provide further context for comparison to an extent that Herbert's prose works do not; and thirdly, the political, social, and personal pressures to conform to the Church of England were strong. Though we have clear evidence that Donne embraced his Catholicism despite negative repercussions for years, it is impossible to know to what extent these pressures formed his proclaimed theological beliefs. The participants in this conversation, and even frequently the specific books, are often the same as those who participate in the theological discussions about Herbert, and often argue for similar positions. Louis Martz again highlights the correspondences between Donne's poetry and Ignatian meditation, Barbara Lewalski argues for Protestant poetics, and later critics often either take sides or attempt to reconcile the two. For instance, Anthony Low emphasizes Donne's Catholic legacy when he claims that "Donne is the most purely meditative of the English devotional poets" (40) and that "his devotional methods maintained a continuity that bridged his religious conversion" (41). Francesca Bugliani Knox further addresses the connections between Ignatian meditation and John Donne's poetry. On the other hand Gene Veith maintains that "Donne strenuously affirms justification by faith alone and his sermons are

eloquent in celebrating God's grace" (119), though he also points out the ways that Donne's theology differs from Calvin's. R. V. Young argues that "the vagueness of the 39 articles" provided an alternative to the extremes of Roman Catholicism, or Lutheranism, or Calvinism (32), and that "the Church of England appealed to Donne precisely by virtue of its theological and liturgical imprecision" (32). Young's work, in particular, finds more substance in discussing the devotional poets without too-specific doctrinal classifications, arguing for a bigger picture (219).

Unfortunately, many critics tend to treat all of Donne's theology after his entrance into the Church of England as if all of the sources were written at once. That is, critics tend to leave no room for development and change of Donne's ideas over his lifetime and are often more concerned with identifying him with a certain denomination or theologian than with particular doctrines. Not all critics fall into this trap, however. Jeanne Shami, for example, argues that those who try to interpret Donne as belonging to any particular theological group can do so only by selective quotation: "It cannot be said too often that Donne's views on any subject are complex and elusive" (383). Another example is Theresa DiPasquale, who points out that "A more comprehensive reading reveals that Donne can, for example, defend conservative ceremonial . . . while departing broadly from Hooker and his successors on the role of sermons" (3), even as she investigates Donne's particular theology concerning the Sacraments and the Eucharist in particular (*Literature and Sacrament* 5, 9).

One point that scholars do not dispute is the centrality of the Cross and Christ's Passion to Donne's theology and religious poetry. Julia Smith especially studies "Donne's imaginative response to the Crucifixion . . . to see what his

personal emphases were" (513). She thoroughly and insightfully investigates Donne's uses of, references to, and beliefs about Christ's crucifixion in his poetry, prose, and sermons. She highlights "the lack of detail, either scriptural or traditional, associated with Donne's portrayal of the Cross. The only occasion on which Donne follows closely the scriptural narrative of events leading up to the Crucifixion is in his last sermon, "Deaths Duell" (518). This lack of detail or attention to this particular narrative contrasts strongly with both Herbert and Herrick's approaches. Such a lack of detail is also more striking because of the importance of Christ's Passion to Donne's theology, as can be seen in the Good Friday poems we will consider.

In addition to discussions about Donne's doctrinal allegiances or specific theological beliefs, a few critics have also made observations about the dialogical, temporal, communicative, and itinerant character of Donne's poems. Like critics of Herbert, these scholars note these characteristics individually and not as part of a larger framework. First, Mary Sloane argues that Donne and the other metaphysical poets were writing in response to an "epistemological upheaval" in which the importance of sight and visual metaphors in talking about philosophy and the mind were gaining prominence. Sloane argues for a change in the perception of the validity of knowledge gained through the senses from Donne to Traherne (2-3). Despite Donne's use of sensory description, Sloane argues that Donne's poetry, along with Herbert's, contains:

> a skepticism toward man's ways of knowing that goes beyond that which was a frequent precursor of religious faith. That their poetry reveals a sure knowledge of the older world view and its epistemological assumptions is obvious. But they were aware also that there *was* an epistemological problem. (151)

I propose that the "older world view" and the epistemological shift that Sloane observes in Donne and Herbert coincides with the shift from texts assuming a grammar of participation toward texts assuming a grammar of representation as Candler describes it. Although Sloane's account is mostly focused on the role of emblems and imagery in metaphysical poetry, her observations strengthen the reasons for reading Donne's poetry while relying on a Grammar of Participation.

Secondly, Donne's poems are dialogical. I have already mentioned Donne's familiarity with theological texts; that familiarity is made evident in the way that poems dialogically engage with Scripture, medieval theology, and contemporary doctrinal debates and political situations. Furthermore, some critics recognize that Donne's engagement with Scripture goes beyond incorporating allusions into dialogue. For instance, Young argues that Donne has a different attitude toward Scripture than many other seventeenth-century poets and theologians; for Donne, "the Bible is important not as a source of subjective revelations, but as a means of integrating the individual with the larger community of fellow believers, past and future as well as present. The Bible is the common text of Christians, bringing them together and ensuring Catholicity" (176). In addition, much of the poems' dialogue with Scripture tends to be identifiable not through particular words and phrases, but through more general stories, characters, and doctrines; that is, learned reference rather than phraseological adaptation.

Of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, Donne's poems are the most context-dependent, in that they require readers to be familiar with and remember other texts in order to comprehend them. Donne also emphasizes the importance of memory in his sermons, which both makes the dialogic character of the texts

possible and leads to temporal emphasis rather than spatialization. Donne particularly links memory to salvation, saying, "But the *memory* is so familiar, and so present, and so ready a faculty, as will always answer, if we will but to speak to it, and aske it, *what God hath done for us, or for others*. The art of *salvation*, is but the art of *memory*" ("Preached" 2). In another sermon Donne argues:

> The holy-Ghost takes the nearest way to bring a man to God, by awaking his memory; for, for [sic] the understanding, that requires long and cleer instruction; and the will requires an instructed understanding before, and is in it self the blindest and boldest faculty; but if the memory doe but fasten upon any of those things which God hath done for us, it is the nearest way to him. ("A Sermon" 1)

The faculty of memory serves to make the past present within the imagination, facilitating the temporal experience of the liturgy, and Donne appropriates this faculty of memory in his poetry in two ways. First, readers' memories allow the poems to establish dialogues with other texts. Readers both remember other texts when reading Donne's poems, and remember Donne's poems when re-encountering other texts. Secondly, memory is what allows for difference in repetition with difference. As the poems establish their temporal characteristics through a liturgical view of time, the Christian view of time is established as different from the pagan view of time through both its focus on an end or goal and its awareness of memory which distinguishes each cycle of feasts and fasts from the next. Memory both enables the liturgy to make past events present and ensures that each celebration is a little different than previous ones. This view of time includes many images of cycles and circles; images with which Donne is particularly fascinated. As Alan Fischler argues, "in the works of John Donne, the circle assumes the status of controlling metaphor" and is inextricably linked with Donne's conception of the human condition and means of salvation (169).[80]

In addition to their dialogical and temporal characteristics, the poems also display their communicative character in relation to manuscript cultural dynamics. As manuscripts, "most of Donne's poems are not only designed for a particular occasion and audience or audiences but also for a specific genre which had its own set of rules known to both the poet and to his readers" (Bell, "Gender Matters" 203). Ilona Bell argues that by reading these poems outside of that manuscript culture (which we cannot hope to reproduce), "we may forget that we are eavesdropping on one side of a conversation that was both deeply private and culturally situated, both permeated with personal allusions and imbued with society's norms and expectations" (202). The manuscript culture makes the exchange between the author and reader more intimate than the exchange between the author and reader of a printed text. In a manuscript poem the reader is socially connected to the author, even if they are separated by numerous degrees. This connection between author and reader is even more evident in cases like *La Corona*, when the poem was sent specifically to a particular person, even if that person is not the addressee within the poem. Poets as a part of this manuscript culture must have been uniquely aware of their role in relationship with their texts to their readers. DiPasquale argues that Donne's "conception of the exchange between the author and reader" includes a view of poetry as sacrament with the poet in the role of a priest (*Literature and Sacrament* 5). The communicative tendencies of Donne's work also appear in the way that Scripture is in dialogue with his work. According to Young, within Donne's poetry,

> Biblical types furnish a means of restoring and confirming the *identity* of the redeemed self through *identification with* the scriptural models of God's Providence. The invocation of these

> types in his poems, along with pervasive allusions to biblical passages and scenes, grounds the individual experience of the persona in the corporate experience of the Church embodied in Scripture. (176-77)

The grounding of the persona in the Church, in turn, grounds the reader within the Church. Though the "identification with . . . scriptural models" and identification with the persona or focalizer (even without conflation between the focalizer and the reader) the reader is led along the *ductus* of the poem.

Finally, though these poems are not part of a longer sequence, they are still itinerant, unfolding their *ductus* and leading their readers toward their *skopos,* toward union of the soul with God. Julia Smith argues,

> We find in his religious writings a deep need for salvation, and a reliance on the efficacy of Christ's blood to free him from that corruption of sin and death from which he cannot free himself. By conforming himself to Christ in his death, he hopes to share his resurrection. (513)

Julia Smith draws these last two phrases from Donne's sermons, as he refers to Philippians 3:10-11, "That I may knowe him, and the vertue of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his afflictions, and be made conformable unto his death, If by anie meanes I might atteine unto the resurrection of the dead,"[81] and Romans 6:3-5:

> Knowe ye not, that all we which have bene baptized into Jesus Christ, have bene baptized into his death? We are buryed then with him by baptisme into his death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glorie of the Father, so we also shulde walke in newnes of life. For if we be grafted with him to the similitude of his death, even so shall we be *to the similitude* of his resurrection.

Though the *skopos* of Donne's poetry is addressed by Julia Smith, DiPasquale and others, these same scholars do not necessarily address the *ductus* that leads to the *skopos* of Donne's poems. Stanley Archer does discuss the prevalent journey motif in Donne's poems, but acknowledging that Donne pictures the Christian

life as a journey is not the same as manuducting readers through a journey within a poem.

Though these observations concerning these characteristics are valuable, as with Herbert scholarship, our understanding of the ramifications of such observations can be improved by realizing that these characteristics are part of a larger framework. Though scholars may identify the particular itinerary of an individual poem, no one has yet connected this with the medieval account of the journey of the soul to God. Furthermore, no one has yet connected such an itinerary with the communicative character of Donne's poems; that is, while critics might describe a poem's itinerary, they do not address how the reader is led along the same path. In these three poems—"Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day," "Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day," and *La Corona*—Donne's focalizer works to manuduct readers along a particular path; that is, by leading them along a *ductus* following the medieval conception of *exitus/reditus*, he works to conform them to and baptize them into Christ's death—to unify them with Christ—so that they can attain resurrection. I contend that within these poems the focalizer leads the readers through the path of the soul identified by Bonaventure, from emanation, through exemplarity, and to consummation, or, in other words, along the path of *exitus/reditus* through Christ's Passion. The readers are led along these itineraries by being positioned as members of the church, for whom the focalizer is speaking as a representative.

"Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day"

As the heading indicates, "Upon the Annunciation when Good Friday Fell upon the Same Day" muses on the implications of the liturgical calendar celebrating the moveable feast (or fast) of Good Friday with the immoveable Feast of the Annunciation. The poem is highly context-dependent in a few ways which reveal its dialogical character. First, "Upon the Annunciation" is in dialogue with Scripture. However this dialogue looks a little different than it does in Herbert. Though the poem depends on scriptural events and context in order to convey meaning, it rarely, as in Herbert, reflects specific biblical phrases. For example, in line 8, the soul sees Christ as a cedar: "She sees a cedar plant itself and fall." Robin Robbins argues that, as cedar was not planted in Britain until 1645, the use of cedar as a type of tall tree also calls to mind the *Song of Songs*, where the bridegroom is compared to cedars (491). In addition, the brief allusions to many biblical stories—those surrounding Mary at Golgotha (12), the angel Gabriel speaking to Mary (16), Jesus giving care of Mary to John on the cross (16), God's people being led by pillars of fire and cloud (31-32), and the Holy Spirit descending as tongues of fire in Acts (31) to identify a few—are necessary for the reader to know and remember in order to understand what the poem is doing.

The poem is dialogical in that it presents these stories to the reader in a new juxtaposition or comparison, as is prompted by the poem's controlling idea of the celebration of Annunciation and Good Friday simultaneously, thus presenting these stories in a new light. In addition to these more generalized examples of the dialogical tendencies of the poem, at least two lines also reuse and repurpose phrases or words that bring to mind specific passages. The first

example is identified by Robbins as containing phrases directly from the Vulgate: "Of th'angels *Ave* and *Consummatum est*" (22). Robbins points out that the "*Ave*" is a quotation of the first word the angel said to Mary (in English, "Hail") in Luke 1:28, while "*Consummatum est*" is the last statement of Christ on the Cross (in English, "It is finished") in John 19:30 (492). The second example is found in lines 35-36: "Or 'twas in him the same humility, that would be a man, and leave to be." These lines echo Philippians 2:3-11. Paul urges the Philippians to have "mekenes of minde" in verse 3, which is a translation of *humilitate* in the Vulgate (*Biblia Sacra*), and in verse 5 urges, "let the same minde be in you that was even in Christ Jesus" going on to praise him as he "made him self of no reputation" (2:7) and "humbled him self, and became obedient unto the death, even the death of the crosse" (2:8). The lines refer to the double humility of incarnation and death, and "the same humility" in Donne echoes the "same minde" in Philippians 2.

Secondly, the poem is in dialogue with the liturgy. This is evident not only in the title and topic of the poem, which celebrates the liturgical coincidence which makes March 25, 1608 a "doubtful day / of feast or fast" (5-6), but also in other references to the Church. First, the focalizer declares, "my soul eats twice" (2), which alludes to the two separate liturgical celebrations held on the same day (Donne 490). Later in the poem, Donne directly discusses the Church as "God's Court of Faculties" (23), as the guide by which we know God (29), and as the "imitating Spouse" (39) which declares that "sometimes and seldom" (24) the celebrations of the Annunciation and the Passion should be joined.

Thirdly, Donne's poem also is in dialogue with other contemporary interests and scientific developments, particularly those regarding exploration

and navigation. Donne, writing in the middle of the Age of Exploration, often is drawn to images of maps or travel in his poetry (for instance, in "Hymn to God My God in My Sickness" and "The Good Morrow"). In "Upon the Annunciation," Donne utilizes two related similes—that of maps and that of navigation by the stars. First, he compares the way the double commemoration of the day makes an "abridgement of Christ's story" (20) with "plain maps" in which "the furthest West is East" (21). Secondly, he compares God to true North and the Church to the North Star, which "strays not far" (28) and thus is how we know where North is.

Scripture, liturgy, and terms regarding navigation and exploration are certainly "texts" which Donne's readers likely would have reencountered after reading "Upon the Annunciation." In addition, these second encounters with texts would be influenced by readers' memory of the poem. For instance, though Donne's evocations of scriptural texts allow him to compress depth of meaning into his poems, the poems also juxtapose certain texts and create associations between ideas. Readers may, for instance, upon hearing references to the fiery pillar in the story of Exodus, be reminded of the Holy Spirit descending as flame on Pentecost (Acts 2:3-4), as this is the association Donne's poem makes: "His Spirit as his fiery pillar doth / Lead" (31-32). Such an association between the fires through which God makes himself known is not necessarily new to Donne, but his poem could create awareness of or merely reinforce such an association in readers. Or, regarding the text's dialogue with the liturgy, a reader on the day of March 25, as the first day of the new year and celebrating the Annunciation—even if such a celebration was less central to the Protestant church than the

Roman Catholic church—would also recall to mind Christ's Passion as the fulfilling event, even on the years on which Good Friday fell on a different date.

Like the dialogical characteristics of this poem, the temporal tendencies of this poem are brought to the foreground in its subject matter. The temporal unfolding of the *ductus* of the poem will be discussed presently, but the conception of temporality—time and eternity—within the poem exposes the importance of time to the soul's journey toward God. The church lives in a cycle of feasts and fasts, and the Annunciation and Good Friday on the same day make the day both a feast and a fast: "this doubtful day / of feast or fast" (5-6). It is a "doubtful" day, because the question of feasting or fasting is important and confusing. As Rosalie Colie puts it, the liturgical calendar on this particular year,

> provided . . . a temporal and sublunary illustration of the concurrence in divinity of all temporally linear events. 'Feast and fast' are compressed into one day, as if to confuse the true worshipper. . . . Both acts are appropriate, and simultaneously so, since Christ is always present, though no longer bodily on earth as an historical personage. . . . The figural tradition of Christianity, glossing Scripture always *sub specie aeternitatis*, stresses the simultaneity of all significant spiritual events, however disjunctive chronologically. (136)

In "Upon the Annunciation," the simultaneity of the events is further emphasized by the persistent use of the present tense throughout: she [the soul] "sees him man," (3) and "sees at once" (11). The focalizer also identifies the day as today: "Tamely, frail body, abstain today: today / My soul eats twice" (1-2) and "She all this day affords" (44). In this use of present tense "the poem focuses upon conjunctions rather than foreshadowings," as Lewalski argues (*Protestant Poetics* 256). Furthermore, Lewalski claims that the poem, "is not a meditation upon either or both events celebrated on that day, nor yet upon their Divine Actor. . . . It treats the coincidence of these feasts upon a single day as an emblem

of the perfect circularity and unity of the Christian vision" (256). In fact, the poem explicitly presents the circle as an emblem: "Of both them a circle emblem is, / Whose first and last concur" (4-5). One more interesting use of tense, which both emphasizes the temporal character of the poem and disrupts easy categorization of the poem's time, is the repetition of variations of a phrase in lines 2, 6, and 40. In line 2, the focalizer says "Christ hither and away," that is, giving Christ directional movement in the present. Line 6 says, "Christ came, and went away," putting it in the past. Line 40 says, "He shall come, he is gone," stating the same thing in the closest thing English has to a future tense. The repetition with difference ensures that, despite the circular character of the poem, the *ductus* of the poem is not reducible to a circle of merely identical repetition.

This poem is by no means the only work of John Donne in which "the circle assumes the status of controlling metaphor" (Fischler 169). In his article, "'Lines Which Circles Do Contain': Circles, the Cross, and Donne's Dialectic Scheme of Salvation," Alan Fischler investigates Donne's "most significant references to circles and, on the basis of these and his ideas about the figure of the cross, to propose a geometric model which embodies his scheme of salvation" (170). Fischler argues that the conception of human life and existence as circular is "integral to the most fundamental archetypes of literature and religion" (170). In Fischler's understanding, the concept of life as circular is not necessarily tied to the Christian liturgy, but exists in multiple cultures (170). What makes Donne's portrayal of the circle as an emblem significant is its relationship to views of time and eternity. Gary Waller claims, "As seventeenth-century science matured, the nature and meaning of time gradually became a matter for purely empirical investigation. . . . But earlier in the century, during

Donne's lifetime, time is still treated primarily as a theological matter" (80). Waller argues that Donne's view of time changes over the course of his life (Waller is one of the few critics who remembers to view Donne's statements about a particular subject as spread out over the course of his lifetime rather than all views being held simultaneously), and that Donne "progressively comes to accept the traditional Christian antithesis of time and eternity" (85). Waller asserts that time in "Upon the Annunciation" is, therefore, not merely circular, but is transformed into eternity. In other words, the circular character of time here is not merely pagan, but is transformed to eternity through the confluence of the circular character of time and the importance of the two events celebrated—Christ's conception and therefore Incarnation and his Death—as points in which Christ crosses the barrier between eternity and time.

The communicative tendencies of this poem are evident in similar ways to many of Herrick's poems, in that they do not necessarily conflate the reader and speaker as some of Herbert's poems do, but establish the reader as a fellow-speaker or fellow-witness within the same community as the focalizer. However, while Herrick's community is often unspecified, Donne's community is specifically the church. First, the addressee and focalizer of "Upon the Annunciation" are occasionally misunderstood. Michael Schoenfeldt, for instance, identifies this poem as one of Donne's poems which imitates the psalms in using the "poetical device of the dialogue of a man with his soul" (40-41). However, the poem does not address the soul until the last two lines of the poem. In assuming a grammar of representation and spatializing his reading of the poem—that is, in this case, ignoring the temporal unfolding of the poem—Shoenfeldt sees what is true of a part as applicable to the whole. Instead, the

poem's first line identifies the addressee: the "frail body" (1). In one sense the body can be understood as the focalizer's own "frail body." In another sense, however, this could be the Body of Christ, or the Church. The poem is at once both individual and communal. The focalizer asks the body to abstain because "My soul eats twice" (2). However, the soul is not the focalizer of the poem either. Not only does the focalizer describe the soul's actions using "my soul" (2), the poem goes on to speak of the soul in the third person: "She sees" (3, 7, 8, 11). As the soul is only a direct participant as the addressee in the first few lines, Schoenfeldt's claim that the poem contains a dialogue with the soul seems inadequate. On the other hand, Mary Radzinowicz identifies a category of Psalms in which the soul is addressed as the "*anima mea*" Psalms, claiming that their purpose was for the psalmist to "[speak] for himself in a context where those who heard him asked that he speak for them and to them" (43). By opening with the *anima mea* formula, even while discarding it soon after, the focalizer may be drawing on the implications of this type of psalm. Radzinowicz goes on to elaborate on this device within the context of "Upon the Annunciation" and the paradoxes it celebrates, concluding,

> The paradoxes are not psalmic, the use of paradox as a stimulus to faith is not psalmic, and the address to the soul in the poem is subsidiary to the enjoyment of paradox. Here Donne uses the *anima mea* device to recommend an activity not natural to the soul in the psalter. Nonetheless in 1608 the value of liturgy, the strength of personal faith, and the usefulness of the psalm figure are clearly drawing together in the poet's mind. (50-51)

The use of the *anima mea* device at the end of the poem, in addition to the address to the "body" which begins the poem, further emphasizes the dual individual and communal character of the poem.

Furthermore, the communicative and communal character of the poem is established to an even greater extent in the first-person pronouns within the second half of the poem. The first half of the poem, though addressing the body and discussing the focalizer's soul's observations, does not use first-person pronouns after line 2. However, in line 25, the focalizer shifts perspectives. The focalizer begins to discuss the character of the Church, using a simile comparing the Church to the North Star as mentioned earlier. The focalizer includes the reader in establishing the simile: "As by the self-fixed Pole we never do / Direct our course" (25). The word "we" then occurs in lines 27, 29, and 30. The last occurrence discusses "we" following the motion of the Church in order to follow God. Thus, the reader as a member of the Church is drawn into participating in Donne's observations and, after line 25, to being a member of the community for whom Donne is speaking, namely, the Church. Lastly, the final two lines address the soul and return to singular first person: "This treasure then, in gross, my soul uplay, / And in my life retail it every day" (45-46). The phrase "my soul" in line 45 mirrors "my soul" in line 2, and the short sentence directly addressing the focalizer's self—the body in the first lines and the soul in the last lines—bring the poem full circle, so that the "first and last concur" (5). Overall, through the progress of the poem, the readers are led from an external perspective to a involved perspective, led from hearing the focalizer speak to the focalizer's own body, to understanding they are, in fact, a part of that body and speaking in community with the focalizer, until, at the end of the poem, the focalizer's attention turns inward once more, leaving the readers as observers again. When the readers are externally observing at the beginning and end of the poem, the focalizer models behavior for the readers to follow; when the readers are

positioned as fellow-members of a community with the focalizer, the focalizer leads the readers through specific comparisons and understandings of the Church.

The itinerary of "Upon the Annunciation" follows a cyclical pattern. The poem begins with a decision to fast physically as there are two occasions for spiritual nourishment. The poem then details the observations of the soul, as the soul experiences, in the present, the events of both the Annunciation and Passion. The first step in the *ductus* is "Christ hither and away" (2). Christ is shown to be God in that his "first and last concur" (5). Despite already having declared that he or she will fast, the focalizer says it is a "doubtful day / Of feast or fast" (5-6) as "Christ came, and went away" (6). The focalizer goes on to describe the soul's comprehension of the event in a series of images: Christ becoming nothing in both his incarnation and death (7), a cedar planting itself and falling (8), the "the head / Of life at once not yet alive and dead" (9-10). The focalizer next moves on to describe Mary's role in both the Annunciation and the Crucifixion (11-18).[82] The focalizer then summarizes the events so far by declaring "All this, and all between, this day hath shown, / Th'abridgement of Christ's story" (19-20). What is important here is the "all between." Though the simultaneous celebration "makes one / (As in plain maps, the furthest West is East) / Of th'angels *Ave* and *Consummatum est*" (20-2), the "all between," the rest of the map, still matters. Christ's life, between the Annunciation and Passion is still important. In addition, in the life of the Church, the time between Christ's ascension and return is important. Next the focalizer praises the Church. Hugh Kirkpatrick glosses the next lines by declaring that "The function of a court of faculties . . . is to grant licenses, permissions, dispensations, and exceptional

rulings, as on such a day as this. In her wisdom, the church but rarely allows the coincidence of these two events, of joy and of mourning" (39). The focalizer goes on to compare the Church to the North Star which allows us to know God, as the North Star allows us to know true North. Next the focalizer compares the Holy Spirit and the Church to pillars of fire and to cloud.

The focalizer then plainly identifies three things that the Church means by allowing the celebration of both events at once: "This Church, by letting these days join, hath shown . . ." (32). The three things that Donne argues that the Church teaches us through the coincidence of days are about humans, Christ, and God. First, that "Death and conception in mankind is one" (33). Robbins points out that Donne's poetry often links sex and death (493), but I contend that an additional (and more relevant) reading is that the Church hopes to teach that humans are mortal and sinful from the point of conception, and that to be conceived is to eventually die. Secondly, the Church, by this day, teaches about Christ: "'twas in him the same humility, / that he would be a man, and leave to be" (35-6). Donne argues that through this doubtful day we are taught about Christ's double humility in becoming man and in dying. As Philippians 2:7-8 says, "He made him self of no reputation, and toke on him the forme of a servant, and was made like unto men, and was fou-de [*sic*] in shape as a man. He humbled him self, and became obedient unto the death, even the death of the crosse." Thirdly, the Church teaches about God: "As creation he had made as God, / With the last judgement but one period" (37-38). As God is eternal, so there is no time difference between Creation and Judgment in God. This last lesson emphasizes again the view of time as a created entity and the appropriateness of a circle emblem for God and eternity. The focalizer goes on to

point out that the Church, as Christ's "imitating Spouse" (39) in celebrating the Annunciation and Good Friday on the same day is copying God by combining "Manhood's extremes" (40). Therefore, readers, as a part of the church, are also following God in reading this poem in celebration of the "doubtful day." The focalizer then moves to an extreme or contradiction of a different kind. The focalizer argues that "one blood-drop, which thence did fall, / Accepted, would have served, he yet shed all" (41). The focalizer compares the extravagance of Christ's sacrifice in shedding all his blood to the extravagance of spiritual nourishment of the single day which celebrates the Annunciation, the Crucifixion, and everything in between.

Finally, Kirkpatrick explains regarding the final lines, that the soul "uplaying" (45) or storing away the "treasure" (45) "leads the mind back to the opening lines where the body is to abstain while the soul tastes a doubly rich portion" (Kirkpatrick 39). Kirkpatrick continues, "This subtle return from last to first completes the image of the circle as symbol of Christ's life and man's life, of the unity of birth and death and of all beginnings and endings, and of the destruction of time by eternity" (39). While Kirkpatrick is correct in noticing the way that the end of the poem returns to the beginning, his reading is reductive. The concepts of abstaining and uplaying are indeed linked as Kirkpatrick argues, but as opposites. Though the end of the poem echoes the beginning, it is repetition with a difference. The difference, impossible without memory and indicative of progression, is an important part of what distinguishes liturgical time from pagan cyclical time, and, more particularly, what separates the *ductus* of journey of the soul toward God from pagan ideas of cycles of life, death, and rebirth.

In Chapter Two, we examined the path of the soul toward God according to Bonaventure and other medieval authors. As discussed, Bonaventure identifies three parts of the journey: emanation (*exitus*), exemplarity (imitation of Christ, or the pattern of Christ's life) and consummation (*reditus*, or the union of the soul with God) (49; sec. 10). In "Upon the Annunciation," the exemplarity or the "through Christ" part of the journey is emphasized throughout the poem. First, the earlier mentioned "all between" emphasizes that in plain maps the oneness of West and East does not negate the importance of the rest of the map. Secondly, the Church is the "imitating Spouse" (39), which attempts to imitate Christ in other ways besides "join[ing] in one / Manhood's extremes" (39-40). Thirdly, and finally the focalizer declares that "though the least of his pains, deeds or words, / Would busy a life, she all this day affords" (43-44). The "all," here, is all of Christ's pains, deeds, and words. The poem's return to the beginning in the next two and final lines comes only after discussing Christ's life and death, and that is the important source of difference.

Overall, the focalizer leads the reader—through the poem's communicative character in drawing the reader to be a part of the community, specifically part of the Church—along a path which recounts the paradoxical observations of an individual soul before moving into the lessons that the Church teaches and ending with a brief discussion of Christ's shed blood being sufficient for salvation (it "would have served" (42)) before concluding with the charge of the focalizer to his soul to "uplay" (45) the lessons/"treasure" (45) and "retail it every day" (46). The itinerary of the poem's journey toward union with God leads reader from concern with the individual soul, through participation in the Church, and finally through acceptance of Christ's blood. In addition,

throughout this *ductus*, the poem continually and periodically returns to the concept of "today" (1), "this day" (5, 19, 44), "these days" (24, 33), and ends with "every day" (46). Thus the poem not only celebrates the cycle of feasting, but models the exit and return of readers along their journey through coming back to acknowledgement of the day. The *skopos* of the poem, then, leads the reader, if they follow the model of the focalizer, to a soul full of "treasure" which is "retailed" daily. As the treasure is "his pains, deeds, or words" (43) uplaid in the soul, the soul is full of knowledge of Christ, and thus united with God. "Retail" in this context seems more likely to mean the second and third definitions given in the OED than the first, which is "to sell (goods) by retail" ("Retail, v.," def. 1). Both definitions 2, "To parcel out," and 3, "to recount or tell again in detail; to repeat to others" seem more probable. Utilizing these definitions, the last line means either to parcel out every day or to recount every day the "pains, deeds or words" (43) of Christ from a few lines earlier. The particular *skopos* of this poem is the soul's comprehension of Christ and further plans to pass on this "treasure" to others.

"Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day"

Unlike "Upon the Annunciation," "Good Friday: Made as I was Riding Westward that Day" is one of Donne's more anthologized poems. Like "Upon the Annunciation," however, "Good Friday," when read while relying on a grammar of participation, invites readers to participate in the focalizer's journey and leads readers along a particular *ductus* toward the *skopos* of a fuller comprehension of Christ. This poem 1) leads readers to follow the focalizer in acknowledging that they are currently riding away from Christ (*exitus* or

emanation), 2) manuducts readers through contemplation and comprehension of the suffering of Christ and through incorporation into the Church (exemplarity) and 3) provides the focalizer as a model for deciding to look at Christ face to face in order to know him despite deadly consequences (*reditus* or consummation).

As in the other poems we have examined thus far, this poem accomplishes the manuduction of the reader along its itinerary through its dialogical, temporal, and communicative characteristics. "Good Friday" is in dialogue with Scripture, meditational practices, and both classical and Christian traditions. In addition to familiarity with the general story of the Crucifixion, this poem, more than "Upon the Annunciation" makes references to specific verses and utilizes phraseological adaptation. For instance, the focalizer declares, "Who sees God's face, that is self life must die" (17). This line clearly refers to Exodus 33:20, when Moses is told that no one can look at God's face and live; the focalizer, however, goes on to take the information further, exclaiming, "What a death were it then to see God die!" (18). The concern with facing God reoccurs in the last line when the focalizer petitions, "Restore thine image so much by thy grace, / That thou may'st know me, and I'll turn my face" (21-22). Seeing God face-to-face is also scripturally linked to the concept of full knowledge of God. According to I Corinthians 13:11, "For now we se through a glasse darkely: but then *shal we se* face to face. Now I knowe in parte: but then shal I knowe even as I am knowen." The focalizer's goal is reciprocal knowing—he or she wants to know God, to see his face, but only after God's image is restored in him or herself. The idea of God's image is also an example of the poem's dialogue with Scripture. In Genesis 1:26, humans were created in the image of God, which was obscured or corrupted by the Fall.[83] Another instance of the poem's dialogue with Scripture is

God's footstool cracking (20), which refers both to Earth being God's footstool, as in Matthew 5:35, and to the earthquake at Christ's death, reported in Matthew 27:51. Yet another example is found in the focalizers petition that Christ will "Burn off my rusts and my deformity" (40). The image of God as a purifying, or even destroying, fire is present many times in Scripture, including I Corinthians 3:13 and Hebrews 12:25-29. The dialogue of this poem with Scripture is important in two ways. First, familiarity with these Scriptures is important for readers' comprehension of the poem at any significant level. Secondly, all of these scriptural passages are passages that readers of "Good Friday" in the seventeenth century were likely to re-encounter after reading this poem, though not all of them are associated in the liturgy with Good Friday. The poem thus draws readers to consider Christ's Passion when contemplating or encountering Scripture that would not otherwise necessarily be associated with the Good Friday story, such as the passage in I Corinthians 13:12 or the image of purifying fire in I Corinthians 3:13.

The poem is also in dialogue with meditational practice, particularly in regard to focusing on the senses. Low and Martz present "Good Friday" as typifying a meditational poem, following a traditional meditational structure similar to that in Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*. Low argues that one of the goals of the poem is to present a "metaphor for difficulties of meditating in less than ideal circumstances" (73). Low argues that the focalizer of the poem "who meditates is a man of the world, devout and wishing to do his duty but unable to escape the press of business and the distractions of life. The poem's achievement is that these common problems are not ignored but turned to account, poetically and devotionally" (73). As an example of meditational

thought, the poem is in dialogue with other meditations, especially those that meditate on the image of Christ on a Cross. The focalizer's refusal to look at Christ on the Cross is in sharp contrast with other meditations—whether in prose or poetry—whose goal is to focus on Christ's image, such as Donne's own Holy Sonnet IX, beginning, "What if this present were the world's last night?" The dialogue of the poem with other meditational practices highlights differences in meditations, and argues for a more flexible style of meditation. The focalizer can be understood as meditating while on a horse, and is still moved by God. The next time readers are tempted to be distracted from meditation by the business of life, perhaps remembering this poem will encourage them to contemplate Christ in the midst of other activities.

Thirdly, the poem's dialogue with both Christian and classical traditions is almost as important to understand as the poem's dialogue with Scripture, in order to appreciate the poem's persuasive ends. First, the poem subtly draws on Christian tradition throughout. For example in line 39, the focalizer prays, "O think me worth thine anger: punish me." The fact that the focalizer asks Christ to punish him in this line is significant as 39 is traditionally the number of lashes Christ received at the hands of Pilate's soldiers.[84] Secondly, regarding the heading, though different manuscripts have slightly different versions of the title, the basic concept, that the focalizer is riding westward on Good Friday is consistent. This is significant, as identifying riding as an activity of the focalizer "imbues [the] poem with added spiritual ramifications . . . [and] places this speaker within a very definite religious, literary, and visual tradition" (Malpezzi, "'As I Ride'" 24). Malpezzi argues that this poem is in dialogue with the traditional metaphor of the body as the horse and the rider as the soul.[85] The

image was used in sermons, including in Donne's own sermons (25), and elsewhere, to talk about the need for the soul to direct the course of the body (24), According to Malpezzi, the focalizer "at the beginning of the poem is not in control but is carried wherever his horse wishes" (26). Malpezzi goes onto explore the implications of the connection to this implicit metaphor contained within the poem's heading.

Next, the poem begins with the image of the soul as a sphere: "Let man's soul be a sphere" (1). As Sloane argues, in the wording of this line the focalizer "implies . . . that the sphere is something he has somewhat arbitrarily selected" (27). This further implies a certain level of intellectual detachment. The idea of spheres and their relationship to classical conceptions of the structure of the universe is fully explored in A. B. Chamber's important mid-twentieth-century article, "'Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward' the Poem and the Tradition." In addition to the role of spheres in conceptions of the universe, A. B. Chambers argues that classical tradition considered westward movement—following the sun, ocean currents, the movement of empires—to be the natural, rational, God-given directional movement ("Goodfriday" 13-14). Donne reverses this tradition, so that the "motion which should have been 'natural, uniform, and direct' is apparently wrong" (42). Instead, "the westward journey becomes not a rational movement but a departure from the Christian path, a turning away from light to enter the ways of darkness" (48). The underlying meaning of movement in the poem also includes the tradition of Christ as the Dayspring and therefore in the East (46), the tradition of Christ looking Westward from the Cross (Robbins 566), and the tradition of West being associated with death (Fischler 170). In the age of exploration that leads to Donne's use of images of maps and navigations, these

traditional metaphors and discussions about the character and structure of the universe would have resonated differently with readers after encountering Donne's use of these metaphors in this poem. For instance, readers setting off on a westward journey might consider their own spiritual journey, or reflect on whether or not their movement is in accordance with God's will.

The temporal characteristics of this poem can be seen most clearly in the poem's use of verb tense and memory. Unlike Herbert's "The Sacrifice" or Herrick's "*Rex Tragicus*," "Good Friday" does not treat the events of "Good Friday" as if they were currently happening. Instead, as Martin Elsky observes, the poem

> preserves the Passion as a past historical event . . . at the same time as it maintains it as present, ongoing event, which the poet would witness were he riding in the right direction. The poem mediates this apparent temporal disparity with concept of remembrance, for though the poet is not riding to see Christ on the cross, the Passion is 'present yet unto my memory,' not as something recalled though absent, but as an event made present in both time and space. ("History" 69-70)

Elsky connects this particular characteristic with the way that some sixteenth- and seventeenth-century poets "arranged their meditative poems to follow the pattern of the Church's festivals, imitating in their poetry the Church's liturgical renewal of events in redemptive history" (69). The focalizer is well aware of the crucifixion as a past event, but it is "present" to his memory (34). The events of Good Friday are first told in past tense: Christ "did rise and fall" (13), and Christ's death "made his own lieutenant, Nature, shrink" (19) and "made his footstool crack" (20). However, after the events are declared "present yet unto my memory" (34), they are spoken of in the present tense: "thou look'st t'wards me, / O Saviour, as thou hang'st upon the tree" (35-6). The petition is also in

present tense, and the poem ends with a promise for the future: "I'll turn my face" (42). Memory in this poem makes past events present as it does in the liturgy.

As in "Upon the Annunciation," the focalizer in "Good Friday" employs the concepts of individuals and communities to present the focalizer as a representative as the Church, leading the reader along the poem's *ductus*. The poem begins with the reader as addressee, though this is implied by the imperative "let" (1) rather than a vocative. The focalizer also discusses "our souls" (7) rather than focusing on "my soul." This seems to imply that the first sentence (1-8), at least, is a conversational observation of the focalizer to the reader, while the reader, in the "our" is established as a participatory witness. The next section of the poem emphasizes the "I" of the focalizer, in some places providing identifying particulars: "I am carried t'wards the West" (9). However, the focalizer does not completely abandon the plural first person. The focalizer asks,

> Could I behold that endless height, which is
> Zenith to us and t'our antipodes,
> Humbled below us? Or that blood, which is
> The seat of all our souls if not of his . . . (23-26)

Despite the focalizer's shift of attention, the reader is still included in the "us" of humanity. More specifically, the reader becomes incorporated into the "us" of the Church, as the focalizer mentions Christ's "Sacrifice, which ransomed us" (32). However, the focalizer shifts from discussing Christ in the third person to directly addressing him using second-person pronouns and a vocative toward the end of the poem: "Thou look'st t'wards me, / O Savior, as thou hang'st upon the tree" (35). The focalizer's imperatives in the conclusion are not commands,

but petitions, leading the reader to participate in the focalizer's prayer alongside the focalizer, as a fellow-petitioner. As in "Upon the Annunciation," the focalizer both inducts the reader into the church—and thus into dialogue with Scripture, meditative practices, and traditions—and models behavior for the reader to follow.

In addition to the shifts from addressing the reader to addressing Christ and the incorporation of the reader into the Church, Sloane argues that Donne's manner of using emblems[86] and images invites readerly participation in the poem. Sloane's examination of Donne and Herbert's poetry in light of emblems leads her to conclude that the particular images and descriptions that Donne utilizes encourage the reader to "not merely watch" (48); instead, as readers:

> we are participants rather than observers much in the same way that we are participants in, rather than observers over, the emblem print. . . . Thus, we are not drawn into the poem through the description of psychological feelings or states but through the visual presentation of them. It is through the mental process needed to extract meaning from the visual images the poet uses that we begin to participate in the poem. (48-49)

Sloane argues that Donne and Herbert do not use emblems in their poetry in the traditional manner, but that their poems still utilize the emblematic tradition to invite the reader to participate in the poem. Sloane's observations of the participatory character of emblems and of the printed page in general contribute to an understanding of the ways that the development of printing not only contributed to the development of a grammar of representation, but also opened up possibilities for texts to be communicative in new ways. Donne's use of emblematic images draws readers to participate in the construction of the mental image formed by the words, and thus to build the emblematic image in their own mind. Then readers must further examine the images constructed for further

depth of meaning. By constructing the emblems verbally rather than visually, Donne's poetry gives the images a temporal dimension and ensures that no two readers "read" the exact same image, thus ensuring difference among individuals and "copies" of the image in a way that the printing of images challenges. In addition, by involving readers to this extent, the poems draw the reader further to participate in the *ductus* of the poem.

Quite a few scholars address the structure of the poem, and even note a progression within the poem. Some critics, like DiPasquale, argue that "Good Friday" has the structure of three sonnets (*Literature and Sacrament* 23), but Robbins claims, "Good Friday" "does not possess the rhyme-scheme or argumentative structure of [Donne's] real sonnets: it is in couplets, and [lines] 9, 23, and 37 do not exhibit the turn characteristic of [Donne]" (562). William Halewood, Chambers, and others read the poem as having a kind of error-correction itinerary. Halewood argues that the "sin" or "error" of the speaker in Goodfriday 1613 is the general fallenness of humanity (218), especially "*self*-devotion, hence desertion of God—a misdirection of the will" (219). In the end of the poem, this is corrected: "God enters to be spoken to, an event rhetorically signaled by a rush of vocatives that puts an end to question and debate, and closure for the work as a whole is effected by the 'ordinary miracle' of God's rectifying presence" (228). He compares God's presence at the end of the poem with God's presence at the end of the Book of Job. Richard Strier reacts against the error-correction reading of the poem, arguing that the poem ends with Donne wanting to look at God on Donne's own terms, only after he has already received the corrections and been made perfect ("Going" 23-24). DiPasquale reads the poem as demonstrating "the tension between human artifice and the

super-Natural act of generation that gives birth to redemption" (*Literature and Sacrament* 23). Ultimately, she claims that the error of the focalizer is that the focalizer "can never quite bring himself to surrender entirely to grace or to rely on God instead of the 'opus opertum' of his own poetic work" (119). Achsah Guibbory promotes a similar reading, claiming that the focalizer "both attempts to control God (thus persevering his individual separateness and autonomy) and seeks intimate union with God that would erase his separate identity" ("John Donne" 142). Each of these critics proposes an interpretation of the poem's itinerary, but—divorced as their suggestions are from other aspects of a grammar of participation—they miss certain key aspects. By reading "Good Friday" while relying on a grammar of participation, we can see that the structure of the poem is both progressive and cyclical, drawing the reader to follow the focalizer toward union with God in a way that scholars reading without an awareness of the grammar of participation might miss.

The itinerary of "Good Friday" begins with intellectual detachment and examination (Sloane 27)—"Let man's soul be a sphere…" (1)—and ends in strong emotion—"O think me worth thine anger: punish me" (39) and "Restore thine image so much by thy grace, / That thou may'st know me, and I'll turn my face" (41-42). The opening metaphor concerning the soul leads the reader to consider the state of his or her own soul and its connection to the rest of the universe, or "the other spheres" (3). The importance of the connection to other spheres is especially significant when we understand readers to be a part of those spheres. The inclusion of the reader in the "our souls" (7) which participate in the circular motion of "whirling" (8) means that the focalizer is continuing to manuduct the reader through the lessons about meditation on the Passion in which the

focalizer next engages. The focalizer continues by asking a series of questions, a technique which further draws the reader in to consider the questions. Chambers argues that the answer to all the questions, while on the surface is no, is actually yes ("Goodfriday" 50). For instance, despite declaring that he "durst not look" (29), he must dare to look as he is able to describe Christ's hand pierced with holes (21-22), Christ's blood (25-26), and Christ's flesh "ragg'd and torn" (27-28). After acknowledging that these things are present to his memory despite not facing them as he rides, the focalizer addresses Christ directly, asking for "corrections" (38) and purification. Finally, the poem reaches the *skopos* in the last line; the focalizer in "Good Friday" promises to turn his face to Christ, having already established earlier in the poem that it will mean his death. The state of detached investigation of the first part of the poem cannot be maintained after an encounter with the suffering Christ, even if Christ is "present" only to memory (34).

In addition to the progression from detached curiosity to passionate involvement, the poem also, like "Upon the Annunciation," presents circles as key images and metaphors, and through repeated returning to focus on what the focalizer sees, creates a *ductus* which itself is cyclical. First, the poem establishes the connections to spheres in the first few lines, as Chambers discusses ("Goodfriday" 1-8). Secondly, the poem presents a number of paradoxes that are slightly reminiscent of the simile of the map in "Upon the Annunciation":

> Hence is't that I am carried t'wards the West
> This day when my soul's form bends t'wards the East
> There I should see a sun by rising set,
> And by that setting endless day beget:
> But that Christ on this cross did rise and fall,
> Sin had eternally benighted all. (9-14)

In bringing opposites together in this manner, the focalizer highlights the circularity of the focalizer's understanding of the day. Next, the poem describes Christ as having "hands, which span the Poles, / And turn all spheres at once" (21-22), again emphasizing turning and circular motion. Despite all this mention of circles, the focalizer's path moves unwaveringly in one direction, westward, until the end of the poem, when at last the focalizer promises to turn to face Christ. In turning, the focalizer completes the circle, imitating Christ's circular motion in rising and falling and in turning the spheres.

The *exitus/reditus* motion along the *ductus* can be seen in the repeated focus on what the focalizer sees. The focalizer mentions what he sees or does not see in lines 11, 15, 21, 23, 29, 30, 33, 35, and 42. On a larger scale, the poem as a whole manuducts the reader through a tripartite structure of the journey of the soul to God which reflects Bonaventure's account. As the poem begins, the focalizer is "carried t'wards the West / This day when my soul's form bends t'wards the East" (9-10). That is, he is moving away from God in emanation. This is reinforced by the heading and all the texts with which the poem is in dialogue, as discussed earlier. Secondly, the focalizer moves to contemplate "that spectacle, of too much weight for me" (16), which is the image of Christ's Passion or exemplarity. The focalizer manuducts the reader through contemplation of Christ's suffering, and in doing so ultimately incorporates the reader into the church through declaring Christ "ransomed us" (32). The focalizer then models a response to Christ's suffering—namely, he asks for corrections for himself in order to "Burn off my rusts and my deformity" (40). Thirdly, and finally, the focalizer declares, "Restore thine image so much by thy grace, / That thou may'st know me, and I'll turn my face," (42) having decided that if Christ can

restore the image of God in him, he will look at Him face to face despite the deadly consequences that he established earlier. The focalizer, though not yet united with God in consummation, promises to make knowing God the highest priority. In addition, by incorporating the reader into the church and then modeling the response to Christ's suffering, the focalizer manuducts the reader to make the same decision.

La Corona

Finally, *La Corona*, like "Upon the Annunciation" and "Good Friday" also manuducts the reader through the itinerary of emanation, exemplarity, and consummation. I am not the first to make this observation, however. In Erin Colgrove's, "This Crown of Prayer and Praise: Worship in Donne's *La Corona*," she describes the movement of the soul along the path of *La Corona* as movement through worship (40-60). Colgrove also uses "the soul" in place of both "the reader" and "the speaker" at different points. Throughout her argument, she gestures toward *La Corona's* communicative and itinerant characteristics. She claims, that after the first sonnet,

> the soul begins a journey with Christ that will consider the work of Christ from the angel's announcement of his conception to his mother Mary ("Annunciation") to the celebration of his entrance into heaven ("Ascension"), then begin to reconsider it all again. . . . The arrival of Christ has impacted the heart of the worshipper, and the worshipper cannot refrain from verbally praising and declaring the newly arrived salvation. (40-41)

Though Colgrove's specific observations only occasionally coincide with my own, I contend that—similarly to critical observations of Herbert's sequence—accurate observations of the itinerary, and in this case, the communicative

tendencies, of the poems simply reinforce the idea that such poems ought to be read while assuming a grammar of participation.

La Corona is a cycle of seven sonnets in which the last line of one sonnet is repeated as the first line of the next. The first poem does not have its own subtitle, but the ensuing six subtitles name particular points in the life of Christ: "Annunciation," "Nativity," "Temple," "Crucifying," "Resurrection," and "Ascension." Gardner doubts that these subtitles are by Donne, arguing that in their inclusion "the unity of the poem is obscured" (57). *La Corona's* form is in dialogue with "the Italian secular genre" which linked sonnets in the same way (Sullivan 153).[87] Hodgson argues that the formal structure of the poems "emphasizes its own construction, its own made qualities" (54), and that the poem overall formulates Donne's theory of "sacred poetics" (54). Lewalski focuses on the qualities of the poem which work to present the poem as an artifact—as the "crown of prayer and praise" (1.1; 7.14)[88]—linking these qualities to the role of the poem as an emblem in its crown-structure and distinguishing between the "praise" and "prayer" in the first and last lines (*Protestant Poetics* 257-59).

The poem is also in extensive dialogue with Scripture and liturgy; Robbins identifies over seventy scriptural references in his edition of *La Corona*, quite a few of which he indicates are included in the Book of Common Prayer for prayers as part of the morning or evening service. For instance, Robbins notes that "with a strong, sober thirst, my soul attends" (1.12) echoes Psalm 42:2 (among others), which reads "My soule thirsteth for God, *even* for the living God." Robbins also points out that this Psalm is scheduled in the Book of Common Prayer for evening prayer two days after Epiphany (478). Scripture and

the Anglican liturgy permeate the entire poem.[89] Familiarity with Scripture and the liturgy adds depth and context to aid in understanding Donne's poem, and the poem, in turn, provides new connections and new perspective on the scriptural liturgical passages present in the poems. For instance, Donne links the desire for God from Psalm 42 with a desire for "endless rest" and even death: "at our ends begins our endless rest. / The first last end, now zealously possess'd, /With a strong, sober thirst, my soul attends" (10-12). The dialogue between texts means that the next time readers encounter Psalm 42 in church, they may understand the soul as thirsting not only for God, but for union with God at the end of all things. The poem, in this way, contributes to readers' understanding of Scripture.

Many critics also acknowledge that the poem is in dialogue with meditative practices, especially those related to saying the rosary. Martz argues that references to the Catholic practice of saying the rosary are unmistakable, found in "the title, the sevenfold division of materials, and the method of meditation followed" (107). Ceri Sullivan explains that the particular "Catholic tradition of saying the rosary using seven, rather than the more usual five decades" was known as a "corona" (153). Martz also points out that though Donne utilizes the rosary for structures, the content is carefully arranged around Anglican sensibilities: "Donne's sequence is . . . addressed to Christ, and the life of the Virgin is very carefully subordinated" (107). Low makes a similar claim that "Donne abandons the objectionable features of the rosary—beads, verbal repetitions, and too-great attention to the Virgin—yet retains much of his original. What chiefly characterizes the rosary as a devotion is that it is at once vocal and meditative" (Low 43). Though Donne may have adapted and altered

the form of the Corona, especially in paring down Marian praise, the dialogue between the poem and the meditative practice of saying the rosary is inescapable. However, Donne's poem, in providing sonnets concerning the life of Christ rather than the life of Mary, provides an alternative for contemplation. The dialogue with the text, then, may serve to soften more extreme Protestant readers' response to the idea of meditation.

Furthermore, the poem is in dialogue with major theological controversies of the time, as Herbert's "The Altar" is in dialogue with contemporary controversies about communion tables in churches or Herrick's "*Rex Tragicus*" is in dialogue with controversies over the theater. Daniel Gibbons explores a number of these controversies, demonstrating their pervasiveness throughout the poem and the deft manner in which the poem handles complex issues. For instance, in "Annunciation," the focalizer declares that Christ "Can take no sin, nor thou give" to Mary while in her womb. According to Gibbons, this line "allows room for at least three different theological affirmations: (1) Mary is herself sinless and therefore cannot pass Original Sin on to Jesus, (2) Christ is ontologically incapable of receiving the taint of original sin from her, or (3) both are true" (32). Gibbons argues that these careful inclusions of controversies are supposed to allow the reader to move through them and transcend them "into apprehension of divine mysteries which exceed the limitations of our logical faculties" (33). In addition, the poem provides an alternative to Mary as mediator despite her clear presence in the poem; R. R. Dubinski argues that "Donne makes integral use of the commonplace Protestant emphasis on Christ's mediatorial office"—that of King, Prophet, and Priest (207). The poem's careful skirting of both Puritan and Catholic interpretations while not ignoring the existence of the

controversial subjects lends the poem's greater concerns depth and force. While some authors write for a broad Christian audience by ignoring or trivializing doctrinal distinctions, Donne fearlessly acknowledges such distinctions as important, while still refusing to commit to either side of the debate. Readers encountering such issues in the future might be more willing to explore theology in search of truth rather than to argue for a predetermined point, and might be more willing to accept other Christian's faith as sincere, even while believing them to be wrong.

Overall this poem is in dialogue with multiple texts: poetic forms, Scripture, Scripture as part of the liturgy, the meditative practice of saying the rosary, and contemporary theological controversies. The readers' familiarity with these texts before reading the poem would affect their understanding of the poem; in addition, all of these texts are ones that readers would likely encounter after reading the poem, such that their previous reading of the poem could then affect their understanding of the texts. For instance, as indicated earlier, remembering *La Corona* when encountering Scripture could shade readers' understanding of certain verses, affect their views on meditation, and encourage them to engage in dialogue with other Christians with doctrinal differences. *La Corona's* content is nothing new or innovative—therefore, its impact on readers comes from the way that the poems slightly reframe issues relating to Mary, to the Incarnation, and to Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension.

The temporal tendencies of the poem can be seen in three ways. First, the action of the poem is depicted in the present tense or even immediate future tense. The poem continues in present tense throughout: Christ "yields himself" (2.5), "Now leaves His well-belov'd imprisonment" (3.2), and "speaks wonders"

(4.6). The focalizer also declares, "Now thou art lifted up" (5.12). Not only Christ's life is in the present tense, but also the petitions of the focalizer, who prays, "May then sin's sleep, and death's, soon from me pass" (6.12), who petitions Christ to "deign" to accept the crown the focalizer presents (1.1; 7.14), and who declares, "Salvation to all that will is nigh"(1.14; 2.1) and "with thine own blood quench thine own just wrath" (7.12). The last sonnet, "Annunciation," shifts to acknowledge the consequences of Christ's life, death, and resurrection in the past tense, though still addressing Christ in the present tense: "O strong ram, which hast battered heaven for me, / Mild lamb, which with thy blood hast marked the path, / Bright torch, which shin'st that I the way may see" (7.9-11). The meditational and prayer-like qualities of this poem allow the focalizer to describe the life of Christ as if he or she were watching it occur currently, while still acknowledging the eternal consequences of Christ's Passion and the present situation of the focalizer.

Secondly, this use of present tense throughout the poem should be understood as a liturgical conception of time rather than merely an a-temporal or extra-historical conception because of the connection between this poem and the Eucharist. DiPasquale argues that the poem itself is intended to act as a sacrament, "as a sacred offering that, like the Eucharist, cuts through space and time" (*Literature and Sacrament* 58). Through her demonstration of the connections between the Eucharist and this particular poem as a Sacrament, DiPasquale incidentally illustrates the ways in which this poem acts liturgically to make the past re-present to the memory.

Thirdly, the poem displays its tendencies toward the conception of liturgical time in its circular structure. As Gardner points out in her notes on the

poem, the first sonnet "might as well be called 'Advent' [as] its leading ideas and much of its phrasing are derived from the Advent Offices in the Roman Breviary" (57). As such, Advent is both the beginning of the Church calendar, looking forward to Christ's Nativity, and the logical succession to Christ's ascension in the seventh sonnet, looking forward to the next coming of Christ. Chambers calls this poem "the first-last poem," as it both begins and completes the circle of Christ's life ("*La Corona*" 166). In addition, Daniel Gibbons points out that the first sonnet is only "upon a first reading, the beginning of a sequence" (28). The poem's circular structure leads the reader to re-read the sequence, but the fact that the first sonnet's subject of looking forward to the Nativity changes upon rereading to looking forward to the Second Coming as well, means that the cycle is not merely circular, but also progressive, repetition with difference. Furthermore, such an understanding of the first poem as advent would not be possible without the poem's dialogue with the liturgy.

In addition to the communicative tendencies implied by the dialogical character of the poem, *La Corona* displays its communicative character particularly through the position that the focalizer claims and the resulting position into which readers are placed. Low asserts that *La Corona* is the least personal of Donne's religious poems as the focalizer is an everyman even when the focalizer claims to be a poet in the first stanza (50). However, while Low may be correct that the poem is relatively impersonal, the focalizer in the poem takes on the role of a priest or preacher. DiPasquale declares that the focalizer

> speaks as the priest or preacher whose voice leads the rest of the congregation, [and] his inclusion of phrases in the first-person plural and his direct address to a community of Christians . . . invite readers to make the poet/speaker's prayers their own. (*Literature and Sacrement* 95)

The focalizer's role of priest is further affirmed in "Ascension" when the focalizer exhorts readers to praise God, addressing them as "Ye whose true tears, or tribulation / Have purely washed or burnt your drossy clay" (7.3-4). In the focalizer's position of priest or preacher, the focalizer pulls the readers of the poem to participate, as in "Upon the Annunciation" and "Good Friday" by including them as part of the Church.

The focalizer further establishes the reader as a part of the church in the poem's particular use of first- and second-person pronouns. This becomes apparent if we trace the shifts in person over the trajectory of the entire sequence. The initial poem presents "this crown," (1.1) which is "weaved in my . . . melancholy" (1.2). The focalizer also refers to "my Muse" and asks that God "give me, / a crown of glory" (1.7-8). The focalizer then switches to the plural declaring that "The ends crown our works, but Thou crown'st our ends, / For at our ends begins our endless rest" (1.9-10). The focalizer then switches back to singular pronouns in referring to "my soul" (1.12). The second sonnet, "Annunciation," eschews first-person pronouns for descriptions of Christ's character and actions. In addition the poem is also ostensibly addressed to Mary, the "faithful Virgin" (2.5). The focalizer addresses her saying "in thy womb" and "thou art now / Thy maker's maker, and thy Father's mother" 2.11-12). Even more notably, according to A.D. Cousins and R. J. Webb, in "Annunciation, "the poem's persona creates a sacred tableau and then inserts himself into as an agent—rather than as, say, a mere witness" (136). The focalizer asserts his or her presence as the implied speaker in the imperative "Lo" (2.5), and in the way that the focalizer continues on to lecture the Virgin, which Cousins and Webb consider "impertinent" (136). According to Cousins and Webb, this has the effect

of making Donne's persona the center of attention—something that continues into the "Nativity" (Cousins and Webb 137). While the extent to which the focalizer is the center of attention is debatable, the focalizer is clearly present throughout the "Annunciation," despite the lack of first-person pronouns.

The shifts in person continue in the third sonnet, "Nativity," which again refers to "my soul." However, the addressee in this sonnet is complicated by a shifting mode of speech. The focalizer exclaims, "But oh! for thee, for him, hath th'inn no room?" (3.5). The "thee" seems to be the same second person as in the previous sonnet which ends, as this begins, with a statement about "thy dear womb" (2.14, 3.1). The focalizer then turns to directly address the focalizer's own soul: "Seest thou, my soul, with faith's eyes" (3.9). In "Temple," the focalizer begins by addressing Joseph: "Joseph, turn back: see where your child doth sit" (4.2). "Crucifying" begins with an unclear addressee, and still avoiding first-person pronouns, speaking about Christ in the third person, but begins to address Christ directly at the end: "Now thou art lifted up, draw me to thee, / And at thy death, giving such a liberal dole, / *Moist with one drop of Thy blood my dry soul*" (5.12-4). Next, in "Resurrection," the focalizer continues to use first person and to address Christ directly: "Death, whom thy death slew; nor shall to me / Fear of first or last death bring misery/ If in thy life-book my name thou enrol" (6.6-8) and "May then sin's sleep, and death's soon from me pass, / that, waked from both, I, again risen may / *Salute the last and everlasting day*" (6.12-4). Finally, in "Ascension," the focalizer addresses the reader directly for the first time. The focalizer commands "*Salute the last and everlasting day!*" (7.1), a command directed to the repentant and suffering church: "Ye whose true tears,

or tribulation / Have purely washed or burnt your drossy clay!" (7.3-4). The sestet turns again however to addressing Christ:

> O strong ram, which hast battered heaven for me,
> Mild lamb, which with thy blood hast marked the path,
> Bright torch, which shin'st that I the way may see,
> Oh, with thine own blood quench thine own just wrath,
> And if thy Holy Spirit my Muse did raise,
> *Deign at my hands this crown of prayer and praise*. (7.9-14)

The poem ends with a clear and individual address to God which echoes the beginning of the first sonnet. In both the first and last sonnet, however, the church is present—in the plural pronouns in the first sonnet and directly addressed in the last. Readers, as part of the Church, are thus included in the focalizer's address to God and included by being addressed and encouraged to praise God.

The structure or itinerary of *La Corona* is, as noted earlier, cyclical. Multiple critics discuss the implications of such a structure. Fischler argues that the circular structure foregrounds the "emphatic reversal of the cycle in Nature" in the events of Christ's life—he is born in Winter, which is associated with death, and dies in Spring, which is associated with life (173). In addition, Margaret Maurer's key article concerning the poems "circular argument" presents the multiple possible readings of the circle as intentional:

> The circle as shape and as motion is an emblem of the paradoxes of Christianity. God is beginning and end; and the story of the Redemption is replete with incidents in which the God-man is raised by being cast down. The circle as shape without beginning or end and the virtual and self-sustaining motion of rotation in which every fall at one point is a rise at another are thus especially appropriate to the story on which *La Corona* is based: the matter of the poem admits the full wealth of the circle's symbolic potential. (54)

Maurer also points out the paradoxes of the circle as it changes with perspective; for instance, it represents both perfection and nothing in mathematics (54). She argues that though Donne repeatedly draws attention to and draws inferences from circles within his poems, the particular implications of each circle changes in each instance (55). One use of a circular pattern that she does not mention, however, is the circular characteristic of the medieval conception of the itinerary of the journey of the soul to God, though she does discuss Augustinian ideas linking circles to prayer and praise.

In addition to the larger circle formed by the structure of the sonnets linked by first and last lines, the poems are also woven more tightly together by their rhymes. The repetition of lines links the rhyme scheme of each octave to the rhymes of the previous sestet (Nania and Klemp 49). In addition, the rhyme scheme of the sestets alternates between cddcee and cdcdee except for in the seventh sonnet "Ascension," with octaves remaining abbaabba throughout (49). John Nania and P.J. Klemp further point out that an alternating rhyme scheme with an odd number of sonnets leaves one sonnet in a central position (50). Nania and Klemp argue that "Temple" is the central sonnet based on the order in which the poems are presented (51); however, if we understand the poem to be a circle, the two sonnets with the same rhyme scheme are "Resurrection" and "Ascension," implying that the circle is balanced either between the two or on "Nativity." Nania and Klemp also argue for a few other patterns such as a movement from night to day and balanced images in sonnets one and seven, two and six, and three and five (51). Nania and Klemp's observations concerning the tight interweaving of the seven sonnets reinforce a reading of *La Corona* as a single poem rather than as seven sequential sonnets.

Though the overall itinerary of the poem is circular, there is still progression within the poem. In addition to the move from night to day that Nania and Klemp identify, Maurer observes that sonnets two, three, and four are full of more and more celebratory praise, while sonnets five, six, and seven end with petitions (64). Finally, though the last line of the poem leads to the first line, and the reader is led into the circle once more, the itinerary of the poem is progressive as it manuducts the reader toward eschatological beatitude. The itinerary through the life of Christ means that though the poem repeats the first line, it is repetition with a difference. Reading this poem while relying on a grammar of participation means that when the focalizer returns readers to the starting point, the readers are not the same as they were before, but have been brought to a place of being differently because of their itinerary through the life of Christ. In effect, only by relying on a grammar of participation do we begin to appreciate the character of the circle as involving both non-identical particularity and readerly participation.

La Corona begins with an "*exitus*" movement. Though it begins by directly addressing God, the addressee has become slightly unclear by the end of the poem. In the next few poems, as mentioned earlier, the poet avoids addressing God directly, despite almost doing so in "Nativity," until the last three lines of "Crucifying." Though the poem begins with direct address to God, that stance is almost immediately lost and not restored until the end of the fifth sonnet. In addition, the first sonnet could be, as observed earlier, understood as a kind of "Advent," in that it looks forward to the Nativity but also to the return of Christ after his Ascension. It begins by addressing God, petitioning him to "deign" to accept the poem as a "crown of prayer and praise" (1.1). The first sonnet acts to

establish the character of the poem and lead the reader from emphasis on world fame, the "vile crown of frail bays" (1.5) toward desire for "a crown of glory" (1.8) and salvation. The sonnet also gestures toward the *telos* of the poem (and of life) as a whole: "The ends crown our works, but Thou crown'st our ends / For at our ends begins our endless rest" (1.9-10). The sonnet finishes with a declaration that "'Tis time that heart and voice be lifted high: / *Salvation to all that will is nigh*" (1.13-4). The first sonnet manuducts the reader as a member of the church away from worldly concerns to spiritual desires, to "a strong, sober thirst" (1.12).

Next, the poem moves through the events in Christ's life which illustrate his own *exitus/reditus* movement. The second sonnet focuses on Christ's incarnation: "That All, which always is all everywhere" (2.2) "yields himself to lie / in prison" (2.5-6). DiPasquale argues that "the meeting of 'all' and "All" . . . initiates a verbal conflation of Christ and man" (*Literature and Sacrament* 68) a conflation which gains especial significance in "Resurrection." The final line, "*Immensity, cloistered in thy dear womb*" (2.14) not only indicates the disparity between the "maker" (2.12) and "flesh which death's force may try" (2.8), but also implies separation or isolation in the word "cloistered." In "Nativity," Christ continues to follow an "*exitus*" type movement. He "leaves His well-beloved imprisonment" (3.2), then goes further, into Egypt (3.13-4). As the reader is led along Christ's path, the reader also moves further away from the starting point of the poem.

The sonnet, "Temple," is central for a number of reasons, not only because it is the fourth of seven sonnets in the order they are presented. Chambers argues that though the story is generally considered relatively unimportant, the story is significant in biblical commentaries as a point which affirms that Christ is both

man and God. Christ's humanity is seen in his observation of the Passover and his obedience to his parents, while his divinity is seen in his ability to teach the leaders about God, His Father ("Meaning" 213). In addition, according to Nania and Klemp, this sonnet "marks the first time in the life of Christ (as Donne narrates it) in which the Saviour moves from a passive to an active role" (51) as in the gospel narratives. In addition, this section also "is an emblem for each man, who is nothing less than a temple of God" (53). Dubinski further argues that "what this episode clearly dramatizes is an anticipation of Christ's prophetic and teaching role that will be completely fulfilled in his public ministry" (206). Furthermore, in the *exitus/reditus* structure of Christ's life as it is presented in *La Corona*, this is the point at which the circle stops moving away from God and starts turning back. The poem emphasizes turning and change: "Joseph, turn back" (4.2), and "The Word but lately could not speak, and lo, / It suddenly speaks wonders" (4.5). The poem marks the beginning of the path of Christ back to God the Father: "He in his age's morning thus began" (4.13). In "Temple," the focalizer narrates Christ beginning to move back toward God the Father, Christ's *reditus*, and, through the communicative character of the poem, manuducts the reader along the same itinerary.

"Crucifying" is the section of the poem that shares subject matter with the rest of the poems we have examined. The beginning mostly focuses on the motivations of humanity: "He faith in some, envy in some begat;/For what weak spirits admire, ambitious hate. / In both affections many to him ran" (5.2-4). Next, the focalizer observes, and asks the readers to observe, Christ's suffering:

> Whose creature Fate is, now prescribe a fate,
> Measuring self-life's infinity to a span,
> Nay to an inch. Lo, where condemnéd he

> Bears his own cross with pain, yet by and by,
> When it bears him, he must bear more, and die. (5.7-11)

The events of Herbert's "The Sacrifice" and Herrick's "*Rex Tragicus*"—including the paradoxes—are compressed into these five lines. Though they are compressed, they are crucial to the movement of the poem. Only through Christ's suffering and death can the focalizer have the right to address God again, and to participate in his death and resurrection. The focalizer reflects the newly re-acquired right to address God by immediately moving to petition: "Now thou art lifted up, draw me to thee, / And at thy death, giving such liberal dole, / *Moist with one drop of Thy blood my dry soul*" (5.12-4). It is not enough to observe; the focalizer must participate by moistening his soul with Christ's blood. Low observes that in "Good Friday," the focalizer can not bear to look at Christ's blood, but here begs for one drop (47). While in "Good Friday," the focalizer's concern was the face of Christ, here, the focalizer's concern is Christ's blood. Seeing the face of God and participating in the Eucharist are two different aspects of eschatological beatitude, and between these two poems, Donne addresses both.

DiPasquale convincingly argues that this repeated line—"*Moist with one drop of Thy blood my dry soul*" (5.14, 6.1) is the climax of the poem. She argues that in the repetition of the line, "Donne does to a word what the Consecration does to the bread and wine—he changes its nature by changing its use" (*Literature and Sacrament* 81). Though in the other sonnets,

> each linking line acquires a subtly different sense as it appears in a new context, . . . we must wait until the first line of 'Resurrection' to see a dramatic shift in the use of a particular word, a pun that plays upon the possibility of the 'same' word being used as either a verb or an adjective. (81)

Between this changing nature of the word and the actual content which expresses the focalizer's desire for Christ's blood, this point of the poem is deeply Eucharistic. This reflects the connection between Christ and man in "Annunciation," and in "Resurrection "allow[s] the poet/speaker to feel that his own flesh is Eucharistically one with Christ's, that he can write of Christ's resurrection as his own" (68). DiPasquale's Eucharistic interpretation which identifies the focalizer with Christ is significant, as it helps make sense of why "Resurrection" focuses not as much on Christ's Resurrection on Easter as it does on the resurrection of the focalizer, and therefore on readers as part of Christ's church, at the end of time. Through Christ's blood at the end of the fifth sonnet, readers are able to accomplish St. Paul's goal in Philippians 3:10-11, of being "made conformable unto his death, If by anie meanes I might atteine unto the resurrection of the dead," a process traditionally pre-figured by baptism.

Finally, the last sonnet, narrates Christ's final *reditus*, his return to heaven—"Behold! The Highest, parting hence away, / Lightens the dark clouds which He treads upon" (7.5-6)—and his preparation for the Church entering heaven at the end of time—"first he, and he first, enters the way" (7.8). The sonnet also exhorts the Church—and therefore the readers as part of the Church—to rejoice at Christ's ascension and the promise it represents for the Church's eventual union with God. Low remarks that within this sonnet,

> The strong affections are reinforced by powerful rhythms, pauses, and elisions. Only two words in six lines are not monosyllables. The result is a sonnet best described as a potent and triumphant hymn. Outside of the sermons there is nothing else like it in Donne. (48-49)

In looking forward toward the Church entering heaven, the poem also looks to the "advent" implied in the first poem, as discussed earlier (DiPasquale,

Literature and Sacrament 89). The triumphant tone of this poem leads to a reunion of Christ with God and an anticipated reunion of the Church with God, and therefore readers with God as readers have been positioned as a member of the church. The union of the reader with God is further made likely by the revelation of the Holy Spirit, the Church's means of union with God in the time before the end of time, as possibly the focalizer's muse (7.13).

The final line of the poem brings readers back to the beginning of the cycle, but the readers, through understanding and following the "exemplar" of Christ's life, have been changed. Though the poem continues to lead readers through the circle once more, the experience of reading must be different a second time because the readers have been made different through the poem's manuduction of them toward participation in the life of the Trinity. A second reading might lead readers to deeper understanding of concepts that they encountered on a first reading, might encourage readers to action, or might refresh the readers' faith in the same way that meditation might. *La Corona* is not necessarily innovative, but in condensing the life of Christ into six sonnets framed by the same anticipatory sonnet at both the beginning and the end, it gives new life to familiar Scripture passages and images. For instance, the focalizer refers to Christ within Mary's womb as "light in dark" (2.13) and later as the "Bright torch, which shins'st that I the way may see" (7.11) in the same sonnet which begins "*Salute the last and everlasting day!*" (7.1). On the second reading, the image of "light in dark," which is contained within the darkness of Mary's womb, is an image of a much more powerful light, which better emphasizes the contradiction in the succeeding line, "Immensity, cloistered in thy dear womb" (2.14). Though the poem's structure forms a circle, the fact that

the experience of reading it a second time is different indicates that the circle does not indicate regression, but still indicates progression along the path of the journey of the soul toward God.

Conclusion

Of the poems of the three poets we have examined thus far, Donne's Good Friday poems most clearly echo the medieval account of the journey of the soul toward union with God; that is, they most clearly delineate the itinerary of *exitus/reditus* and of emanation, exemplarity, and consummation. In each of these poems as well, the focalizer seeks union with Christ in his resurrection through observation and participation in some manner in Christ's suffering. In "Upon the Annunciation," knowledge of God is eventually gathered and then given out like treasure. In "Good Friday," the focalizer determines that turning to see Christ's face is worth the deadly consequences. In *La Corona*, the focalizer moves through identification with Christ's life, death, and resurrection and continues to move through this cycle of meditation as he or she waits on Christ's return. Furthermore, the poems do not merely follow the structure of the medieval account or depict the focalizers following the poems' itinerary; instead, the focalizers manuduct readers through this itinerary by means of the poems' communicative characteristics which place readers in the role of members of the Church. Though many critics note the apparent structure of these poems, a structure is not an itinerary. In reading these poems while relying on a grammar of participation, they offer a potentially living itinerary, rather than a structure for readers to master, as they might if they assume a grammar of representation. The latter is clearly possible, but reading in such a manner arguably misses what

the poems uniquely offer. Though Donne's poems, unlike the poems of Herbert and Herrick, are not part of a sequence which is itself a part of a larger itinerary, they each manuduct their readers along the particular *ductus* toward the *skopos* of sharing in Christ's resurrection through meditation on and participation in Christ's suffering. The slight differences in the details of their itineraries do not negate the similarities of the shape of their paths or the fact that all three poems manuduct readers to the same end—eschatological beatitude—through the same means—by incorporating readers into the Church.

CHAPTER SIX

Epilogue: An Incomplete Grammar of Participation in Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*

Although this study does not attempt to consider all the Good Friday poems written or published in the seventeenth century, there are good reasons to consider one more significant Good Friday poem. Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* consists centrally of an 1840-line poem concerning Christ's Passion; it also includes a variety of occasional and dedicatory poems. The poem is significant not only because of its subject matter and quality, but also because it represents the first published work of its kind for a woman in Britain. Although the form of the poem differs from those we have considered thus far, briefly attempting to read *Salve Deus* in light of the characteristics we have been exploring is helpful both in understanding Lanyer's poem and in identifying commonalities between Herbert, Herrick, and Donne's poems that Lanyer does not always share.

Aemilia Lanyer was born Aemilia Bassano and baptized on 27 January 1569 (in the new style system of dates) into a family of court musicians (Woods xv-xvi). She grew up on the outskirts of the court, and continued to move on the fringes of the courtly society and to seek further entry as an adult. From her visits in 1597 to an astrologer, Simon Forman, we know more about Lanyer's life than official records might tell us. She was for a few years mistress to Henry Cary, Lord Hunsdon, the Lord Chamberlain of Queen Elizabeth. She apparently recalled that time fondly though he was 45 years older than she was. When she

eventually became pregnant with Hunsdon's child, she married the court musician Alphonso Lanyer (xvii-xxi). Sometime after this point and before Lanyer's only known work, *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, was published in 1611, Lanyer spent time with and visited Margaret Clifford, the Dowager Countess of Cumberland, at Cookham (xxvi). Alphonso Lanyer died in 1613, and Aemilia spent the next more than twenty years in lawsuits over rights to a hay and grain patent he had owned (xxvii). Lanyer founded a school in St. Giles in the Field in 1617, but it closed in 1619 due to what seems to be issues with the rent (xxvii-xxix). She eventually died on 3 April, 1645 after living out her days with her grandchildren (xxx).

The Text

Of the nine extant known copies of *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, five are complete or nearly complete (Woods xlvii). The full text consists of nine dedicatory poems to various noble women and "vertuous Ladies in general," two prose dedications—one to Lady Margaret Clifford, the Countess Dowager of Cumberland and one to "the Vertuous Reader"—the title poem, the first published English country house poem which is entitled "The Description of Cooke-ham" (xxxix-xl) and a short closing note, "To the doubtfull Reader." A few editions presumably intended for specific audiences lack certain chosen dedicatory poems (xlviii). The book was entered into the Stationers' Register on 2 October 1610 and officially published in 1611. Woods points out that the poem was therefore published in the same year as "the King James Bible, John Donne's *Anatomy of the World*, quartos of three Shakespeare plays, one Jonson play, a reprint of Marlowe's *Faustus*, Chapman's translation of Homer, and the first

collected edition of Edmund Spenser's *Works*" (xxx-xxxi). In such company, Lanyer's poem is sometimes overlooked, but quite a few scholars over the last few decades have worked to increase appreciation for Lanyer's poetry.

In examining this text I hope to establish three claims. First, I contend that the tendencies and characteristics I have examined thus far are not aspects common to all texts from this period concerning Christ's Passion. While some of these characteristics do appear in this particular text, they cannot merely be read into all texts. Secondly, I hope that this brief discussion of Lanyer's *Salve Deus* may contribute to readers' further understanding of both the poem's excellent qualities and the character of its limitations. Thirdly, Lanyer's writing illustrates that the inclusion of some of the four tendencies I have identified is not sufficient to enact reliance on a grammar of participation; rather, all four characteristics must work together.

There are more than a few characteristics that Herbert, Herrick, and Donne's biographies share that Lanyer does not. Two, however, in particular stand out as the result of lack of opportunity due to her gender and as having had visible effects on her poetry. First, Herbert, Herrick, and Donne each became priests at some point in their lives—a vocation that influenced their own poetry and which provided them with income while leaving opportunity to write poetry. Secondly, Herbert, Herrick, and Donne were all educated, particularly in rhetoric, at either Oxford or Cambridge, an educational opportunity that would have been denied to Lanyer. Lanyer addresses both the issue of priesthood and of scholarship in her poems.

First, though Lanyer is not a priest, her poems contain what Woods calls an "unapologetic creation of a community of good women for whom another

woman is the spokesperson and commemorator" (xxxi). Lanyer takes on the role of priest in two main ways: in teaching and interpreting Scripture and in presenting her poem as a kind of Sacrament. Theresa DiPasquale argues that interpreting the Scripture and administering the Sacrament are intertwined duties and functions: "In order to write the Scriptures anew and open their meaning for readers, the poet must be both prophet and priest; Lanyer believes she is called to just such a dual vocation" (*Refiguring* 126). Woods claims that Lanyer's interpretation is unique. She argues that while translation of religious works and writing of personal religious experience were acceptable for women's writing, Lanyer's poem is different in that it "claims biblical and historical authority and grants the viewpoint of women as much or greater authenticity as that of men" (xxxii). Lanyer is also aware of the rarity of what she proposes to do. In the opening stanza of the first poem in the book, "To the Queenes most Excellent Majestie," she asks, "Vouchsafe to view that which is seldome seene, / A Womans writing of divinest things" (3-4). Later, in the prose dedication, "To the Ladie *Margaret* Countesse Dowager of Cumberland," Lanyer declares, "so I / deliver to you the health of the soule" (9-10). Writing of divine things and considering the health of other people's souls are both duties of priests.

Another duty of priests is the interpretation of Scripture, a task which Lanyer clearly takes on. Achsah Guibbory particularly links Lanyer's interpretation of Scripture to her defiance of gender roles:

> Claiming the authority to reinterpret the Bible and the significance of the Crucifixion, joining the ranks of the (male) apostles and corrected their prescriptions for human behavior where they diverge from what seems to her the message of Jesus, Aemilia Lanyer takes the next logical step and defies the assumption that the priesthood is an exclusively male privilege. ("The Gospel" 207)

While earlier critics tend to see Lanyer as overturning traditional biblical interpretation, Carol Blessing argues that, instead, Lanyer is a part of a traditional strain of interpretation: "Lanyer's readings of the Passion accounts draw from a wealth of already feminized images of Christ's suffering, and of the suffering of the Virgin Mary" (Blessing 245). Frances James provides further support for the idea that Lanyer's interpretations are not completely original, but a furthering of certain traditions (James 64-67). Blessing argues that the understanding of Lanyer as writing within a tradition strengthens both Lanyer's feminist arguments and her biblical interpretations.

The second way that Lanyer claims priestly authority is through her presentation of her poetry as Eucharistic Sacrament, as DiPasquale claims (*Refiguring* 128). DiPasquale actually makes similar arguments for *La Corona* and *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* in two different works, but Lanyer's own words presenting the poem as a Eucharistic Sacrament are rather overt in places. In "To the Queenes most Excellent Majestie," Lanyer presents the poem as a

> . . . feast,
> To which your Highnesse is the welcom'st guest.
>
> For here I have prepar'd my Paschal Lambe,
> The figure of that living Sacrifice;
> Who dying, all th'Infernall powers orecame,
> That we with him t'Eternitie might rise:
> This pretious Passeover feed upon, O Queene,
> Let your faire Virtues in my Glasse be seene. (83-90)

In presenting her poem as the "Paschal Lambe," Lanyer "takes upon herself a sacerdotal function" (DiPasquale, *Refiguring* 128). Finally, within "Salve Deus Rex Judæorum," the stanza that begins the narration of Christ's first actions in the poem begins "That very Night our Saviour was betrayed" (329)—which echoes the beginning of the Eucharistic service drawn from I Corinthians 11:23:

"For I have received of the Lord that which I also have delivered unto you, *to wit*, That the Lord Jesus in the night he was betrayed, toke bread. . ."[90] Though Lanyer was not and could not have been a priest in the same way as Herbert, Herrick and Donne, through her assumption of the authority to interpret Scripture and her authority to present readers with a Eucharistic Sacrament, she takes on that role in *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*.[91]

Lanyer circumvents her lack of priestly authority and presents herself in that role despite her gender, but she is not so easily able to circumvent her lack of university education. Instead, she highlights her lack of "art," drawing on the traditional struggle between art and nature and placing herself along with other women on the side of nature. In two passages Lanyer dwells on her lack of scholarly art and skill. While these passages are part of the traditional expressions of a poet's humility, Lanyer turns them further to her advantage. First, in "To the Queenes most Excellent Majestie," Lanyer clearly links scholarship with men and allies her own writing both with nature and God's will as part of her defense for writing as a woman:

> And pardon me (faire Queene) though I presume,
> To do that which so many better can;
> Not that I Learning to my selfe assume,
> Or that I would compare with any man:
> But as they are Scholers, and by Art do write,
> So Nature yeelds my Soule a sad delight.
>
> And since all Arts at first from Nature came,
> That goodly Creature, Mother of Perfection,
> Whom *Joves* almighty hand at first did frame,
> Taking both her and hers in his protection:
> Why should not She now grace my barren Muse,
> And in a Woman all defects excuse. (145-156)

In these lines, as DiPasquale argues, Lanyer not only defends her lack of "Learning" but also allies unfallen nature—who God "at first" created—with

women (*Refiguring* 129). In another passage, from "The Authors Dreame to the Ladie *Marie*, the Countesse Dowager of *Pembrooke*," Lanyer both reminds her readers of the tension between art and nature—"Art and Nature strived" (81)—and presents a defense of nature rather than art:

> For to this Lady now I will repaire,
> Presenting her the fruits of idle houres;
> Thogh many Books she writes that are more rare,
> Yet there is hony in the meanest flowres:
>
> Which is both wholesome, and delights the taste:
> Though sugar be more finer, higher priz'd,
> Yet is the painefull Bee no whit disgrac'd
> Nor her faire wax, or hony more despiz'd.
>
> And though that learned damsell and the rest,
> Have in a higher style her Trophie fram'd;
> Yet these unlearned lines beeing my best,
> Of her great wisedom can no whit be blam'd. (193-204)

Here Lanyer does not identify learning as a masculine pursuit as she does in "To the Queenes most Excellent Majestie," but praises the learning of her potential patroness. However, she still defends her "unlearned lines" by comparing them to natural honey as opposed to more finer and refined sugar. In some ways, the "unlearned" character of Lanyer's poetry might be a factor in understanding how her poem only partially relies on a grammar of participation, especially if the characteristics of texts assuming a grammar of participation were learned implicitly through studying older texts as part of a university education.

Lanyer's differences from Herbert, Herrick, and Donne in these two ways stem at least partially from her gender, and influence the shape of her poems. Furthermore, DiPasquale brings together the two concepts of Lanyer's priesthood and embrace of the natural rather than artistic:

> For Lanyer, too, poetic priesthood involves celebrating female virtue, evoking Eucharistic presence, and directing her readers

> heavenward; but it also means bearing witness to what she believes to be the complete reconciliation, through Christ, of female Nature and Grace on earth. (*Refiguring* 132)

Despite its differing form, the subject matter of Lanyer's text falls clearly into the same theological and pedagogical category as the poems by Herbert, Herrick, and Donne that we have examined.

A Review of Literary Criticism

Though interest in Lanyer was renewed in the latter half of the twentieth century, the discussion of *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* was at first dominated by those who had a tendency to depict Lanyer as instrumentalizing Christ's Passion in order to gain patronage for her own poetry and present a proto-feminist argument. Woods describes the poem as having "a strong polemical thrust, attacking the vanity and blindness of men and justifying women's right to be free of masculine subjugation" (xxxv). Lanyer's concern with attitudes toward woman is clear in the way that "the book is dedicated and addressed only to women, assumes a community of intellectual women, and makes no serious apology for a woman poet publishing her own work" (xxxi). Furthermore, as Woods points out, "the book's only acknowledgement of masculine authority is the title page's description of Lanyer as 'Wife of Captain Alfonso Lanyer Servant to the Kings Majestie'" (xxxi). Other critics have a similar attitude. Barbara Lewalski, for instance, comments that "the title of Lanyer's volume promises, somewhat misleadingly, a collection of religious poetry," when instead, "the volume contains several kinds of poems, which together offer a protofeminist defence of women and of Lanyer as a woman poet" ("Re-Writing" 98). Lewalski

generally presents Lanyer's choice of topic as primarily something used to claim authority and gain patronage.

More recent criticism also occasionally takes this view, focusing on the feminist arguments and ignoring or dismissing the religious implications. For instance, Constance Furey focuses on the work's emphasis on relationships rather than individuality as a consequence of Lanyer's gender: "Lanyer impressed upon her readers that the very act of writing is relational" (471) in contrast to Donne, who "returns again and again to the problems of dependency and vulnerability that inhere in relationships" (473). In another example, Sidney Sondergard argues that "Lanyer rhetorically weakens the thrall of the existing male hierarchy" by claiming that "a hierarchical structure is inconsistent with the Christian value system" (88) and by redefining "power through the example of Christ's sacrifice" (89). This strain of criticism, which focuses almost exclusively on the feminist aspects of the text, risks becoming reductive and missing the poetic and theological richness of Lanyer's writing.

Though a few rare critics may fall to the opposite error and discuss the theological implications without paying attention to the feminist aspects of the poem, this is difficult to do credibly. Most recent criticism tends to take both the poem's feminism and its religious sincerity seriously. Guibbory, for example, presents a history of women's activities within the church and points out a contradiction of the Protestant Reformation. On one hand, "In getting rid of monastic orders and religious houses, it deprived women of a special form of sacred experience" ("The Gospel" 192). On the other hand, Protestantism had "the potential to give women equal access with men to the sacred. All were 'brethren' in God, all people could know God through reading the Scriptures,

and women as well as men could be touched by God's grace" (192). Guibbory argues that Lanyer's poem "asks to be taken seriously as religious poetry that adopts Christ's message to give a special place to women in devotion" (192). Guibbory depicts Lanyer as a "biblical interpreter who claims the status of a true apostle of Christ and even assumes a quasi-priestly role" (192). Blessing also endeavors "to show [Lanyer] as constructing a text that is one part of a significant discourse" (245), arguing that within the text, "If the major condemnation of women has come through religious structures and discourse, then to ally women with Christ is to overturn those objections" (241). Both Guibbory and Blessing portray Lanyer as a poet whose theology is inevitably informed by her experiences as a woman within her society.

The tendency of critics in the first category to see Lanyer as instrumentalizing Christ's Passion is odd when compared to other poets of the time. Though Donne is an example of a man living largely off patronage in the first decade of the seventeenth century, and his poem *La Corona* was accompanied by a poem to Margaret Herbert, asking for patronage perhaps more subtly than Lanyer's poems ask, I have not yet encountered a scholar who argues that Donne is instrumentalizing "prayer and praise" or the life of Christ. Perhaps Lanyer's lack of subtlety draws such accusations or her gender influences readers to doubt her devotional sincerity. More likely, however, the way that the poem only partially relies on a grammar of participation, in particular the tension between the itinerary of the poem and the itinerary of the poem's subject matter, manuducts readers toward a *skopos* when the poem's structure is not meant to lead the reader to a particular end. I contend that, overall, the poem has some characteristics and tendencies that might indicate its reliance on a grammar of

participation, but it is lacking in others. First, the poem is very clearly dialogical. Secondly, the poem has some temporal tendencies, but also exhibits a few signs of spatialization. Thirdly, the poem is not consistently communicative. And fourthly, the poem's *ductus* and *skopos* do not seem to always fit the poem's subject matter. Overall, the poem demonstrates an incomplete reliance on a grammar of participation.

Salve Deus Rex Judæorum

The other poems among which the title poem of "Salve Deus Rex Judæorum" is embedded often state explicitly what is implicit in the poem itself. For instance, in the prose dedication "To the Vertuous Reader," the focalizer clearly states that men who denigrate women are:

> evill disposed men, who forgetting they were borne of women, nourished of women, and that if it were not by the means of women, they would be quite extinguished out of the world, and a finall ende of them all, doe like Vipers deface the wombs wherein they were bred, onely to give way and utterance to their want of secretion and goodnesse. Such as these, were they that dishonoured Christ his Apostles and Prophets, putting them to shamefull deaths. (19-26)

Later in the dedication, the focalizer contrasts men with this attitude toward women with Christ's treatment of women:

> It pleased our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, without the assistance of man, beeing free from originall and all other sinnes, from the time of his conception, till the houre of his death, to be begotten of a woman, borne of a woman, nourished of a woman, obedient to a woman; and that he healed woman, pardoned women, comforted women: yea, even when he was in his greatest agonie and bloodie sweat, going to be crucified, and also in the last houre of his death, tooke care to dispose of a woman: after his resurrection, appeared first to a woman, sent a woman to declare his most glorious resurrection to the rest of his Disciples. (40-50)

What is explicit in "To the Vertuous Reader" is implicit in the title poem's dialogue with Scripture. Woods argues that this version of the story is "different" from the gospels "in being uniquely woman-centered throughout, chronicling female virtues and suffering as part of the poet's strategy for comforting and praising the Countess of Cumberland. Within that context, however, the story is a richly imagined version of the most central events of the Christian faith" (xxxvi). The dialogical character of the poem can be seen in the fact that the focalizer depends on her readers having previously known the story of the Passion in detail, purposefully drawing on the differences between other accounts of the Passion and her own. After reading Lanyer's account of the Passion, readers' understanding and interpretation of the story will be altered when they again encounter the story elsewhere. As Woods points out, Lanyer's account draws heavily from Matthew's account as the only Gospel which mentions the message of Pilate's wife, but she also take details from the other gospels, especially when they mention the women in the story (xxxvi). The poem is in dialogue with the story of the Passion in similar ways to Herbert's "The Sacrifice" and Herrick's "*Rex Tragicus*." The differences in interpretation that the focalizer leads readers to, however, are more extreme in Lanyer's poem.

In addition to dialogue with the story of Good Friday, the poem is also in dialogue with the Psalms, particularly in the stretch after the introduction of the poem before the narrative truly begins. Lines 73-144 are particularly Psalmic, containing lines such as "He rides upon the wings of all the windes, / and spreads the heav'ns with his all powrefull hand" (81-82) and "He searches out the secrets of all minds" (84), echoing Psalms 104 and 139 respectively. The dialogue of the poem with the Psalms also further establishes Lanyer's authority

as a woman writer. Where her stanzas echo Psalms, her writing can be compared to Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke's work finishing her brother's translation of the Psalms (Woods xxxii). Including these Psalmic stanzas near the beginning of the poem also establishes a dialogue between the poem and Scripture on a more common ground before the focalizer goes on to re-interpret the Passion story through women's eyes. These stanzas psalmically praising God establish the character of God as consistent between traditional interpretations and that of the focalizer.

While the poem's dialogical character is clear, the rest of the tendencies we have been examining thus far are less so. On one hand, the poem exhibits the liturgical tendency of making the past present through its use of flashbacks. The poem at different points digresses to make even further past events such as the Fall (761-840) and the Annunciation (1041-96) present. Between this pattern which could reflect a liturgical view of time and the Eucharistic overtones discussed earlier, the poem displays temporal tendencies similar to other poems by Herbert, Herrick, and Donne.

Despite these similarities, however, the poem leans more toward a spatialized view of knowledge, particularly in its focus on sight as the main mode of comprehension of Christ. For instance, in the dedicatory poem "To the Ladie *Anne*, Countesse of Dorcet," the focalizer claims "His death and passion here you may behold, / And view this Lambe, that to the world was sent" (116-17). In *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, the focalizer tells the addressee, Margaret Clifford, Countess Dowager of Cumberland,

> . . . In your heart I leave
> His perfect picture, where it still shall stand,

Deepely engraved in that holy shrine,
Environed with Love and Thoughts divine.

There you may see him as a God in glory,
And as a man in miserable case;
There may you reade his true and perfect storie,
His bleeding body there you may embrace,
And kisse his dying cheeks with teares of sorrow,
With joyfull griefe, you may intreat for grace;
And all your prayers, and your almes-deeds
May bring to stop his cruell wounds that bleeds. (1325-36)

The focalizer presents a static image as the focus for Lady Margaret's response, highlighting the location of the image by repeating the "there."

In addition to the focus on visual space, the poem's use of tense—while on the surface similar to the use of tense in other poems relying on a grammar of participation—reveals a kind of disregard for the internal temporal sequence that a manuductive poem would require. The poem, rather than using verb tense liturgically to make the past present, tends toward an ahistorical or atemporal attitude. The poem slips between past and present tense throughout its narrative. For instance, at the point in the poem when the focalizer begins to narrate the events of the passion, the story is told in past tense (329-76). The focalizer than changes to directly addressing Christ, and does so in the present tense (377) before going back to the past tense (385) and later back to the present tense for a few stanzas (545). While the use of present tense in places makes the narrative more vivid, its haphazard character does not reveal a liturgical view of time as switching between verb tenses might elsewhere.

In addition to haphazardly switching tenses, the poem also constantly switches addressees, occasionally at the same points, but often not. This hinders the poem's communicative potential. While the poem displays neither clear temporal tendencies, nor clear spatialized tendencies, the poem is discrete. As

earlier discussed, a poem should be considered communicative if it draws the reader to participate in the poem in some way. In the poems we have examined, we have seen that poems exhibit communicative tendencies by conflating the speaker and reader, by directly addressing the reader, and by incorporating the reader into a community with the focalizer such as the church. This poem displays none of these characteristics. Instead the poem is discrete—consistently locating the reader outside itself—as we can notice in the switch of addressees, in the particular identity of the focalizer, and in the particular way in which the poem uses plural first-person pronouns. We shall consider each of these elements in turn.

First, *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* begins by addressing Lady Margaret Clifford, Countess Dowager of Cumberland directly: "To thee great Countesse now I will applie / My Pen, write thy never dying fame" (9-10). Later the focalizer shifts from discussion of her muse in 265-66, to directly addressing her muse, asking, "But my deare Muse, now whither wouldst thou flie" (274), to addressing herself in the second person, talking about "thy weakling muse" (282). By this point in the poem, though the focalizer goes back to ostensibly addressing Lady Margaret, she is pretty much absent as Lanyer narrates the events of the Passion in mostly the third person. However, the focalizer at various points switches to address various characters directly: Christ (377-78), Peter (587-600), Caiphas (705), Pilate (749), Daughters of Jerusalem (985), and the Virgin Mary (1025). At various points in between, the focalizer returns to a third-person narration and finally finishes by addressing Lady Margaret. Though the addressee is ambiguous in places, the focalizer never really addresses or presents the implied reader as someone with whom the actual reader can identify.

Secondly, the identity of the focalizer is very particularly and narrowly established as Lanyer's poet-persona. More than the other poets we have studied, even Donne mentioning his ride westward in general terms, this focalizer refers to very singular events and relationships. The focalizer mentions, for instance, conversations with Lady Margaret about writing about Cooke-ham (17-24). She (and the focalizer clearly establishes herself as a "she" (15)) also identifies herself as the poet from the beginning (9, 11, 14, 17) and reminds the reader of the persona's presence right before beginning the narrative part of the poem: "His Death and Passion I desire to write, / and thee to reade, the blessed Soules delight" (271-72). She also declares near the end of the poem that her purpose in life is to declare the Countess's praise:

> And knowe, when first into this world I came,
> This charge was giv'n me by th'Eternall powers,
> Th'everlasting Trophie of thy fame,
> To build and decke it with the sweetest flowres
> That virtue yeelds; . . . (1457-1461)

The focalizer concludes the poem by reiterating the Countess's role as guide and the focalizer's identity as her servant:

> Great Ladie of my heart: I must commend
> You that appeare so faire in all mens sight:
> On your Deserts my Muses doe attend:
> You are the Articke Starre that guides my hand,
> All what I am, I rest at your command. (1836-1840)

From the beginning of the poem in its specific references to previous conversations and particular people to the end when the focalizer elaborates on the relationship between the focalizer and addressee, the focalizer establishes the particularities of her identity so specifically that it is difficult for any readerly identification with the speaker or the addressee to be maintained. In effect, the mode of address, despite its intentions, ends up sounding like a kind of "name

dropping" that excludes the reader rather than using the evocation of particularities to offer opportunities for recognition and shared experience.

Thirdly, though the focalizer occasionally uses plural first-person pronouns, they do not bring the reader in as part of a particular group or community. Instead, the "our" and "we" are typically only used in situations that acknowledge both the focalizer and Lady Margaret Clifford as part of humanity in general. The poem tends to use first-person plural in situations such as "our sinnes" (62), and "our sweet Saviour" (545), or, in Eve's apology when the focalizer is speaking indirectly through Pilate's wife, "our Sex" (767). The use of the first-person plural, however, is not consistent, nor generally indicative of a prayer in which the reader can join.

In addition to leaving little place for readerly recognition within the poem, the poem's discrete character is also enhanced through the focus of Lanyer's poem as an artifact. As earlier discussed, Lanyer attempts to present her poem as a Eucharistic Sacrament. Her terminology and wording in doing so, however, emphasize the poem as a book or as an artifact, a container that can be passed from mother to daughter. In "To the Ladie *Katherine* Countesse of Suffolke," Lanyer writes to encourage Lady Katherine to pass the work on to her daughters, saying, "And let your noble daughters likewise reade / This little Booke that I present to you; / On heavenly food let them vouchsafe to feede" (49-51). The characterization of the poem as a contained artifact emphasizes the poem's discrete character, rather than the communicative reading experience that a text would offer if it were relying on a grammar of participation.

Finally, the poem is cartographic rather than itinerant. Though it is possible to read this poem forcibly as itinerant, reading the poem in this mode is

actually to do this poem a disservice. The *ductus* of the poem would progress along these lines: from praise of the possible patroness, to a discussion of the attributes of God, to the story of the Passion, beginning with the betrayal of Judas, moving through Good Friday with digressions to the Fall and Annunciation, then to the Resurrection, then to praise of virtuous women and finally to praise of the patroness. Reading the poem while following this particular itinerary, beginning and ending as it does with a focus on Lady Margaret, is partly what leads readers to see Lanyer as instrumentalizing the Passion. The lack of a *ductus* moving toward the ultimate *telos* does not mean that Lanyer is unaware of the desire for the Beatific Vision. In "To the Ladie *Katherine* Countesse of Suffolke," she expresses her desire that the poem will assist the Lady Katherine in gaining this vision:

> And since his powre hath given me powre to write,
> A subject fit for you to looke upon,
> Wherein your soule may take no small delight,
> When her bright eyes beholds that holy one:
> By whose great wisdome, love, and speciall grace,
> Shee was created to behold his face. (13-18)

This expressed desire is not the only persuasive end of Lanyer's poetry, however. In fact, the poem has three persuasive goals: to provide an interpretation of Christ's Passion which will lead the reader to "behold his face" (18), to present an argument for the equal treatment of women before God, and to gain patronage for Lanyer as a poet. If we read the poem assuming a grammar of participation, the poem's *ductus* which focuses mostly on Christ's Passion leads to the *skopos* of establishing patronage, as the poem ends with Lanyer declaring that the Countess is her "Articke Starre that guides [her] hand" (1839). The tension or disconnect between the *ductus* and *skopos* leads readers to perhaps

think less of the quality of the poem or the skill of the poet. If, instead, we read the poem as cartographic, in which the three goals or *telē* of the text are all present to different degrees throughout the poem without one necessarily leading to another, the tension fades and the poem can be more fully appreciated and understood.

Conclusion

The differences between Herbert's, Herrick's, and Donne's Good Friday poems and Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, then, illustrate the key points I made in earlier chapters. First, the determination of whether a text relies on a grammar of participation or a grammar of representation is not always clear. The assumption and reliance of a text on one grammar or the other cannot be determined by the time at which a text was written. Nor does a text always clearly display characteristics of a text relying on either a grammar of participation or a grammar of representation. Instead, the text may display a mix of characteristics or tendencies. Secondly, the four characteristics or tendencies that I identified in earlier chapters are reliable indicators of which grammar a text assumes. That is, that a text assuming a grammar of participation will be dialogical, temporal, communicative, and itinerant rather than monological, spatial, discrete, and cartographic as in a text assuming a grammar of representation. These characteristics and tendencies, however, are only indicators, and a text must have all four characteristics working in concert in order to be considered a text that assumes a grammar of participation. In addition, as the discussion of Lanyer's work demonstrated, these tendencies and characteristics are indeed present in some texts and absent in others rather than

being characteristics that can be read into any text. Thirdly, reading texts while assuming their appropriate grammar provides deeper understanding of the texts, while reading them according to their wrong grammar leads to misinterpretation or missing part of their import.

While reading the Good Friday poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne while relying on a grammar of participation leads to a deeper understanding of the itinerary of the sequences of Herbert's and Herrick's poems and a clearer picture of Donne's understanding of the journey of the soul to God, attempting to read Lanyer's Good Friday poem while relying on the same grammar leads to a misguided emphasis on certain aspects of the poem while obscuring others. First, the poems of Herbert, Herrick, Donne, and Lanyer all exhibit dialogical characteristics, especially in regard to Scripture and liturgy. Each of their poems depends on readers' familiarity with external texts such as Scripture and liturgy to enhance comprehension and add depth to readers' interpretations. Furthermore, the poems' dialogue with these other texts influences the comprehension of these texts when they are reencountered after reading the poem. Secondly, the poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne all exhibit temporal characteristics, while Lanyer's poetry does so to a limited extent. In Herbert, Herrick, and Donne, this means that the poems both reflect a liturgical view of time and depend on a temporally-unfolding reading experience for correct comprehension. Lanyer's poem, though gesturing toward comprehension of the significance of liturgical time, assumes a spatialized view of knowledge which is heavily dependent upon sight. Thirdly, while the poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne all exhibit communicative tendencies which draw the reader in to be led by the focalizer through the poem, Lanyer's poem excludes the reader. Fourthly,

and finally, while the poems of Herbert, Herrick, and Donne all lead the reader along the itinerary, or *ductus,* which is inseparable from a particular end, or *skopos*, Lanyer's poem—though it has a particular structure and follows a particular arrangement and, at least to some extent, narrative sequence—is cartographic, without leading to the main point of the poem.

In light of these claims, I contend, therefore, that scholars ought to be aware of these two grammars and their expression through these tendencies and characteristics, and should take into account which grammar poems or texts assume when examining texts—particularly theological and pedagogical texts from the centuries in which the predominance of one grammar was transitioning to the predominance of the other. Further scholarly work and exploration, both of texts which assume a grammar of participation and of texts which assume a grammar of representation, may also contribute toward a development of a conception of poetic imitation that is not representation in the modern sense.

Thus, reading the Good Friday poems of George Herbert, Robert Herrick, and John Donne while relying on a grammar of participation allows the focalizer to manuduct readers 1) through identification with Christ's suffering and death and the proper response to it in Herbert, 2) through acceptance of suffering and death for Christ's sake in Herrick, and 3) along the path of *exitus/reditus* in Donne by being incorporated into the Church, in order to lead readers toward sanctification, union with God, and the Beatific Vision.

NOTES

1. For further discussion of the vitality of the celebration of the Eucharist in pre-Reformation England, see Duffy, chapter 3, "The Mass" (91-130).

2. Candler's starting points and influences for the shift he discusses include new organizational principals of texts used by particular late medieval and Renaissance scholars such as Agricola in *De Inventione Dialecta* (22-23) and Philipp Melanchthon in *Loci Communes* (26), the use of moveable type in Europe particularly in regard to Gutenberg's Bible and other easily mass-produced theological texts (15), and the movement toward the Cartesian revolution beginning in the 1630s (22).

3. This connection between orality and memory and its importance for the practicing church and the understanding of Scripture is more fully explored by Mary Carruthers in *The Craft of Thought*. For further reading about different theories of memory and its impact on the interpretation of texts, see chapter 7, "Memory," in Phillip Donnelly's *Rhetorical Faith;* chapter 7, "Liturgically Trained Memory" in Peter Candler Jr.'s *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction*; and Walter Ong's *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue.*

4. For further discussion of Luther's lectures and the evidence from which Cummings and Candler draw, cf. Bruns 139-40, Ebeling 34-46, Grossman 86-99, and Whitford.

5. According to Andrew Pettegree, "The printed book has always been . . . a cornerstone of research on the Reformation" and "the printing press is firmly established as one of the critical technology that justify the sense of fundamental change. Print was an essential component of the surge toward modernity" (428). For further discussion see Pettegree 428-29, 443-45.

6. Guenther's reading of Sidney's argument here reflects a grammar of representation in its separation of ends and means (*skopos* and *ductus*) in order to present the power of rhetoric in poetry as a possible tool for political and social power—that is, to effect external change and virtue without paying attention to ontological difference. It is the facts that Herbert and others do *not* separate their *ductus* from their *skopos* and that they also belong to Sidney's first category of poets—those who "imitate the inconceivable excellencies of God" (Sidney 18)—that prevent Herbert and others from using instrumental aesthetics in the modern, grammar of representation, sense.

7. Rosendale does not overtly distinguish between "figural" and "figurative" understandings. The distinction may be implied in his word choice, but the distinction of figural from figurative seems ultimately unclear in his text.

8. Herbert echoes Sidney in at least one other poem; the first poem in *Astrophil and Stella* is echoed in "Jordan II" (Wilcox, *English Poems* 367-68).

9. I am aware that the use of "Anglican" here is somewhat anachronistic, but, due to the lack of a better adjective for "of the Church of England," I will continue to use it for its convenience.

10. For further observations regarding the Eucharist as a ritual and shifts in the interpretation of the ritual from the medieval era to the modern era, see Muir 159-59, 173.

11. Most critics disagree about the extent to which we can view Izaak Walton's account of the publication of The Temple as accurate. Assertions range from Herbert seeing the poems through publication himself, to Walton's story of sending it to a friend to be published when Herbert was on his deathbed. For further information see David Novarr's *The Making of Walton's Lives*, J. Max Patrick's "Critical Problems in Editing George Herbert's *The Temple*" and Doerksen's "The Laudian Interpretation of George Herbert."

12. Full title: *His Noble Numbers, or, His Pious Pieces Wherein (Amongst Other Things) He Sings the Birth of His Christ: And Sighes for His Saviour's Suffering on the Crosse.*

13. *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, with Gary Stringer as the main editor, is a daunting work of scholarship which addresses many of these textual questions. Unfortunately, none of the poems I plan to examine have been included in the volumes published thus far.

14. Headings/Titles taken from Robin Robbins edition of *The Complete Poems of John Donne*. It is assumed by Robin Robbins (and other editors) that the "titles" of the poems were not added or composed by Donne (xviii), and they are merely used here as headings to provide common referents. Because of this, variations of all three titles are found within my sources and occasionally Robbins' headings do not seem to conform to more common variants.

15. The importance of ordering loves rightly is a central Christian tenet. As Augustine explains in *On Christian Teaching*,

> The person who lives a just and holy life is one who is a sound judge of these things. He is also a person who has ordered his love, so that he does not love what it is wrong to love, or fail to love what should be loved, or love too much what should be loved less (or love too little what should be loved more), or love two things equally if one of them should be loved either less or more than the other, or love things either more or less if they should be loved equally. . . . And if God is to be loved more than any human being, each person should love God more than he loves him self. (21; 1.27)

16. Bakhtin's focus on the dialogic internal and inherent in a text, means that for his use of "dialogic," "the world of poetry, no matter how many contradictions and insoluble conflicts the poet develops within it, is always illumined by one unitary and indisputable discourse" (286). Bakhtin establishes a "difference between ambiguity in poetry and double-voicedness in prose" (328),

which I do not propose to challenge, though I have misgivings about his conception of "the art of poetry, as a utopian philosophy of genres, [which] gives rise to the conception of a purely poetic, extrahistorical language, a language far removed from the petty rounds of everyday life, a language of the gods" (331).

17. What Ong means by "dialogue rhetoric" is persuasive activity in the context of conversation between speaking persons, as distinct from monologue or diagrammatics, which Ong sees as resulting from Ramist dialectic.

18. The habit of some seventeenth-century poets—especially those often classified as "classical" or "cavalier" poets—of utilizing somewhat obscure classical allusions in their poems, therefore, is not an indication of dialogical tendencies. While an author or text could depend upon the reader to re-encounter better known allusions, perhaps, other "learned references" would be merely indications of unidirectional impact. This is not a disparagement of the rhetorical work which such allusions accomplish, merely an observation about their character as monological rather than dialogical.

19. According to Kathryn Edwards, the history of calendrical change in Protestant Europe was more complicated than might at first appear:

> Time in pre-Reformation Europe was organized according to agricultural and ecclesiastical calendars. With religious reform should have come calendrical reform and thus a basic revising of the appropriate structure of time and of the relationship between those who exist in time (everything in this world, especially humans) and that which exists beyond time (God). . . . Research on calendrical change has stressed its gradual nature in the centuries after the Reformation. Even areas that readily adopted the Gregorian calendar made few alterations to a day's significance; certain saints were still venerated on certain days, and processions and sermons continued to mark key points in the year. An examination of England, in particular, has emphasized that the annual religious calendar was the product of centuries of negotiation and was being revised right up to the beginning of the Protestant Reformation. Like the Reformation itself, calendrical change ebbed and flowed during the sixteenth century, and the calendar would never lose aspects of its pre-Reformation form, despite challenges by ecclesiastical hierarchies. (334-35).

Furthermore, she argues, the changes in the liturgical calendar were reflected in changes in ritual which would have varied at a local level:

> The ecclesiastical calendar also affected the ritual aspects of the mass itself. Rather than focus on the Reformation's theological debates, scholars of popular religion have examined to what degree populations accepted changes in religious services and what effect these changes had on popular religiosity. . . . These studies concentrate on the local appreciation of a ritual with an ostensibly universal message. For example, when an altar is changed to a simple table and the elaborate cloths, chalices, and other objects of a medieval mass are removed, many questions are left for the

> community so affected: Who decided that the change would occur? Who approved of the change? What happens to the objects that were once used as part of the mass? Is this new mass spiritually valid? (335).

20. Duns Scotus, a Franciscan who was ordained as a priest in 1291 and studied and taught in Oxford and Paris (Pickstock 121), is often the villain of those lamenting the end of medieval patterns of thinking, much as Pickstock treats him here. One of the consequences of the univocity of being is the emphasis on cataphatic knowledge of God—God can be clearly *represented* (as in a "grammar of representation") in human knowledge and language. Furthermore, Duns Scotus, according to Pickstock, abandoned the Augustinian and Thomist idea of time being "inseparable from the movement of memory and desire" (138-39). In addition, on a slightly different note, according to Young,

> The irony (a Thomist would say) is that by claiming to know too much about the being of God, Scotus opens the door to those who assert that we know absolutely nothing. The unbridgeable gap Scotus opens up between univocal and equivocal predication was bound to be exploited by the nominalism of Ockham and lead to the 'hidden God' of Luther—and of Baxter and Ussher.(130)

For further reading see Richard Cross, Allan Wolter's edition of Duns Scotus' *A Treatise on God as First Principle*, and Peter King.

21. Pickstock's arguments bring up a point that needs to be addressed. Though I have been using the term "temporal," I do not mean to exclude necessary and fruitful uses of place from texts that assume a grammar of participation. Donne's use of the body and the place of the world in "Hymn to God, My God, in My Sickness," is a particularly Donne-like use of place that he also turns cyclical:

> Whilst my physicians by their love are grown
> Cosmographers, and I their map, who lie
> Flat on this bed, that by them may be shown
> That this is my south-west discovery,
> *Per fretum febris*, by these straits to die
> I joy that in these straits I see my West,
> For though their currents yield return to none,
> What shall my West hurt me? As West and East
> In all flat maps (and I am one) are one;
> So death doth touch the Resurrection. (6-15)

Donne's uses of cosmography, maps, and bodies are not signs of over-spatialization, because these uses are tempered with liturgical and cyclical ideas about time—in this case, death touching Resurrection. The spatial and temporal are in balanced tension. Herbert also uses the place of a church building, including poems in *The Temple* entitled "Church-lock and key," "The Church-floore," and "The Windows." However, he is leading his reader sequentially through the places he describes, and the places are merely useful locations rather than ends in themselves. Indeed, the end goal of the poems is not a celebration of particular architecture, but what each of these places can contribute toward the soul's journey toward God.

22. In addition to the performative character of re-beginnings, Pickstock says of the medieval Roman Rite that "the many repetitions and recommencements . . . can be situated not within a context of secular interpolation, but rather of oral provenance conjoined with an apophatic reserve" (173). Texts assuming a grammar of participation do not limit themselves to the apophatic; however, texts assuming a grammar of representation tend toward the cataphatic, as they are comfortable representing God in language and in seeing knowledge as something concrete and spatialized from an external perspective. Therefore, texts that unite apophatic and cataphatic are more likely, though not guaranteed, to assume a grammar of participation.

23. Elsky focuses more on the differences between Protestant and Catholic verse, and while many of his observations concerning liturgical practice in seventeenth-century England and its relations to lyric poetry are extremely insightful, his argument is too invested in Protestant and Catholic differences and divisions, even as he identifies some Protestant characteristics in Catholic poetry and some characteristics missing in some Protestant poetry.

24. Elsky, in his various articles, is concerned with a number of aspects of seventeenth-century poetry that are similar to characteristics highlighted by reading some of these lyric poems relying on a grammar of participation. I believe he skillfully articulates the description of seventeenth-century liturgy and the relationship between liturgical practice of the sacraments and its influence on the lyric poetry of the time.

25. Genette further provides four classifications for understanding the focalization of different texts. First, "nonfocalized" or narrative with "zero focalization" is narrative with an omniscient narrator. Second, "internal focalization" is narrative with a specific point of view, which can be fixed (one character), variable (switching characters), or multiple (as when the same event is told from multiple perspectives). Third, "external focalization" is objective narrative where the reader does not have access to the thoughts and feelings of characters. Finally, the fourth type of focalization is narrative in the first person, which Genette realizes is not classified according to the same principles and tends toward internal focalization with a fixed focalizer (*Narrative Discourse* 188-90, 198).

26. Whether or not *Paradise Lost* as a whole can be read relying on a grammar of participation is another argument, which I will not address here.

27. Heiden writes directly in response to an article by McHale, and McHale writes a second article entitled "Thinking Some More about Narrative in Poetry: A Brief Reply to Bruce Heiden" directly in response to that response.

28. For a discussion of the influence of the mystics on metaphysical poetry, see Istrat Husain's 1948 book, *The Mystical Element in the Metaphysical Poets of the Seventeenth Century*.

29. The sermon is entitled: *That the Soul, Seeking God, is Anticipated by Him: And in What Consists that Search for God in which it is thus Anticipated*.

30. Herbert's early biography, *The Life of George Herbert* was written by Izaak Walton and published with seventeenth-century editions of *The Temple*. David Novarr in *The Making of Walton's Lives*, casts quite a bit of doubt on certain aspects of the biography, but others seem quite accurate. Other, more contemporary biographies can be found at the beginnings of almost all editions of Herbert's poetry. For more articles which focus on specific relationships or communities that Herbert participated in see Elizabeth Clarke and Joyce Ransome. Finally, for a recent biography of Herbert which focuses more on his development as a poet than his childhood and family see Christina Malcolmson.

31. As I noted in the introductory chapter, Sir Philip Sidney's nephew was the 3rd Earl of Pembroke, William Herbert, and George Herbert's distant cousin (Miller-Blaise, "'O Write in Brasse'" para. 2). Specific textual evidence for his connections to John Donne and Sir Francis Bacon can also be found in *The Herbert Allusion Book*, by Robert Ray 1-3. T. S. Eliot, in his article on George Herbert also returns again and again to the influence of Donne on Herbert, personally, in poetic style, scholarship, metaphors, and even specific allusions (124). Eliot claims that Donne wrote "The Autumnall" to Magdalen Herbert, George Herbert's mother (118) and Hutchinson corroborates his assertion (xxii).

32. Anne-Marie Miller-Blaise in both "'O Write in Brasse': George Herbert's Trajectory from Pen to Print," and "*Oratio Nostra Est Silentium*: Silence in George Herbert's Holy Rhetoric" presents Herbert as Rhetor. In "*Oratio Nostra Est Silentium*" especially, she links Herbert's various advice on preaching to specific rhetorical techniques from Hermogenes, Quintilian, Aristotle, and others ("*Oratio Nostra*" 48-50). She also discusses William Perkins' *Arte of Prophecying Or A Treatise Concerning the Sacred and Onely Manor and Method of Preaching* which was published in Latin in 1592 and translated to English in 1607. Incidentally, Miller-Blaise argues that the *Arte of Prophecying*, "curtails the five parts of rhetoric by dismissing 'Artificiall Memorye'" ("*Oratio Nostra*" 57). In addition to Miller-Blaise, Sara Wheaton also focuses on the speaker-persona of *The Temple* as being rhetorically aware and savvy, purposefully including and interpreting known strategies for rhetoric into his advice regarding preaching in *The Country Parson* especially. Wheaton includes, among discussion of a number of rhetorically potent tropes and practices a particularly insightful section on apostrophe (151-52).

33. For further debate on Herbert's original goals and intentions, see Herbert's early biography by Izaak Walton, bundled with later seventeenth-century editions of Herbert's poetry, Hutchinson's biographical comments in her edition of *The Works of George Herbert*, John Wall's biographical introduction in his edition of *George Herbert: The Country Parson, The Temple*, David Novarr and *The Making of Walton's Lives*, and (for a bit of a more cynical interpretation of Herbert's character and motivations) Russell Fraser's "George Herbert's Poetry."

34. Izaak Walton's biography of Herbert provides a story, now generally considered apocryphal, in which Herbert gave a copy of a "little book" to a man named Edmund Duncon to pass to Nicholas Ferrar, who was Herbert's friend at the nearby religious settlement of Little Gidding. Though in 1941, Hutchinson still accepted this story uncritically (lxx), later critics such as David Novarr in *The Making of Walton's Lives*, Daniel Doerksen in "The Laudian Interpretation of George Herbert," and Max J. Patrick in "Critical Problems in Editing George Herbert's The Temple" have made a number of arguments for different sequences of events. For instance, though early readers and biographers assumed that "little book" was *The Temple*, J. Max Patrick implies it may be a copy of *The Country Parson*, as no such book or manuscript of *The Temple* survives.

35. One particularly helpful reference in examining seventeenth-century reception of George Herbert is Robert Ray's *The Herbert Allusion Book*, which collects allusions to and citations of Herbert, ranging from 1615-1700, and drawing from 243 books and manuscripts from 175 people (iv-v). In addition to the data presented by Ray's work, Sharon Achinstein's article, "Reading George Herbert in the Restoration," provides helpful interpretation of that, and other, data. According to Achinstein, Herbert was "unquestionably one of the bestsellers of the seventeenth century, running to eleven editions by century's end" (430). Achinstein discusses how Herbert's *The Temple* and biography were published in ways that presented a particular view of Herbert's relationship with the Anglican Church and thus were used for certain political ends. Daniel Doerksen, in "The Laudian Interpretation of George Herbert," presents a similar argument, arguing that Ferrar's introduction, Walton's *The Life of George Herbert*, Christopher Harvey's imitation in *The Synagogue*, and the various ways these works were published together influence early criticism toward particularly Laudian interpretations. According to Doerksen, the Laudian, that is, high ceremonial Anglican, interpretation of Herbert's poems was:

> deliberately fostered by Christopher Harvey and Izaak Walton. Because of their well-intentioned but partisan strategy, a serious confusion about Herbert's poetry and his church stance developed which held sway for centuries, and is not without effect even now (36).

Doerksen argues that despite this Anglican and Laudian claim on Herbert, many Puritans and non-conformists appreciated his works (45). For further, related arguments, see Doerksen's *Conforming to the Word.* In addition, Herbert had a profound impact on religious poetry specifically in the seventeenth century. As I mentioned previously, Sean McDowell notes that at least seven poets "reproduced the lines [lines 5-6 of "The Church-porch"] in the prefaces or title pages of their works between 1650 and 1700" (65).

36. Based on the condition of B and the length of time that it took for a text to move from manuscript to print, including licensing, typesetting, etc., Patrick argues that Herbert could have sent the manuscript to Cambridge himself, especially since there was time for two editions in 1633, the year he died (11-13). Therefore, Patrick argues, the first printed edition is the closest we have to an original text.

37. Cf. Ilona Bell and Barbara Harman for reviews of *The Living Temple* and its problems and *Rhetorical Faith: The Literary Hermeneutics of Stanley Fish* by Donnelly for an overview of Stanley Fish's work in general that identifies certain inconsistencies.

38. Here and in other poems, see Wilcox's notes in her edition, *The English Poems of George Herbert* for further scriptural references, although I, in turn, may identify scriptural allusions or references that she does not.

39. All quotations of Herbert's poems here and in other chapters are taken from *The English Poems of George Herbert*, edited by Helen Wilcox.

40. For a discussion of the narratological term focalizer and why I have appropriated it to use here, see Chapter Two.

41. This verse, and all Scripture quoted in this chapter, comes from the King James Version, or Authorized Version, published in 1611 and in general use at the time these poems were written and read.

42. Sanctification may be an unclear term as it may have different connotations and theological meanings for different communities. For Protestants in the seventeenth century, there seem to be a few agreed upon definitions, however. According to Lewalski, "Reformation Protestants also held that at the time of justification the process of *Sanctification* is also begun, for God's graces come not singly but together. Sanctification involves the actual but gradual repairing of the defaced image of God in the soul, whereby it enjoys a 'new life'" (*Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* 18). She quotes Calvin, Luther, Richard Hooker and even Donne to demonstrate English Protestant consensus concerning sanctification, its beginning in life, and its fulfillment only after death (*Protestant Poetics* 18-19).

43. Cf. Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 7 and 22, and John 12.

44. The moments to be reenacted do not seem to correspond to the traditional Stations of the Cross, despite the suggestiveness of the possibility.

45. Other editions from the seventeenth century follow various patterns. For instance, 1634 and 1656 editions seem to match the 1633 edition exactly. 1641, 1660, 1674, 1678, 1679, and 1695 editions complete the line in the first stanza and the first on each page only. The 1674 and 1695 editions have different pagination than the 1633 and 1641 editions, however, which means that the stanzas in which it is spelled out are not the same. The 1667 edition writes out the line in the first three stanzas, the first on each page, and a series of seemingly random stanzas elsewhere in the poem. Hutchinson's 1941 edition of *The Works of George Herbert* follows the 1641 edition and others like them, and only writes out "Was ever grief like mine?" for the first three stanzas and then for the first stanza of every page; however, the stanzas at the top of the page do not match those at the top of the pages in any of the seventeenth-century edition. Finally, Wilcox's 2007 *The English Poems of George Herbert* writes out the whole phrase for every stanza.

46. Cf. Leviticus 5:5, 16:21, 26:40; Numbers 5:7; I Kings 8:33-5; II Chronicles 6:24-6; Psalms 32:5.

47. Cf. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (I John 4:15).

48. Cf. "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind" (Ephesians 4:22-3); and "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin" (Romans 6:6).

49. For the classic and early discussion of speech acts and performative utterances, see J. L. Austin's *How to do Things with Words.*

50. For further discussion of "measuring" in the Sacrifice Sequence, see Stambler 261-62.

51. Wood goes on to connect "The Sinner" to sonnets 1, 14, and 18 in Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*.

52. Some critics, such as Frank Huntley, have suggested various events that could have led to the differences in manuscripts. For instance, he suggests that a scribe was copying down the poems and started changing the titles of some when he found repetition, before realizing that the repeating titles were on purpose and leaving the rest (68). While this seems like a reasonable explanation for some of the poems' different titles, other of Huntley's suggestions seem more complicated than necessary.

53. I find Huntley's arguments for inclusion of "Good Friday" among these poems stronger than the arguments he presents against it despite such an argument running counter to his thesis.

54. Cf. Exodus 32:32-33, "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book."

55. For further well-balanced critique of their edition, cf. Mardock and Rasmussen.

56. For further reading regarding Herrick's relationship with Johnson, cf. Leah Marcus's *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes*; Thomas Moissan's "Robert Herrick's Jonsonian 'Overplus'"; and Roger Rollin's "Robert Herrick's Fathers."

57. As Cain and Connolly's *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick* is the best current edition of Herrick's poetry, collating a great number of extant copies and editions, my quotations from and numberings of Herrick's poems follow this edition. The numbers were not present until much later editions and usually

presented separate numbering systems for the secular and religious poems. I follow Cain and Connolly's numbering system which is continuous through both parts of the work, and place the number after the title in parenthesis the first time I mention a particular poem. Unfortunately these numbers are not consistent with the numbers in earlier editions, which often restart the numbering system in *His Noble Numbers.* The numbers are useful tools in identifying the location of one poem within so many, especially as many poems have either no title or an identical title to another poem.

58. For a further review of criticism from 1648 until 1974, cf. Rollin's chapter, "Sweet Numbers and Sour Readers: Trends and Perspectives in Herrick Criticism" in *"Trust to Good Verses": Herrick Tercentenary Essays*, 3-14.

59. For a thorough exploration of Herrick's "ceremonial" mode of poetry, see DeNeef.

60. The brevity of epigrams may make it difficult for an epigram to be itinerant, for instance; however, in some ways, maxims, adages, and epigrams are excellent examples of participatory discourse, as rhetorical examples which are embedded in dialogue with other cultural texts and in which readers must puzzle out the meanings and implications. Seventeenth-century epigrams like those in *Hesperides* and *His Noble Numbers* can be understood as witty invitations to think more deeply and to engage in dialogue. For further discussion of various kinds of seventeenth-century epigrams, see Hudson.

61. Cf. Mark 15:17 and John 19:2 . The robe is identified as scarlet in Matthew 27:28 and only called "gorgeous" in Luke 23:11.

62. Cf. Matthew 27:38 and Mark 15:27. Luke calls the men "malefactors" (Luke 23:32) and John only notes there were "two other with him" (John 19:18).

63. Cf. John 19:34.

64. This tradition seems to come from a combination of Deuteronomy 25:1-3 which discusses giving condemned men not more than 40 stripes and Paul's comment in 2 Corinthians 11:22, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one."

65. For further exploration of the relationships between "*Rex Tragicus*" and medieval drama and theater, cf. Marcus's article, "Herrick's Noble Numbers and the Politics of Playfulness." Marcus argues that the attitude toward drama displayed in the poem is "medieval in spirit" (122), and argues that medieval liturgical "drama was not a commemoration of deeds from the past, but a welding of past and present in which sacred events were enacted as though for the first time" (123). In addition, there is a brief discussion in Starkman's "*Noble Numbers* and the Poetry of Devotion." Starkman argues that the poems have "a pageant-like quality" and "read almost like poems meant to be publicly performed" (11). A third critic, Thomas Moisan, explores in depth the theatrical implications and context of the poem in "Robert Herrick's 'Rex Tragicus' and the

'Troublesome Times.'" Finally, D.C. Allen investigates the significance of the biography and history of Roscius who is compared to Christ in line 19 of "*Rex Tragicus,*" in "Herrick's '*Rex Tragicus*.'"

66. For a slightly later example of another poem connecting kingship and the stage, see Andrew Marvell's "An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland."

67. For further information the three unities, cf. Castelvetro on time (85-87; 1.227, 1.229), place (90-92; 1.239, 1.243), and action (84, 87-92; 1.225, 1.233-1.243). In addition, cf. Bongiorno's introduction for a discussion of how Castelvetro distorts Augustine to arrive at the three unities (xxxxix-xl).

68. On the other hand, chapter 7 of Richard Hooker's first book of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* is entitled "Of man's will which is the first thing that laws of action are made to guide." If this is intended as the reference in the exhortation to Christ to "keep / The Lawes of Action," then it would imply that at this point the focalizer is encouraging Christ to continue following God's will, as the laws implied in Hooker are the moral laws which, according to the title of chapter 2, is "that law which God from before the beginning hath set for himself to do all things by."

69. Another effect of "his" in the titles of the poems and of *His Noble Numbers* is to provide a gender attributable to the focalizer, especially as Herrick's poems do not generally lead to a conflation of the focalizer and the reader.

70. Though the use of italicized print in seventeenth-century works often indicates direct discourse, the poem here does not utilize them in this manner—the words italicized here are for emphasis or the designations of specific characters: including the phrase "*Sion's Daughters*" (7) and "*Christ*" (10), but also "The *Crosse*, the *Cords*, the *Nailes*, the *Speare*, / The *Myrrhe*, the *Gall*, the *Vinegar*" (8-9) and a few others.

71. Cain and Connolly's second volume of their edition of *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick* includes many early copies of Herrick's poems set to music: "In the second half of the century, [Herrick's] short lyrics which had been set to music start[ed] to circulate widely, primarily through the editions of printed music published by John Playford" (2:5). For a more theoretical discussion about Herrick's use of music and metaphor, cf. Mattison.

72. For a slightly more in-depth discussion of seventeenth-century pattern poems, cf. my discussion of Herbert's "The Altar" in Chapter Three.

73. For further information regarding the significance of "Thanksgiving" in the Anglican Church, cf. the section on Herbert's "The Thanksgiving" in Chapter Three.

74. For further information regarding the medieval conception of the Harrowing of Hell and its depiction in art, see Tamburr. For further information regarding the use of the Harrowing of Hell in art and literature in the seventeenth century, see Romanelli.

75. Claude Summers argues that Dorcas, within this poem, is an image of the British Church which Herrick is mourning. For further analysis of the implications of Dorcas' lack of resurrection, cf. Summers' article, "Tears for Herrick's Church."

76. For instance, three biographies with vastly different approaches include John Carey's *John Donne, Life, Mind, and Art*, David Edwards' *John Donne: Man of Flesh and Spirit*, and John Stubbs' *Donne: The Reformed Soul*.

77. As mentioned in Chapter One, the Donne Variorum project, while staggering in scope, has not yet published the volumes including these poems.

78. Rhodes Dunlap has pointed out that as March 25 was the first day of the new year, the confusion between Old Style and New Style would not apply, and therefore we can identify the year of the coinciding feasts as 1608 with certainty (258-59).

79. Theresa DiPasquale presents the historical and textual evidence for this claim in *Literature and Sacrament* (98).

80. Fischler's article investigates images of lines and circles in Donne's poetry, prose, and sermons, assembling them into a single cohesive image which Fischler believes accurately depicts Donne's soteriology.

81. For Scripture references related to Donne and Lanyer, quotations have been taken from the Geneva Bible rather than the King James Version, as the King James Version was not published until 1611—after two of the three Donne poems we will consider and the same year as Lanyer's work. In addition Donne often draws from the Latin version of the Bible, so I have consulted the Vulgate when appropriate.

82. For further reading on the Virgin Mary in Donne's poetry and theology, especially in regards to seventeenth-century Church politics and theological debates, cf. Elizabeth Hodgson's *Gender and the Sacred Self in John Donne*. Ilona Bell's "Gender Matters: The Women in Donne's Poems" and Theresa DiPasquale's *Refiguring the Sacred Feminine*.

83. Robbins points out that Herbert reuses Donne's phrase in "The Sinner" (567): "Yet, Lord, restore thine image, heare my call" ("The Sinner," line 12). Cf. the Chapter Three and earlier discussion of Donne sending poems to Magdalen Herbert's mother for the social and literary connection between Donne and Herbert.

84. Cf. the note in Chapter Four on the number of lines in "*Rex Tragicus*."

85. Malpezzi, in looking at the image of the horse and rider, conflates the body and appetite, specifically lust, perhaps assuming the traditional association of the body and sinful "flesh" in the New Testament.

86. For further reading on seventeenth-century emblems in poems by Donne and Herbert, cf. Mary Sloane's *The Visual in Metaphysical Poetry*.

87. The form is also in dialogue with numerological patterns and implications. Hodgson argues that the seven sonnets, which are emphasized by the two time seven lines in each sonnet, somehow indicate the week of creation, the sum of the earth's elements, the sum of the number of the Trinity plus the number of Incarnation, and others.

88. For references to lines within *La Corona*, the citation will be as follows (sonnet.line).

89. Cf. Robbins for a list of references, though he does not often investigate their implications.

90. As Lanyer's text was published in the same year as the King James Bible, I have chosen to quote the Geneva Bible when discussing texts that Lanyer might have encountered, as I did in the chapter on Donne.

91. For further arguments about the Eucharistic character of the poem, see Yaakov Mascetti, who focuses on exploring "the bond between understanding and sight in order to define a gendered mode of reading and interpreting, and which ultimately develops into a consummation of the Christly image as in a Eucharistic moment of encounter between believer and the divine" (2). Also see Micheline White's article, "A Woman with Saint Peter's Keys?: Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611) and the Priestly Gifts of Women," in which she argues that Lanyer "assumes the provocative stance of a poet-priest as she sets out to teach, heal, and feed her readers" (330). However, White takes this further in that she claims that Lanyer argues for the priesthood of her patronesses as well, particularly Margaret Clifford, to whom she attributes the "priestly task of spiritual healing associated with St. Peter's keys" (325). She also presents further arguments concerning Lanyer's readers and the community of women she imagines taking on priestly roles.

WORKS CITED

Achinstein, Sharon. "Reading George Herbert in the Restoration." *English Literary Renaissance* 36.3 (2006): 430-65. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

Allen, D. C. "Herrick's 'Rex Tragicus.'" *Studies in Honor of DeWitt T. Starnes*. Ed. Thomas P. Harrison et. al. Austin: U of Texas, 1967. 215-25. Print.

Alpers, Paul. "Apostrophe and the Rhetoric of Renaissance Lyric." *Representations* 122.1 (2013): 1-22. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

Aristotle. *Aristotle's* Poetics. Trans. George Whalley. Ed. Whalley, John Baxter, and Patrick Atherton. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1997. Print.

Archer, Stanley. "The Archetypal Journey Motif in Donne's *Divine Poems*." *New Essays on Donne*. Ed. Gary Stringer. Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universitat Salzburg, 1977. 173-91. Print. Salzburg Studies in English Literature 57.

Asals, Heather. "The Voice of George Herbert's 'The Church.'" *ELH* 36.3 (1969): 511-28. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 July 2014.

Augustine. *On Christian Teaching*. Trans. R. P. H. Green. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. PDF file. Oxford World's Classics.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Ed. J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975. PDF file. Oxford Scholarship Online.

Bakhtin, M. M. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 259-422. Print.

Bell, Ilona. "Gender Matters: The Women in Donne's Poems." *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*. Ed. Achsah Guibbory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 201-16. *CrossRef*. Web. 21 Mar. 2015.

---. "Herbert's Valdesian Vision." *English Literary Renaissance* 17.3 (1987): 303-28. Print.

---. Rev. of *The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing*, by Stanley Fish. *Modern Language Quarterly* 39.4 (1978): 408-11. Web. 18 July 2014.

---. "'Setting Foot into Divinity': George Herbert and the English Reformation." *Modern Language Quarterly* 38.3 (1977): 219-41. *EBSCO*. Web. 9 July 2014.

Benet, Diana. *Secretary of Praise: The Poetic Vocation of George Herbert*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1984. Print.

Bernard of Clairvaux. "On the Love of God." *Late Medieval Mysticism*. Trans. Ray C. Petry. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1957. 54-78. Print.

The Bible and Holy Scriptures Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament. Geneva, 1560. Facsim ed. *The Geneva Bible.* Eds. William Whittingham and Lloyd Eason Berry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969. Print. The Geneva Bible.

Biblia Sacra: Vulgate Editionis. Valentinus Loch, gen. ed. Ratisbonæ [Regensburg], 1843. Print.

Blaine, Marlin E. "A Note on the Title of Herrick's *Rex Tragicus*." *English Language Notes* 38.2 (2000): 30-34. *EBSCO*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

Blessing, Carol. "'Most Blessed Daughters of Jerusalem': Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* and Elizabethan and Jacobean Bible Commentary." *Ben Jonson Journal* 15.2 (2008): 232-47. *EBSCO*. Web. 5 Apr. 2015.

Bloch, Chana. *Spelling the Word: George Herbert and the Bible*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. Print.

Bonaventure. *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*. Trans. Zachary Hayes. St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1996. Print. Works of Saint Bonaventure 1.

Bruns, Gerald L. *Hermeneutics, Ancient and Modern*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print.

Bugliani Knox, Francesca. *The Eye of the Eagle: John Donne and the Legacy of Ignatius Loyola*. Oxford: Lang, 2011. Print. Religions and Discourse 49.

Cain, Tom and Ruth Connolly, eds. *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick*. By Robert Herrick. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. Print.

---. "Herrick's Communities of Manuscript and Print." *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Ed. Cain and Connolly. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 1-24. Print.

Candler, Peter M., Jr. *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction, or Reading Scripture Together on the Path to God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006. Print. Radical Traditions.

Castelvetro, Lodovico. *Castelvetro on the Art of Poetry*. Trans. and ed. Andrew Bongiorno. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1984. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies 29.

Carey, John. *John Donne, Life, Mind, and Art*. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. Print.

Carruthers, Mary. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34.

Cassiodorus. *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings.* Trans. and ed. Leslie Webber Jones. New York: Norton, 1969. Print.

Chambers, A. B. "Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward: The Poem and the Tradition." *ELH* 28.1 (1961): 31-53. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

---. "The Meaning of the 'Temple' in Donne's *La Corona*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 59.2 (1960): 212-17. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

---. "*La Corona*: Philosophic, Sacred, and Poetic Uses of Time." *New Essays on Donne*. Ed. Gary Stringer. Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universitat Salzburg, 1977. 140-72. Print. Salzburg Studies in English Literature 57.

Church of England. *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*. Ed. Brian Cummings. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

Clarke, Elizabeth. "George Herbert and Cambridge Scholars." *George Herbert Journal* 27.1 (2003): 43-52. *Project MUSE*. Web. 1 Sept. 2015.

Clement, Richard W. "Thomas James (1572?-August 1629)." *Pre-Nineteenth-Century British Book Collectors and Bibliographers*. Ed. William Baker and Kenneth Womack. Vol. 213. Detroit: Gale, 1999. 170-79. *Gale*. Web. 24 Sept. 2015.

Colgrove, Erin E. "This Crown of Prayer and Praise: Worship in Donne's *La Corona*." M.A. Northern Michigan U, 2010. *ProQuest*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015.

Colie, Rosalie Littell. *Paradoxia Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox*. Hamden: Archon, 1976. Print.

Council of Trent. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation*. Trans. Henry Joseph Schroeder. St. Louis: Herder, 1941. Print.

Cousins, A. D., and R. J. Webb. "Donne's Annunciation." *Explicator* 65.3 (2007): 136-37. *ProQuest.* Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Creaser, John. "Herrick at Play." *Essays in Criticism* 56.4 (2006): 324-50. *Oxford Journals*. Web. 4 Sept. 2015.

Cross, Richard. *Duns Scotus on God*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. Print. Ashgate Studies in the History of Philosophical Theology.

Culler, Jonathan D. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981. Print.

Cummings, Brian. *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Davidson, Clifford. "George Herbert and the Architecture of Anglican Worship." *Anglican Theological Review* 84.4 (2002): 853-71. *EBSCO*. Web. 22 Sept. 2013.

DeNeef, A. Leigh. *"This Poetick Liturgie": Robert Herrick's Ceremonial Mode*. Durham: Duke UP, 1974. Print.

DiPasquale, Theresa M. *Literature and Sacrament: The Sacred and the Secular in John Donne*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1999. Print. Medieval and Renaissance Literary Studies.

---. *Refiguring the Sacred Feminine: The Poems of John Donne, Aemilia Lanyer, and John Milton*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2008. Print.

Doerksen, Daniel W. *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne, and the English Church before Laud*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1997. Print.

---. "George Herbert, Calvinism, and Reading 'Mattens.'" *Christianity and Literature* 59.3 (2010): 437-51. *Gale*. Web. 8 August 2015.

---. "The Laudian Interpretation of George Herbert." *Literature and History* 3.2 (1994): 36-54. *ProQuest*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

Donne, John. "A Sermon of Valediction at My Going into Germany, at Lincolns-Inne, April 18. 1619." *The Sermons of John Donne* Ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn Mary Simpson. Vol. 2.11. Berkeley: U of California P, 1953. N. pag. *John Donne Sermons.* Ed. Kimberly Johnson. Brigham Young U. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.

---. "Preached at Lincolns Inne." *The Sermons of John Donne* Ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn Mary Simpson. Vol. 2.2. Berkeley: U of California P, 1955. N. pag. *John Donne Sermons.* Ed. Kimberly Johnson. Brigham Young U. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.

Donnelly, Phillip J. *Rhetorical Faith: The Literary Hermeneutics of Stanley Fish*. Victoria: English Literary Studies, U of Victoria, 2000. Print. ELS Monograph Ser. 84.

---. "The Triune Heart of The Temple." *George Herbert Journal* 23.1 (1999): 35-54. *Project MUSE*. Web. 15 August 2015.

Dubinski, R. R. "Donne's 'La Corona' and Christ's Mediatorial Office." *Renaissance and Reformation* 4.2 (1980): 203-08. *JSTOR.* Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Dunlap, Rhodes. "The Date of Donne's 'The Annunciation and Passion.'" *Modern Language Notes* 63.4 (1948): 258-59. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015.

Dunlop, Alexander. "Number Symbolism, Modern Studies In." *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Ed. Albert Charles Hamilton. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990. 512-13. Print.

Duns Scotus, John. *A Treatise on God as First Principle*. Ed. and trans. Allan B. Wolter. 2nd ed. Chicago: Franciscan Herald P, 1983. Print.

Edwards, David L. *John Donne: Man of Flesh and Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002. Print.

Edwards, Kathryn A. "Popular Religion." *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*. Ed. David M. Whitford. Kirksville: Truman State UP, 2008. 331-54. Print. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies Ser. 79.

Eliot, T. S. "George Herbert." *British Writers*. Ed. Ian Scott-Kilvert. Vol. II. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1979. 49-85. Print.

Elsky, Martin. *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989. Print.

---. "George Herbert's Pattern Poems and the Materiality of Language: A New Approach to Renaissance Hieroglyphics." *ELH* 50.2 (1983): 245-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 July 2014.

---. "History, Liturgy, and Point of View in Protestant Meditative Poetry." *Studies in Philology* 77.1 (1980): 67-83. *EBSCO*. Web. 22 Sept. 2013.

---. "Polyphonic Psalm Settings and the Voice of George Herbert's *The Temple*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 42.3 (1981): 227-46. *Duke Journals*. Web. 22 July 2014.

---. "The Sacramental Frame of George Herbert's 'The Church' and the Shape of Spiritual Autobiography." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 83.3 (1984): 313-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 July 2014.

Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. New York: New Directions, 1947. Print.

Engel, Wilson F., III. "Christ in the Winepress: Backgrounds of a Sacred Image." *George Herbert Journal* 3.1 (1979): 45-63. *ProQuest*. Web. 29 Oct. 2015.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Collected Works of Erasmus: Adages II i 1 to II vi 100*. Trans. and ed. R. A. B. Mynors. Vol. 33. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991. Print.

Firth, C. H., and R. S. Rait, eds. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*. Vol. 1. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911. PDF File. Hathi Trust.

Fischler, Alan. "'Lines Which Circles Do Contain': Circles, the Cross, and Donne's Dialectic Scheme of Salvation." *Papers on Language & Literature* 30.2 (1994): 169-86. Gale. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Fish, Stanley Eugene. *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1972. Print.

---. *The Living Temple: George Herbert and Catechizing*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978. Print.

Fodor, Jim. Rev. of *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction, or Reading Scripture Together on the Path to God,* by Peter M. Candler Jr. *Modern Theology* 23.4 (2007): 654-57. *EBSCO.* Web. 1 June 2015.

Ford, Brewster S. "George Herbert and the Liturgies of Time and Space." *South Atlantic Review* 49.4 (1984): 19-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Aug. 2015.

Fraser, Russell. "George Herbert's Poetry." *The Sewanee Review* 95.4 (1987): 560-85. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 Aug. 2014.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.

Fuller, Anne Margaret. "The Art of the Speakers in George Herbert's *The Temple*." M.A. Queen's U (Canada), 1979. *ProQuest*. Web. 17 July 2014.

Furey, Constance. "The Selfe Undone: Individualism and Relationality in John Donne and Aemilia Lanyer." *The Harvard Theological Review* 99.4 (2006): 469-86. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015.

Gardner, Helen, ed. *John Donne: The Divine Poems.* By John Donne. 2 ed. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1978. Print.

Gaskill, Gayle. "*The Temple* and the Liturgy: The Poetry of George Herbert and the *Book of Common Prayer*." Ph.D. U of Minnesota, 1986. *ProQuest*. Web. 28 Sept. 2013.

Gee, Henry, and William John Hardy. *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. London: Macmillan, 1921. Print.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980. Print.

---. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988. Print.

Gibbons, Daniel R. "Rewriting Spiritual Community in Spenser, Donne, and the Book of Common Prayer." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 54.1 (2012): 8-44. *Gale*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Gregerson, Linda. "Rhetorical Contract in the Lyric Poem." *Kenyon Review* 28.2 (2006): 161-78. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

Grossmann, Maria. "The Development of Printing, 1502-1517." *Humanism in Wittenberg, 1485-1517*. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975. 86-99. Print.

Guenther, Genevieve. *Magical Imaginations: Instrumental Aesthetics in the English Renaissance*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2012. Print.

Guibbory, Achsah. *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion, and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. *EBSCO*. Web. 6 Apr. 2015.

---. "*Hesperides*, the Hebrew Bible, and Herrick's Christian Identity." *"A Certain Text": Close Readings and Textual Studies on Shakespeare and Others in Honor of Thomas Clayton*. Ed. Thomas Clayton, Janis Lull, and Linda Anderson. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002. 122-49. *Hathi Trust*. Web. 3 Apr. 2015.

---. "John Donne." *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 123-47. *CrossRef*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015.

---. "The Gospel According to Aemilia: Women and the Sacred." *Aemilia Lanyer: Gender, Genre, and the Canon*. Ed. Marshall Grossman. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1998. 191-211. Print.

Halewood, William H. "The Predicament of the Westward Rider." *Studies in Philology* 93.2 (1996): 218-28. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Harman, Barbara Leah. *Costly Monuments: Representations of the Self in George Herbert's Poetry*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982. Print.

---. Rev. of *The Living Temple,* by Stanley Fish. *Comparative Literature* 33.2 (1981): 197-202. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 July 2014.

Hayes, Zachary. "Introduction." *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*. by Bonaventure. St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1996. Print. Works of Saint Bonaventure 1.

Heiden, Bruce. "Narrative in Poetry: A Problem of Narrative Theory." *Narrative* 22.2 (2014): 269-83. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

Herbert, George. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations.* Cambridge, 1633. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations*. Cambridge, 1641. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations.* Cambridge, 1656. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations.* London, 1660. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations.* London, 1667. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations, Together with His Life, with Several Additions.* London, 1674. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations, Together with His Life.* London, 1678. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations, Together with His Life.* London, 1679. . *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

---. *The Temple: Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations, Together with His Life, with Several Additions.* London, 1695. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 29 Aug. 2015.

Hodgson, Elizabeth. *Gender and the Sacred Self in John Donne*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1999. PDF file. *Hathi Trust*.

Holland, Robert Gordon. "Voice and Dramatic Process in George Herbert's *The Temple.*" Ph.D. Emory U, 1975. *ProQuest*. Web. 21 May 2015.

The Holy Bible. Nashville: T. Nelson, 1976. Print. The King James Vers.

Hooker, Richard. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: Preface, Book I, Book VIII*. Ed. Arthur Stephen McGrade. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Hudson, Hoyt H. *The Epigram in the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1947. Print.

Huntley, Frank Livingstone. "What Happened to Two of Herbert's Poems?" *Essays in Persuasion: On Seventeenth Century English Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. 65-76. Print.

Husain, Itrat. *The Mystical Element in the Metaphysical Poets of the Seventeenth Century*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948. Print.

Hutchinson, F.E., ed. *The Works of George Herbert*. By George Herbert. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1941. Print.

Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *New Literary History* 3.2 (1972): 279-99. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 May 2015.

Jagodzinski, Cecile M. *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1999. Print.

Jahn, Manfred. "Focalization." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 94-108. *CrossRef*. Web. 25 June 2014.

James, Frances. "'A Christal Glasse for Christian Women': Meditations on Christ's Passion in the Devotional Literature of Renaissance Women." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 10.3 (2009): 58-72. *Gale*. Web. 22 July 2015.

Johns, Adrian. Foreword. *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue, from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*. By Walter J. Ong. New York: Octagon, 1974. v-xiii. Print.

Johnson, Bruce A. "The Audience Shift in George Herbert's Poetry." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35.1 (1995): 89-103. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 July 2014.

King, Peter. "Scotus on Metaphysics." *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*. Ed. Thomas Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 15-68. *CrossRef*. Web. 1 May 2015.

Kirkpatrick, Hugh. "Donne's 'Upon the Annunciation and Passion Falling upon One Day. 1608.'" *Explicator* 30.5 (1972): 39. *ProQuest*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Kjerkegaard, Stefan. "In the Waiting Room: Narrative in the Autobiographical Lyric Poem, Or Beginning to Think about Lyric Poetry with Narratology." *Narrative* 22.2 (2014): 185-202. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

Landrum, David W. "'To Seek of God': Enthusiasm and the Anglican Response in Robert Herrick's *Noble Numbers*." *Studies in Philology* 89.2 (1992): 244-55. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Apr. 2015.

Lapidus, Lawrence A. "'Lean Not Unto Thine Own Understanding': Grammar as Theme in George Herbert's 'Good Friday' and 'Prayer (i).'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 62.2 (1976): 167-78. *EBSCO*. Web. 18 July 2014.

Leach, Elsie. "Lydgate's 'The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun' and Herbert's 'The Sacrifice.'" *Notes and Queries* 7 (1960): 421. Print.

Lein, Clayton D. "John Donne (1572-31 March 1631)." *British Prose Writers of the Early Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Clayton D. Lein. Vol. 151. Detroit: Gale, 1995. 114-39. *Gale*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015. DLB.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979. Print.

---. "Re-Writing Patriarchy and Patronage: Margaret Clifford, Anne Clifford, and Aemilia Lanyer." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 87-106. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 July 2015.

---. "Typological Symbolism and the 'Progress of the Soul' in Seventeenth-Century Literature." *Literary Uses of Typology: From the Late Middle Ages to the Present*. Ed. Earl Roy Miner. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977. 79-114. Print.

Lord, John B. "Herbert's Poetic Voice." *George Herbert Journal* 2.2 (1979): 25-43. *Gale*. Web. 17 July 2014.

Low, Anthony. *Love's Architecture: Devotional Modes in Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*. New York: New York UP, 1978. Print.

Machacek, Gregory. "Allusion." *PMLA* 122.2 (2007): 522-36. *JSTOR*. Web. 4 Apr. 2014.

Malcolmson, Cristina. *George Herbert: A Literary Life*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print. Literary Lives.

Malpezzi, Frances. "'As I Ride': The Beast and His Burden in Donne's 'Goodfriday.'" *Religion & Literature* 24.1 (1992): 23-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

---. "The Feast of the Circumcision: The Return to Sacred Time in Herrick's *Noble Numbers*." *Notre Dame English Journal* 14.1 (1981): 29-40. *JSTOR.* Web. 18 July 2014.

---. "Herbert's 'The Thanksgiving' in Context." *Renascence* 34.3 (1982): 185-95. *EBSCO*. Web. 18 July 2014.

"Manuduction, n." *OED Online.* Oxford UP, September 2015. Web. 30 Oct. 2015.

Marcus, Leah S. "Herrick's *Noble Numbers* and the Politics of Playfulness." *English Literary Renaissance* 7.1 (1977): 108-26. *CrossRef*. Web. 15 Sept. 2015.

---. *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986. Print.

Mardock, James, and Eric Rasmussen. Rev. of *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick,* ed. Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly. *Seventeenth-Century News* 72.3-4 (2014): 190-95. *Gale*. Web. 3 Apr. 2015.

Marshall, Peter. "England." *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*. Ed. David M. Whitford. Kirksville: Truman State UP, 2008. 250-72. Print. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies Ser. 79.

Martz, Louis Lohr. *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*. Rev. ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 1969. Print.

Mascetti, Yaakov. "'Here I Have Prepar'd My Paschal Lambe': Reading and Seeing the Eucharistic Presence in Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 9.1 (2011): 1-15. *Project MUSE*. Web. 15 Aug. 2015.

Mattison, Andrew. "'Keep Your Measures': Herrick, Herbert, and the Resistance to Music." *Criticism* 48.3 (2006): 323-46. *Project MUSE*. Web. 15 Sept. 2015.

Maurer, Margaret. "The Circular Argument of Donne's 'La Corona.'" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 22.1 (1982): 51-68. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. "Why Read Herrick?" *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Ed. Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 25-38. Print.

McCanles, Michael. *Dialectical Criticism and Renaissance Literature*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1975. Print.

McCauley, Janie. "On the 'Childhood of the Yeare': Herrick's *Hesperides* New Year's Poems." *George Herbert Journal* 14.1-2 (1990): 72-96. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

McDowell, Sean. "Finding Readers: Herbert's Appeals to the Passions." *George Herbert Journal* 26.1 (2002): 65-82. *Project MUSE*. Web. 3 Apr. 2015.

McHale, Brian. "Beginning to Think about Narrative in Poetry." *Narrative* 17.1 (2009): 1-30. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

---. "Thinking Some More about Narrative in Poetry: A Brief Reply to Bruce Heiden." *Narrative* 22.2 (2014): 284-87. *EBSCO*. Web. 16 June 2014.

Merrill, Thomas F. *Christian Criticism: A Study of Literary God-Talk*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1976. Print.

Miller-Blaise, Anne-Marie. "'O Write in Brasse': George Herbert's Trajectory from Pen to Print." *Études Épistémè* 21 (2012): n.p.. *Études Épistémè.* Web. 21 July 2015.

---. "*Oratio Nostra Est Silentium*: Silence in George Herbert's Holy Rhetoric." *"Silent Rhetoric", "Dumb Eloquence": The Rhetoric of Silence in Early Modern English Literature*. Ed. Laetitia Coussement-Boillot and Christine Sukič. Paris: Université Paris Diderot, 2007. 43-67. Print.

Moisan, Thomas. "Robert Herrick's Jonsonian 'Overplus.'" *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 21 (1995): 45-62. *ProQuest*. Web. 5 Apr. 2015.

---. "Robert Herrick's 'Rex Tragicus' and the 'Troublesome Times.'" *Viator* 21 (1990): 349-84. *ProQuest*. Web. 5 Apr. 2015.

Moorman, John Richard Humpidge. *A History of the Church in England*. Harrisburg: Morehouse, 1980. Print.

Muir, Edward. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print. New Approaches to European History.

Nania, John, and P. J. Klemp. "John Donne's *La Corona*: A Second Structure." *Renaissance and Reformation* 2.1 (1978): 49-54. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015.

Novarr, David. "The Dating of Donne's La Corona." *Philological Quarterly* 36 (1957): 259-65. *ProQuest*. Web. 30 May 2015.

---. *The Making of Walton's Lives*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1958. Print. Cornell Studies in English v. 41.

Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue, from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*. New York: Octagon, 1974. Print.

---. *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967. Print. The Terry Lectures.

Oram, William. "Herrick's Use of Sacred Materials." *"Trust to Good Verses": Herrick Tercentenary Essays*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1978. 211-20. Print.

Parry, Graham. "His Noble Numbers." *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Ed. Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 276-99. Print.

Patrick, J. Max. "Critical Problems in Editing George Herbert's *The Temple*." *The Editor as Critic and the Critic as Editor: Papers Read at a Clark Library Seminar, November 13, 1971*. Ed. Patrick and Alan Roper. Los Angeles: U of California, 1973. 3-40. Print.

Perkins, David. "Romantic Lyric Voice: What Shall We Call the `I'?" *Southern Review* 29.2 (1993): 225-38. Print.

Petry, Ray C. "Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153): Introduction." *Late Medieval Mysticism*. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1957. 47-53. Print.

Pettegree, Andrew. "Books and Printing." *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*. Ed. David M. Whitford. Kirksville: Truman State UP, 2008. 428-51. Print. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies Ser. 79.

Pickstock, Catherine. *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Print. Challenges in Contemporary Theology.

Press, John. *Robert Herrick*. London: Longmans, 1961. Print. Bibliographical Series of Supplements to British Book News on Writers and Their Work no. 132.

Rader, Ralph W. "Notes on Some Structural Varieties and Variations in Dramatic 'I' Poems and Their Theoretical Implications." *Victorian Poetry* 22.2 (1984): 103-20. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 May 2015.

Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. "'Anima Mae' Psalms and John Donne's Religious Poetry." *Bright Shootes of Everlastingnesse: The Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1987. 40-58. Print.

Ransome, Joyce. "George Herbert, Nicholas Ferrar, and the 'Pious Works' of Little Gidding." *George Herbert Journal* 31.1 (2007): 1-19. *Project MUSE*. Web. 1 Sept. 2015.

Ray, Robert H. "The Herbert Allusion Book: Allusions to George Herbert in the Seventeenth Century." *Studies in Philology* 83.4 (1986): i-182. Print. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 May 2015.

"Retail, v." *OED Online.* Oxford UP, September 2015. Web. 30 Oct. 2015.

Richey, Esther Gilman. "The Property of God: Luther, Calvin, and Herbert's Sacrifice Sequence." *ELH* 78.2 (2011): 287-314. *Project MUSE*. Web. 17 July 2014.

Rickey, Mary Ellen. *Utmost Art; Complexity in the Verse of George Herbert.* Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1966. Print.

Robbins, Robin Hugh A., ed. *The Complete Poems of John Donne: Epigrams, Verse Letters to Friends, Love-Lyrics, Love-Elegies, Satire, Religion Poems, Wedding Celebrations, Verse Epistles to Patronesses, Commemorations and Anniversaries*. By John Donne. Rev. ed. Harlow: Longman, 2010. Print. Longman Annotated English Poets.

Rollin, Roger B. *Robert Herrick*. New York: Twayne, 1992. Print.

---. "Robert Herrick (August 1591-October 1674)." *Seventeenth-Century British Nondramatic Poets: Second Series*. Ed. M. Thomas Hester. Vol. 126. Detroit: Gale, 1993. 168-81. *Gale*. Web. 16 Sept. 2015. DLB.

---. "Robert Herrick's Fathers." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 34.1 (1994): 41-60. *Gale*. Web. 16 Sept. 2015.

---. "Sweet Numbers and Sour Readers: Trends and Perspectives in Herrick Criticism." *"Trust to Good Verses": Herrick Tercentenary Essays*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1978. 3-14. Print.

---. "Witty by Design: Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*." *The Wit of Seventeenth-Century Poetry*. Ed. Claude J Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1995. 135-50. Print.

Romanelli, Christina. "Sacred Heresies: The Harrowing of Hell in Early Modern English Literature." Ph.D. U of North Carolina, Greensboro, 2014. *ProQuest*. Web. 11 Nov 2015.

Rosendale, Timothy. *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. "Standing on Ceremony: The Comedy of Manners in Herbert's 'Love (III).'" *Bright Shootes of Everlastingnesse: The Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Ed. Claude J Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1987. 116-33. Print.

Rev. of *Select Poems from the* Hesperides, or Works Both Human and Divine, of Robert Herrick. Esq. *with Occasional Remarks*, ed. J. N. *The Quarterly Review* 4.7 (1810): 165-76. *ProQuest.* Web. 1 June 2015.

Semler, L. E. "Robert Herrick's God: Visual Aesthetics in *Noble Numbers*." *Parergon* 12.1 (1994): 39-56. *Project MUSE*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

Shami, Jeanne. "Donne's *Sermons* and the Absolutist Politics of Quotation." *John Donne's Religious Imagination: Essays in Honor of John T. Shawcross*. Ed. Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances M. Malpezzi. Conway: U of Central Arkansas P, 1995. 380-412. Print.

Shaw, Robert B. *The Call of God: The Theme of Vocation in the Poetry of Donne and Herbert*. Cambridge: Cowley, 1981. Print.

Sheldrake, Philip, ed. *Heaven in Ordinary: George Herbert and His Writings*. Norwich: Canterbury P, 2009. Print.

Sloane, Mary Cole. *The Visual in Metaphysical Poetry*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities P, 1981. Print.

Smith, A. J. "John Donne (1572-31 March 1631)." *Seventeenth-Century British Nondramatic Poets: First Series*. Ed. M. Thomas Hester. Vol. 121. Detroit: Gale, 1992. 77-96. *Gale*. Web. 18 Sept. 2015. DLB.

Smith, Julia J. "Donne and the Crucifixion." *The Modern Language Review* 79.3 (1984): 513-25. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Sondergard, Sidney L. *Sharpening Her Pen: Strategies of Rhetorical Violence by Early Modern English Women Writers*. Selinsgrove: Associated UP, 2002. *EBSCO*. Web. 22 July 2015.

Stambler, Elizabeth. "The Unity of Herbert's *Temple*." *Cross Currents* 10.3 (1960): 251-66. *EBSCO*. Web. 21 Mar. 2015.

Starkman, Miriam. "*Noble Numbers* and the Poetry of Devotion." *Reason and the Imagination; Studies in the History of Ideas, 1600-1800.* Ed. Joseph Anthony Mazzeo. New York: Columbia UP, 1962. 1-28. Print.

Stein, Arnold Sidney. *George Herbert's Lyrics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1968. Print.

Strier, Richard. "Going in the Wrong Direction: Lyric Criticism and Donne's 'Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward.'" *George Herbert Journal* 29.1-2 (2005): 13-27. *Gale*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

---. *Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983. Print.

Stubbs, John. *Donne: The Reformed Soul*. London: Viking, 2006. Print.

Sullivan, Ceri. *The Rhetoric of the Conscience in Donne, Herbert and Vaughan*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Summers, Claude J. "Tears for Herrick's Church." *George Herbert Journal* 14.1 (1990): 51-71. *ProQuest*. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.

Swann, Marjorie. "Marriage, Celibacy, and Ritual in Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*." *Philological Quarterly* 76.1 (1997): 19-45. *Gale*. Web. 16 Sept. 2015.

Tamburr, Karl. *The Harrowing of Hell in Medieval England*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007. Print.

Targoff, Ramie. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001. Print.

Thekla. *George Herbert--Idea and Image: A Study of The Temple*. Newport Pagnell: Greek Orthodox Monastery of the Assumption, 1974. Print.

Toliver, Harold E. *George Herbert's Christian Narrative*. University Park: Pennsylvania State U, 1993. Print.

Tuve, Rosemond. *A Reading of George Herbert*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1952. Print.

---. "George Herbert and Caritas." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 22.3/4 (1959): 303-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 July 2014.

Veith, Gene Edward. *Reformation Spirituality: The Religion of George Herbert*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1985. Print.

Vendler, Helen. *Poems, Poets, Poetry: An Introduction and Anthology*. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford St Martin's, 2010. Print.

---. *The Poetry of George Herbert*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975. Print.

Walker, John David. "The Architectonics of George Herbert's The Temple." *ELH* 29.3 (1962): 289-305. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Mar. 2015.

Wall, John N., ed. *George Herbert: The Country Parson; The Temple*. By George Herbert. New York: Paulist P, 1981. Print. The Classics of Western Spirituality.

Waller, Gary F. "John Donne's Changing Attitudes to Time." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 14.1 (1974): 79-89. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

Wengen-Shute, Rosemary Margaret van. "George Herbert and the Liturgy of the Church of England." Ph.D. Drukkerij de Kempenaer, 1981. Print.

Whalen, Robert. *The Poetry of Immanence: Sacrament in Donne and Herbert*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. Print.

Wheaton, Sara Elizabeth. "Humanly Persuading: George Herbert's Rhetorical Lyrics." Ph.D. U of California, Irvine, 2008. *ProQuest*. Web. 21 May 2015.

White, Micheline. "A Woman with Saint Peter's Keys?: Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611) and the Priestly Gifts of Women." *Criticism* 45.3 (2003): 323-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Oct. 2015.

Whitlock, Baird W. "The Sacramental Poetry of George Herbert." *South Central Review* 3.1 (1986): 37-49. *JSTOR*. Web.

Wilcox, Helen. "'Comfortable Words': The Book of Common Prayer and English Literature." Baylor English Department. Carroll Science Building, Baylor University. 8 Apr. 2013. Lecture.

---, ed. *The English Poems of George Herbert*. By George Herbert. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Wood, Chauncey. "Sin and the Sonnet: Sidney, St. Augustine, and Herbert's 'The Sinner.'" *George Herbert Journal* 15.2 (1992): 19-32. *Gale*. Web. 1 Sept. 2015.

Woods, Susanne, ed. *The Poems of Aemilia Lanyer:* Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum. By Aemilia Lanyer. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.

Young, R. V. *Doctrine and Devotion in Seventeenth-Century Poetry Studies in Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, and Vaughan*. Cambridge: Brewer, 2000. Print. Studies in Renaissance Literature 2.