Recharting the *Via Media* of Spenser and Herbert*

DANIEL W. DOERKSEN

In some important respects, though not in all, the English church from the time of Elizabeth's accession to the death of George Herbert in 1633 was a church of the middle way, and it left its mark on representative writers like Edmund Spenser and George Herbert. Possessing different gifts and writing in different genres, Spenser and Herbert both manifest a religious awareness deeply imbued with a lively (not lukewarm) moderation. To understand and appreciate their writings most fully, we need to grasp just what the English *via media* was, and how the poetry is related to it.

There are some continuing questions about this poetry and its ethos. For example, was Spenser, or was Herbert, in some degree "Calvinist"?¹ If so, just what does this mean in terms of their poetry? If not, why does Spenser in *The Shepheardes Calender* identify so strongly with Archbishop Grindal? Why does Herbert, in a Latin poetic defence of the English liturgy, concede agreement in *doctrine* with the Scots presbyterian Andrew Melville, and join him in praise of Calvin, Beza, and the English Calvinist William Whitaker? Why does Herbert choose to embody the idea of reprobation in one of his mature poems? How can we account for the great appeal *The Temple* had for nonconformist readers in the seventeenth century?² Answers can be found, I suggest, if we take the trouble to locate the middle way accurately.

The English use of the term *via media* began in the nineteenth century, and our own picture of that way is apparently still affected by the Tractarian interpretation of the Elizabethan and early Stuart church situation. A middle path runs between extremes, and Canterbury, we are told, struck a middle course between Rome and Geneva, steering just as far away from protestantism as from papistry. That, of course, is what Keble and the Anglican Newman wished to believe, but two centuries before their time, evidence indicates, the picture was different. While Hurrell Froude, as Newman said, admired Rome and hated the Reformers,³ most churchmen 200 years earlier came closer to doing the opposite. The English church, as virtually all its writers in the period we are considering declare, is Protestant or Reformed, not papist. In 1607 Thomas Rogers, chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, published an officially countenanced treatment of the 39

* Research for this paper and its initial presentation at the 1983 annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies were made possible by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Articles in which (somewhat like Herbert a few years later) he agreed with the puritans about church unity in matters of *doctrine*; also, he undertook to show the harmony between the English and the continental protestant churches in all essential teachings. (John Donne owned a copy of this book.)⁴

While admitting with various degrees of reluctance that the Roman was a Christian church (though badly in error), most English church leaders took a strong stand against it. Politics—the papal threat to the Elizabethan monarchy, the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the fear of Jesuit subversion—did much to shape English attitudes, but *theological* differences were perceived as basic, and not only by those now regarded as “puritans.” Whitgift as Professor of Divinity demonstrated the pope to be Antichrist (*DNB*); Andrewes and even William Laud engaged in anti-Roman disputation. While Queen Elizabeth seems to have been indifferent to theology (as distinct from ritual), her bishops were not; and both James (in the 1620’s) and Charles I risked serious trouble with churchmen and parliament for what was considered “tolerated popery”—seen in religious, not merely political terms. The English middle way, then, sought to avoid papistry, and was itself theologically protestant.

What was the comparable and opposing extreme to be shunned? John Donne, Dean of St. Paul’s and Prolocutor of Convocation (and of course an influential friend of Herbert’s), can help us here. Although occasionally tempted like others by the convenient alliteration of “papist” and “puritan,” this successor of Thomas Gataker and predecessor of John Preston, both moderate “puritan” lecturers at Lincoln’s Inn, does not regard puritanism as an equal and opposite danger to Romanism. Accordingly, his sermons contain significantly more, and more emphatic, warnings against papistry. At key points Donne balances against the Roman Scylla a Charybdis that is neither puritanism nor Calvinism (he *admired* Calvin), but separatism or Anabaptism.⁵ As some important studies have shown, the consensus of English churchmen until 1625 at least was broadly “Calvinist,” and most “puritans” until after the time of Donne and Herbert remained within the Church of England.⁶ Those who separated and those considered heterodox in *theology* constituted the extreme on the other border of the middle way.

What has confused matters for many readers is that there is a special and limited sense—having to do with order and ritual only—in which the *via media* was indeed a path between Rome and either Geneva or puritanism. Most English churchmen of Spenser’s and Herbert’s time would agree with Whitgift and Hooker that “matters of faith, and in general matters necessary unto Salvation, are of a different nature from ceremonies, order, and the kind of church government”⁷—and it was on the latter kind of unessential and yet not insignificant issue that “puritans” and conformists

disagreed. It is specifically with an eye to such *externals* that Herbert (probably echoing Spenser's description of Medina in *The Faerie Queene*, II, iii, 14-39) writes of a golden mean in his well-known poem, "The British Church." This is why the dominant clothing and grooming imagery is so appropriate:

A fine aspect in fit array,
Neither too mean, nor yet too gay,
Shows who is best.
Outlandish looks may not compare:
For all they either painted are,
Or else undrest. (p. 109)

Herbert uses the language of *via media* even more definitely in his Latin verses in reply to Melville, but only after first announcing that their only disagreement is about ritual. Beyond these early writings, and specifically in his mature poetry, Herbert says virtually nothing about church polity, and not very much about ceremony as such.

The concept of a doctrinal *via media* is much more important and helpful for understanding Herbert's English poems than is that applying to ritual only. A poem like "The British Church," far from being representative of *The Temple*, is an isolated exception. For one thing, the smugness and exclusiveness (though not the loyalty) of the closing lines is most unusual in the mature Herbert:

But dearest Mother, what those misse
The mean, thy praise and glorie is,
And long may be.
Blessed be God, whose love it was
To double-moat thee with his grace,
And none but thee.

Then, too, Herbert is not generally preoccupied with outward ritual as his simple-minded imitator Christopher Harvey will be. Though Herbert always cares about beauty, he usually feels, as in "Sion," that all God's "frame and fabrick is within," or else, as in "The Windows," that real and visible beauty of character depends on God's transforming us inwardly. There are in fact few poems in *The Temple* that a nonconformist would find in any way objectionable, because on the whole Herbert's middle way is one that includes him or her. Richard Hooker shows a similar sense of values to Herbert's when he compares the essentials of salvation as comprehended in Scripture to a path whose *course* is in no way altered when at the national church's discretion the *surface* is "laid with gravel, or set with grass, or paved with stone, [yet it] remaineth still the same path."⁸

Just where do the “puritans” fit into the picture? That name, originally a

term of abuse, can have valid applications during the time of Spenser and Herbert, but requires careful definition for a particular purpose.⁹ I am not here mainly concerned with mere cranks, complainers, or hypocrites, of which any society has a sufficient number, though they may profess any religion, or no religion at all. England had its share, and they were duly pilloried in plays and satires. Such deservors of the mocking nickname "puritan" may be reflected in Spenser's Sir Huddibras and his cranky lady Elissa, and certainly in the faddists, buffoons, and over-weening weavers occasionally pictured in Herbert's Latin verses.¹⁰ Of more serious interest to us here are those committed members of the Church of England who felt the need for further reform, especially of liturgy or polity, and were willing to work for change. Just because most of us feel that Hooker bested them, we may be inclined to underrate them or think of them only in unfavourable terms. If, however, we study those whose writings remain,¹¹ we may find ourselves agreeing that most of these were neither ignorant nor petty men of their time. Their chief goal, we should not forget, was shared with the dedicated conformists—the improvement of English spiritual life. The items on their agenda that we usually talk about were secondary to them—means to a greater end, and for that reason subject to change. So we find that after the Admonition controversy (and therefore during most of Spenser's and Herbert's writing lifetimes) presbyterian church polity was virtually a dead issue.¹² Differences over ceremonies were really family quarrels, conducted with more moderation on both sides than is often recognized nowadays—because both sides were aware of their common ground in Protestant Christian theology and loyalty to the English church.¹³

From Elizabethan times there were people who can be identified as "conforming puritans"—those who suppressed whatever desire they had for specific reforms in, say, ceremony, for the sake of church unity, but nevertheless maintained an outlook that could be termed "puritan" in other respects, for example, in their concern for a godly, learned, preaching ministry. Thus, Peter Lake in a recent book claims William Whitaker as a moderate puritan, although he was "neither a non-conformist nor a presbyterian."¹⁴ Some even became bishops and archbishops (Grindal, Hutton, Abbot) and found themselves enforcing conformity. We tend to think that before the events of the 1640's the puritans were continually frustrated, but I submit that by learning from the conformists and in turn influencing them, and by simply getting on with their real agenda, the conforming puritans made very important contributions to the English church at its very heart. In this way, too, they had more of a positive effect on some of the great literature of that time than has ever been adequately noticed.

Before detailing the make-up of the English *via media* as I see it, I should

say something about English Calvinism. While the English reformation did not spring from Calvin, his kind of theology (from which Genevan polity was separable¹⁵) became dominant in Elizabethan England by various means: the return of Marian "exiles" from Geneva and other Calvinist centres, many becoming leading churchmen; the enormous popularity of the Geneva Bible; the sheer quantity and perceived excellence of Calvin's own writings printed in England, for many years outnumbering the works of any other writer (including the English); and the use of his *Institutes* as a text at the universities.¹⁶ Such dominance is especially understandable if we realize (with François Wendel) that Calvin sought primarily to be a biblical expositor, that what was central to his thinking was not predestination or a form of ecclesiology but perhaps "*Omnia quidem habemus a Deo, sed non nisi per Christum.*" But, as Wendel says, "every authentic Christian theology could claim this."¹⁷ In other words, Calvin is more centrally Christian than is often recognized. Also Harris Harbison has maintained that "he read more widely and was sensitive to more opposing points of view both within and outside the Christian tradition" than most scholars of his time, including Erasmus.¹⁸ The real Calvin must be rescued from his rigidifying followers, including some English puritans, and from those who in later times have simply equated Calvinism with puritanism, presbyterianism, or even predestinarian teaching. Though formally rejecting human reason, will, and works as helping to initiate salvation, Calvin does not reject them totally, and in fact he constantly writes rational discourse and assumes human responsibility. Hooker thus differs from him in perhaps epistemological theory (not practice) and of course in polity, but not in theology. Knowing Calvin's writings as many now do not, most churchmen of Spenser's and Herbert's time thought and spoke well of them—including such conformists as Whitgift, Hooker, Andrewes, and Overall.¹⁹ The usual assumption that English extremists are "more Calvinistic" than moderates depends on an arbitrary definition of "Calvinism," overly influenced by the heat of sixteenth-century continental controversy and insufficiently heedful of this reformer's firm advocacy of moderation, order, and church unity.²⁰ A Calvinistic *via media* is not a contradiction in terms.

While predestination was *not* central in Calvin,²¹ this teaching can, I believe, act as a rough gauge of English Calvinism. The regular church Article on this topic, XVII, is moderately Calvinistic; but even the extreme and rather rigid Lambeth Articles found general acceptance in Cambridge of 1595, and a few decades later in the Irish branch of the church. The modifications suggested by Hooker still leave a definitely predestinarian position,²² which may in fact be closer to Calvin's own in its greater flexibility. As readers of Calvin's *Sermons on Job* knew, this reformer regularly prayed for the salvation of all men. English delegates to the

Synod of Dort were Calvinist in their sympathies, and when in the mid-1620's Richard Montague dared to voice ideas perceived as Arminian, there was a storm of protest, by no means just from puritans. Even parliament got involved, and Montague's *Appello Caesarem* was eventually suppressed by proclamation. While Charles I began to favour "Arminianism," Bishop John Davenant, a friend of the puritan John Preston and a Calvinist professor of divinity at Cambridge at the time Herbert was there, one of the Dort delegates, continued to maintain a strongly predestinarian position during the very years he ordained Herbert and was his diocesan. Earlier Spenser had embodied the predestination of Article XVII in *The Faerie Queene*, Book I.²³ When Herbert says in his prose guide for country parsons that only the "thrusting away" of God's arm makes us "not embraced" (p. 283), he is speaking almost like Una in Spenser's poem (I, ix, 53), drawing attention to God's call. Calvin, without saying as much, regularly challenges his hearers and readers to respond to God's initiative. In "The Water-course," however, Herbert calls on the believer to adore the God

Who gives to man, as he sees fit, { Salvation.
 { Damnation. (p. 170)

When, in another late poem, Herbert suggests the "Ark" of the church is shaking with "old sinnes and new doctrines" (p. 161), he is most likely, like his bishop, thinking of Arminianism as such a novel doctrine.

If we want to picture accurately the *via media* of these poets, we should first bear in mind that all who remained within the church, with whatever reluctance, did walk on some part of this middle way. From puritans on the far left stopping short on the brink of separation to those of Roman inclinations on the right who nevertheless conformed, and including those (perhaps even the majority of the English) who were quite indifferent to church teaching—all formed part of the *via media*. Only separatists and recusants excluded themselves. Of the committed (and we are justified in concentrating on these) we can find the moderate conformists (such as the non-Laudian bishops) and the fully conforming puritans (like Sibbes, Ward, or Preston) at the middle, just right and just left of centre. Toward the left are various shades of non-separating puritans, and toward the right, those who wanted to nudge the church away from its dominant theological Calvinism, to heighten ritual, and to reduce the existing tolerance in the matter of ceremony. Just as the puritans favoured change, there is an important sense in which the Laudians were correctly perceived as innovators. Until well after 1625 they were not at the centre of the "middle way," but on one side. Increasingly they sought to narrow that way to include only their views. When Charles I sided with them and they started to take over the best deaneries and bishoprics, they worked to change the face of the church.²⁴

Before Laud's full ascendancy after Herbert's death in 1633, the English church was characterized by overall unity in theology and considerable flexibility in attitudes toward the admittedly secondary matter of ceremony. The English term "Anglican" dates from 1635, and some of its current connotations from the nineteenth century (as in the Froude quotation, *OED*, s.v. "Anglican"). The long-time modern insistence on labeling English religious writers before the Laudian era as either "puritan" (then mainly a term of abuse) or "Anglican" (an anachronism) and imagining a very significant gap between the two is artificial and often unhelpful. Even into the 1630's a "conforming puritan" like Dr. Samuel Ward, the Master of Sidney Sussex College, could carry on a frequent and easy correspondence with many bishops on the one hand and with "puritans" in trouble about conformity on the other.²⁵ Archbishop James Ussher, well acquainted with "puritans" like Walter Travers at Trinity College, Dublin, where the latter served as Provost, actively sought the appointment of Richard Sibbes to the same post in 1625 (*DNB*). A lifelong friend and correspondent of the scholarly "puritan" Thomas Gataker, Ussher before long came to be on good terms with Laud too. Joseph Hall, raised on puritan sermons and attending Emmanuel, that "puritan foundation" at Cambridge, shared literary interests and a patron (Sir Robert Drury) with Donne, then developed friendships with Davenant and Ward at Dort. The favourite English poet of this Calvinist bishop and writer of meditations was Spenser.²⁶

When we consider the English church as it was before Laud became archbishop, it seems reasonable to regard Spenser as a "conforming puritan" sympathetic to the views of Grindal, certainly at the time of *The Shepheardes Calender* and for some time thereafter. Such a stance would help account for seemingly anti-puritan satire directed against those who feign "godly zeale" to impress "some Noble man" and thus get a benefice (ll. 489-94), in *Mother Hubberds Tale* where generally the thrust is against unzealous conformists like the priest who avoids sects and heresies (ll. 385-91) by avoiding learning:

All his care was, his seruice well to saine,
And to read Homelies vpon holidayes:
When that was done, he might attend his playes;
An easie life, and fit him God to please. (ll. 392-95)

Later Spenser may have shifted a little—which would be all it would take to make him a conformist in the church of the 1590's.

George Herbert, in spite of the artful Izaak Walton's allegations, had no connections with Laud, but received all his preferments from that prelate's moderate opponents, like Williams and Davenant. An actual defender of

church order and ritual in his early Latin poetry, Herbert should be recognized as a non-Laudian conformist. My research into ornaments and ceremony in those churches and chapels he is known to have communed in and served suggests that the services would have been much more like modern "low" rather than "high" Anglican—no altars (or altar rails), no incense or candles, but instead scripture texts written on the walls; reverence and the prayer book indeed, but great stress on scripture and preaching.²⁷ Herbert knew and respected the puritan Sir Robert Harley, married to his own cousin, and in the poet's youth a frequent visitor in the Herbert household.²⁸ Richard Holdsworth, an outstanding puritan tutor during Herbert's time at Cambridge, in the 1640's a royalist Master of Emmanuel and collector of one of the greatest libraries of the time, recommended Herbert's poems in his manuscript "Directions for a Student in the Universitie." He also commended as religious reading a list of authors that defies our modern Anglican-Puritan distinction in identifying the non-Laudian ethos at its best: "B[ishop] Hall, Sibbs, Preston Bolton. Davnant, Perkins . . . etc."²⁹ Much later, in his life of Herbert, Walton reflected a greatly changed perspective on this era. Yet even this creator of a "Laudian" George Herbert left copies of Sibbes' chief works to his son and daughter, urging them to read "so as to be well acquainted with them" and inscribed in his own copy of another, "Heaven was in him, before he was in heaven."³⁰

Protestant doctrine—Christian doctrine understood in Protestant terms—was more a positive and unifying than a divisive force in the England of Spenser and Herbert. The "highest common factor" that linked together most of the important religious writers was not simply obedience to a hierarchy nor a grudging tolerance among mismatched members of a national church, but a lively biblical faith—something like what Richard Baxter, a great admirer of Herbert, later referred to as "meer Christianity."³¹ Polity and details of ritual were secondary matters (at least till Laud's time), not insignificant, but means to a greater end.

My own research provides support for the view of Charles and Katherine George that Protestant theology prevailed at the very centre of the pre-Laudian English *via media*, where moderate bishops and moderate puritans travelled together in a significant degree of harmony. It also fits in with Barbara Lewalski's claim for a Protestant shaping of literature of the time. Ideas and convictions do not of themselves produce good writers or writings, but in the positive milieu of Spenser's and Herbert's period good religious writing, including the literary, could and did flourish. Unlike Herbert, Spenser did not confine himself to religious topics, but *The Faerie Queene*, Book I, gains tremendous effect because it presents an *unholy* Knight of Holinesse, one who desperately needs—and receives—God's transforming power. The insight is biblical and Protestant, but of course

mainly Christian. So too, staying close to the heart of his church's biblical ethos, with its impulse toward introspection, George Herbert wrote his most distinctive and outstanding poems, those picturing inner spiritual conflict. What may be Herbert's very best poem, "Love" (III), might even be seen as embodying a basic Calvinistic tenet—God's love for the undeserving. Indeed, it may be justly if paradoxically claimed that the enduring appeal of *The Faerie Queene*, Book I, and of *The Temple* to a range of readers far beyond the Church of England tradition (including Roman Catholic and secular readers), owes much to the "biblical" shaping of Protestant writing in the time of Spenser and Herbert.

University of New Brunswick

Notes

- 1 Spenser's "Calvinism" has been asserted by Lilian Winstanley in "Spenser and Puritanism," *MLQ*, 3 (1900), 103, 108-09, and F.M. Padelford, "Spenser and the Theology of Calvin," *MP*, 12 (1914), 1-18, among others, and denied by Virgil K. Whitaker, *The Religious Basis of Spenser's Thought* (1950; rept. New York: Gordian Press, 1966). See Whitaker, pp. 5-7, for a brief summary of viewpoints and spokesmen on the issue to 1950. Since that date the question has, it seems, been generally ignored rather than regarded as resolved, while at the same time some historical studies have given us a much clearer picture of what English Calvinism was. After years of readings of Herbert in terms of medieval and even Roman Catholic background (the best of these continue to have great value) William G. Halewood, *The Poetry of Grace* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1970) and Barbara K. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1979), among others, have finally given consideration to Herbert's Protestantism. But objections from Mary Ellen Rickey in her review of *Protestant Poetics*, *George Herbert Journal*, 3 (Nos. 1 and 2, 1979-80), 82-89, and from Heather Asals (a former student of Lewalski's) in *Equivocal Predication* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1981), pp. 4-5, demonstrate that the question is not yet regarded as settled. Richard Strier's important book, *Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), appeared after this paper was completed.
- 2 Joseph H. Summers first raised these questions in the third chapter of *George Herbert: His Religion and Art* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1954). In Herbert, see *Works*, ed. F.E. Hutchinson, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1945), pp. 386, 398, 170, xliii-xliv. My later quotations are taken from this edition. For the Latin, readers may wish to consult *The Latin Poetry of George Herbert: A Bilingual Edition*, trans. Mark McCloskey and Paul R. Murphy (n.p.: Ohio Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 10-11, 46-47.
- 3 John Henry Cardinal Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. D.J. De Laura (New York: Norton, 1968), p. 32.
- 4 *The Faith, Doctrine, and religion, professed and protected in the Realme of England . . .* (Cambridge, 1607). See Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973), p. 275.
- 5 John Donne, *Sermons*, ed. G.R. Potter and E.M. Simpson (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1953-62), VIII, 90; IV, 148, 207. In discussing the *via media* as he sees it in Donne's sermons, William R. Mueller, *John Donne: Preacher* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1962), 148-62, makes frequent use of the term "Separatist." Janel Mueller, ed. *Donne's Prebend Sermons* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1971), p. 22, describes the left edge of the *via media* as Anabaptist.
- 6 George, Charles H. and Katherine, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 72, 370-71; Nicholas Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution" in *The Origins of the English Civil War*, ed. Conrad Russell

- (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 119-43; and Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 79-91.
- 7 Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Everyman's Library (London: Dent, n.d.), I, 298-99 (Hooker is citing Whitgift).
 - 8 Hooker, I, 301. For a somewhat different, detailed reading of "The British Church" which rejects even more strongly the previously received ideas of Herbert's *via media*, see Richard Strier, "History, Criticism, and Herbert: A Polemical Note," *PLL*, 17 (1981), 347-52.
 - 9 See Christopher Hill's chapter, "The Definition of a Puritan," in his *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1964; rept. London: Panther, 1969), pp. 15-30.
 - 10 Edmund Spenser, *Poetical Works*, ed. J.C. Smith and E. De Selincourt (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 78-79 (*Faerie Queene*, II, ii, 17, 35); *Latin Poetry of George Herbert*, pp. 8-9, 36-39, 26-29. However, I will offer a different interpretation of Sir Hudibras and Elissa in a forthcoming paper on the Medina passage in *The Faerie Queene*.
 - 11 The George book previously cited gives careful attention to about thirty such "puritans."
 - 12 George, p. 369.
 - 13 Tyacke, pp. 120-21.
 - 14 *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982), p. 169.
 - 15 As episcopalian Calvinists like Whitgift knew, Calvin did not insist on ecclesiastical discipline as a mark of the true church, and recognized that in externals there would be national and epochal variations—see François Wendel, *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. P. Mairet (London: Collins, 1963), pp. 301-02.
 - 16 See C.D. Cremeans, *The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1949), pp. 24-43, 60-82.
 - 17 Wendel, pp. 357-58.
 - 18 E. Harris Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (New York: Scribner, 1956), p. 140.
 - 19 John Whitgift, *Works*, ed. J. Ayre, Parker Society (Cambridge, Eng., 1851-53), I, 436; Hooker, I, 79; Lancelot Andrewes, *Works*, ed. J.P. Wilson and J. Bliss (Oxford, 1841-54), V, 20; IX, 123, 132; John Overall, *Convocation Book*, Anglo-Catholic Library (Oxford, 1844), p. 154.
 - 20 R.S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1959), pp. 170-71, 184-89, 108-09; Wendel, p. 311. See also Basil Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," in *John Calvin* (Appleford, Eng.: Sutton Courtenay, 1966), 19-37.
 - 21 Wendel, pp. 263-65; Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, tr. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), pp. 159-69, esp. p. 166.
 - 22 Hooker, II, 542.
 - 23 Daniel W. Doerksen, "'All the Good is God's': Predestination in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book I," *Christianity and Literature*, 32 (No. 3, Spring 1983), 11-18.
 - 24 Tyacke, pp. 119-21, 129-34, 137-40; for massive evidence, see N.R.N. Tyacke, "Arminianism in England in Religion and Politics, 1604 to 1640," Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1968.
 - 25 See numerous letters to Ward in Bodleian Library MSS. Tanner 70-74.
 - 26 Frank L. Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England* (Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1981), p. 35.
 - 27 I have work in progress on this subject, but in the meantime one should note that the actual evidence given in Appendix E in Amy Charles, *A Life of George Herbert* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977) does exactly the opposite of what Professor Charles intends, and dissociates Herbert from Laudianism. Following Addleshaw and Etchells, she accepts as "the three elements of the Laudian reform" "the altar at the east end, the rails, the communicants kneeling at the rail to receive the Sacrament" (p. 232); but with regard to the first two she offers no shred of refutation of the charge against Herbert's successor at Bemerton "That he hath bin a great Inovator in his church at Bem[er]ton in [par]ticular hee caused the Comunion Table (calling itt the blessed bord to be turned Aulter wise) and raised the ground vnder itt, and Rayl'd itt" (p. 228). If the charge had not been

true, if such changes had occurred in Herbert's time or earlier, then surely the witnesses for the defence (cited in detail by Charles, pp. 230-31) were badly negligent in not saying so. (The triviality or prejudice of other charges against Herbert's successor, of which Charles makes so much, are completely irrelevant to this part of the argument.) I know of no evidence for Charles' unsupported assertion that "even in his Cambridge days and in the midst of rather strong Puritan influences, - [Herbert] considered the Communion table to be an altar and therefore to be placed against the east wall" (p. 232). Herbert's references to "altars" are regularly non-physical—a symbolism that any Christian of whatever persuasion could accept. That Herbert favoured kneeling at communion, but refused to be dogmatic about it, distinguishes him from the Laudians, who varied from the preceding tolerance by their *insistence* that all should kneel.

28 See *DNB*; Charles, *Life*, p. 41; Herbert, *Works*, pp. 367-69.

29 Appendix II in Harris F. Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton*, II (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1961), 648, 640.

30 Richard Sibbes, *Works*, ed. A.B. Grosart (Edinburgh, 1862-64), I, xx.

31 See N.H. Keeble, "C.S. Lewis, Richard Baxter, and 'Mere Christianity,'" *Christianity and Literature*, 30 (No. 3, Spring, 1981), 27-44, esp. pp. 30-32.