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CHRONOLOGY:

1582  Born Edward Herbert March 3 at Eyton-on-Severn, Shropshire, England
1596  Matriculates as gentleman commoner at University College, Oxford.
1596  Father, Richard Herbert, dies.
1599  Edward Herbert marries Mary Herbert.
1601  Herbert splits time between Montgomery Castle and his mother’s London house.
1603  Herbert is inducted as a Knight of the Order Of the Bath.
1604  Herbert appointed Sheriff of Montgomery County.
1608  Herbert’s first trip to Europe accompanied by A. Townshend.
1609  Herbert returns to England.
1610-14 Herbert serves as a volunteer soldier with protestant forces in the Low Countries.
1615  Herbert travels to Lyons to raise Protestant troops and is subsequently arrested.
1616  Herbert returns to London where he recovers from what is likely malaria.
1618  Herbert is appointed courtier.
1621  In England, the term deist is first acknowledged in Robert Burton’s The Anatomy of Melancholy (1621).
1624  Herbert prints his first book De Veritate.
1625  Death of James I
1627  Mother, Magdalen Danver, dies.
1628  Buckingham is assassinated.
1629  Herbert receives English peerage as Lord Herbert of Cherbury.
1630  Herbert presents The Expedition to the Isle of Rhe to the king.
1639  Charles I expedition against the Scots
1640  Herbert is arrested by Parliament
1644  Herbert rejects the Royalists. Religione Laici and De Causus Errorum are published.
1648  Death of Herbert.
1649  The Life and Reign of King Henry the Eighth
1656  The Expedition to the Isle of Rhe
1663  De Religione Gentilium
1665  Herbert’s Occasional Verse is published.
1675  The word deism first appears in a dictionary.
1680  Kortholt calls Herbert unholy in Three Great Imposters (1680)
1764  Herbert’s autobiography is published by Walpole.
1768  Herbert’s Dialogue between a Tutor and his Pupil is published.
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INTRODUCTION

He was born Edward Herbert (ca. 1582 -1648) on March 3rd at Eyton-on Severn, Shropshire, England. His life began in the Elizabethan through the Jacobean, into the Carolinian era, and fell several years shy of the Commonwealth Interregnum. Invigorated by that epoch Oscar Wilde tagged “the womb of the Revolution” (Wilde 1), Herbert was a figure for “whom the end of life [was] action,” and to “whom the end of life [was] thought,” to use Wilde’s delineation of Renaissance figures (3). Herbert experienced family, crown and church as a “valley of corruption and change,” and he longed to live as a “free, reasonable creature.”2 A medievalist figure and a gentleman of James’s time, Herbert found his thoughts were kindled in a Jacobean wit wrapped in a belly-band of conspiratorial rancor and melancholy. His pursuit of letters and arms would serve for him as a happy, intense medium. For two-thirds of his life Herbert learned to separate his public voice and his private expression, and he squirreled his original thoughts into poems, experimental treatises, and an autobiography. Despite his blue blood, high estate, martial record, and royal favor, he was in his truest aspect the Squirrel of Montgomery Castle.

A man “that art so many men,” Herbert compounded royalist, nobleman, scholar, knight, Anglo-Welsh soldier, diplomat, rhetorician, historian, deistic philosopher, poet, lutenist, composer, essayist, dramatist, biographer, apothecary and duelist. An admiring Ben Jonson ratified (Hill preface):

If men get name, for some one virtue: Then
What man art thou, that art so many men,
All-virtuous HERBERT! On whose every part
Truth might spend all her voice, Fame all her art.
Whether thy learning they would take, or wit
Or valour, or thy judgement seasoning it.
And yet Lord Edward Herbert of Chirbury\(^3\) is a figure without sufficient recognition for prejudice holds him in her cross-beams indefinitely. His private expression was so sheltered from his public life that he was left branded a “consummate egotist” and a “dilettante.”

Herbert’s privileged birth licensed him to cultivate an eccentricity not unlike the notable Michel de Montaigne’s. A darkly figure, Herbert became broody and haughty when things went awry. In 1608 when Herbert made his first trip to Europe to become a man of the world, he sheared himself of sentiment, declaring that ten years of dutiful marriage was enough. Upon his return in 1609, he announced himself as a figure of “great esteem both on court and city, many of the greatest desiring [his] company” (Lee 127). His temperament, incautious and volatile, manifested in an outspokenness that prompted recalls of Herbert by James I from his post as courtier in France. The titles Herbert garnered during this career were but paltry to him. He felt his acts of bravery and diplomatic skills deserved better recognition. At the end of a long career, Herbert had wearied of his binding relationship to the crown. At the onset of the first English Civil War, Herbert unexpectedly switched political allegiance, forsook the King, and willfully disengaged from the Herbertian legacy built on choice marriages, deft soldiering and crown loyalty. When Joseph Hall, English moralist turned bishop, published *Quo Vadis? A just censure of travel as it is commonly undertaken by gentleman of our nation* in 1617, its premise the sad fate of “those, that profess to seek glory of a perfect breeding, and the perfection of that, which we call Civility, in Travel…returning as empty of grace, and other virtues, as full of words, vanity, mis-dispositions” (Hall 5), he might as well have been thinking of Herbert. Herbert exemplified the ancient nobility in all its mercurial, untamed splendor.

Herbert learned to hide his political subversiveness from prying authorities. He took in the scenery then withdrew to his private chamber to draw inferences. His thoughts potentially heretical or treasonous were housed in labyrinthine argumentation to elude the suspicious. When
Rome sent a scout, Gregorio Panzani, to question the nature of Herbert’s philosophical treatise *De Veritate, prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verisimili, a possibili, et a falso* (On Truth, as it is distinguished from Revelation, the Probable, the Possible, and the False) Herbert disarmed him with his verbal innuendo. Panzani reported to Rome that he had encountered a moderate man, one who “professed to recognize the Roman church as Mother of all Churches” (Hill 14).

Herbert’s rhetorical double-talk was anything but benign. He once boasted: “Though I speak not directly, I yet often convey and insinuate into their ears” (Hill 12). Herbert was a paragon of dissimulation, the art so highly prized by Machiavelli and Castiglione.

Herbert however may have masked himself too well, or worn too many masks, for even modern critics and historians have misjudged him. Eminent critics such as Leslie Stephen and Mario Rossi pattern twentieth century criticism of Herbert as a dilettante. Stephen an ex-Anglican who turned Agonist was intolerant towards the deistic Herbert, and scowled in his *National Review* 35 (1900) publication of “Lord Herbert of Cherbury” that the “singular self-conceit of his autobiography is not that of a strong man” (Hill Preface). Rossi, too, flogs Herbert as a dilettante in *La Vita le opere, i tempe di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury* (Florence, 1947). Rossi’s obdurate stance of philosophy of religion as an impossibility prompted Hill to write in *Edward Herbert of Chirbury*: “It would be difficult to conceive of a less suitable guide to the works of Lord Herbert, the father of English deism, than a scholar who attributes much that he disapproves of in modern thought precisely to deism” (Hill, preface). Their bias towards Herbert has been readily adopted by readers.

Herbert is further obscured by younger sibling George Herbert (1593-1633), a metaphysical poet whose work graces all anthologies and whose fame kept the elder brother’s works lesser known and largely uncirculated. The Modern Language Association Bibliography of 1983 indexed three-dozen references on George ‘holy’ Herbert, and none on Edward Herbert,
that unholy brother of the Renaissance. Renaissance figures John Donne (1572-1631) and Ben Jonson (1572-1637), however, praised the work of both brothers. Today only George Herbert’s works make frequent appearances in anthologies alongside Donne’s.

Indeed, readers, then and now, are put off by an antiquarian Herbert whose unfinished autobiography was rescued in 1714, in 1737, and again in 1764 by Horatio Walpole with a first edition print, and Walpole spoke even then of its publication as an “act of revival” of the writer and poet: “I much mistake if hereafter, [Herbert] is not considered as one of the most extraordinary characters which this country has produced,” wrote Walpole into his dedication note. Yet he sniggered at Herbert’s aggrandized accounts of duels. Sidney Lees’ 1886 edition of Herbert’s autobiography asserts that “[Herbert] deserves the serious attention of the student, not only of English literature, but of English social history in the early seventeen century” (preface). Eugene Hills’ work Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1987) invited that second look at Herbert to recover him as philosopher, poet, writer and historian, but Hill’s work continues to sound defensive as he confirms Herbert’s centrality to seventeenth century English studies.

It is perhaps only now, after the full spate of new historicist and queer theory analyses of the period, that Herbert’s importance as a split subject can finally emerge. Tottering between feudal privilege and modern consciousness, Herbert’s swagger stigmatized him but equally gave strength to his private voice. His cultural satirical poem “Satyra Secunda of Travellers From Paris” which he addressed to Jonson attacked the impressionable and non-discerning Englishmen who travelled the continent. Herbert’s political poem “The State Progress of Ill” took a satirical stance on the ills of sovereignty in which he provoked his reader to take up ‘arms’ of reasoned judgment on the matter of religious conviction. The other sort Herbert had witnessed from the frontlines as a volunteer soldier from 1610-1614 out in the Low Countries. In the summer of 1624, Herbert willfully broke his silence by circulating his philosophical work De Veritate, a
rational treatise that called to his readers to free themselves from political-religious puppetry. In doing so, Herbert stood up to the Roman Church and the Christian church, all alone but for his measured words. Certainly, Voltaire remembered Edward Herbert at the height of the Enlightenment. He recognized Herbert as its forerunner. Regrettably, readers have forgotten words of praise for Herbert from the likes of Voltaire, Donne or Jonson yet their praise bifurcates and affirms my thesis of a double Herbert, a public (and Quixotic) figure admired by Jonson, who harbored within a free thinking, brilliant intellectual as praised by Donne and Voltaire. The two Edward Herberts could not have been more at odds and neither would have existed without the other.
BIOGRAPHY

Choice marriages, deft soldiering, and crown loyalty positioned the Herbert family when they abandoned the Welsh system of patronymics for the English pattern of family surnames in 1460 and ensconced themselves in English society. Favorably stationed, a Herbert secured a county seat every year from 1553 to 1640, except for one. Herbert’s grandfather, Edward Herbert (d.1593), built the family name upon accrued wealth and property in his capacity as courtier, soldier, and administrator. He represented the county of Montgomery in parliament, controlled the seat for the borough of Montgomery and was constable of Montgomery Castle (Hill 2). In 1587, Edward purchased Powis Castle in Wales, a large medieval fortress of red sandstone, and he transformed it into a palatial Elizabethan home.\(^5\) In his autobiography, Herbert recollects his grandfather’s county sway (Lee Edition):

> My grandfather’s power was so great in the country that divers ancestors of the better families now in Montgomeryshire were his servants and raised by him.

> He delighted also much in hospitality, as having a very long table twice covered every meal with the best meats that could be gotten, and a very great family.

> It was an ordinary saying in the country at that time when they saw any fowl rise, "Fly where thou wilt, thou wilt light at Black hall," which was a low building, but of great capacity… (4)\(^6\)

Herbert, the eldest of six brothers and three sisters, was the son of Richard Herbert (1554 -1596), a member of the collateral branch of the family of the Earls of Pembroke, sheriff of Montgomeryshire, and a constable of Montgomery Castle. Herbert inherited his good looks, a legacy of “richly black-haired and bearded” appearance from this long lineage of Herberts and described his father as possessing a “manly or somewhat stern look, but withal very handsome
and well compact in his limbs, and of a great courage, whereof he gave proof” (Lee 2). Richard Herbert married Magdalen Herbert (?-1627), nee Newport (later Lady Danvers). Magdalen Herbert was the daughter of Sir Richard Newport. Magdalen Herbert resided with Edward at Montgomery Castle after his marriage to Mary Herbert. Montgomery Castle was the childhood home of Edward and his siblings, and a part of the livelihood he inherited.

Herbert exhibited an early proclivity for the contemplative life for, when he “came to talk,” one of his first “inquiries…was, how [he] came into this world” (Lee 15). This tenacious questioning left him still to be wondered at by others. But perhaps they attributed it to his sickly childhood, for he suffered from bouts of epilepsy or from his general reluctance to speak, which was out of a fear of being imperfect or impertinent. Accustomed to being tutored at home, Edward developed an affinity for private study. He was drawn to his tutor, autodidact Mr. Edward Thellwall of Place-ward in Denbighshire who “acquired the exact knowledge of Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish, and all other learning, having for that purpose neither gone beyond seas, nor so much as had the benefit of any universities” (Lee 20). In Thellwall Herbert too witnessed a rare governing of choler. He admired Thellwall, yet struggled still to tether his own temper. Those closest to him knew of his choleric fits; Herbert confessed: “I could never attain that perfection, as being subject ever to choler and passion more than I ought, and generally to speak my mind freely, and indeed rather to imitate those who, having fire within doors, choose rather to give it vent than suffer it to burn the house” (Lee 20).

At age ten, he was taught by Mr. Newton from Diddlebury, Shropshire, where in the space of less than two years, Herbert attained knowledge of Greek and logic. The Herberths had clearly sufficient expectations of their son Edward to groom and educate him at this young age, for at their expense he entered University College, Oxford, as a gentleman-commoner where he “disputed at first [his] coming into logic, and to have made in Greek the exercises required in...
that college, oftener than in Latin” (Lee 21). Herbert graduated in 1596. Richard Herbert died that same year and Magdalen Herbert petitioned for joint wardship of young Herbert with her brother, Sir Francis Newport. The Herbert brothers, Edward and George were directed by Magdalen Herbert to pursue political and religious careers, respectively. Her sons acquiesced. George Herbert embraced the holy order in 1630 and became a dedicated rector of Bemerton near Salisbury, where over time he earned the moniker “Holy Mr. Herbert.” Herbert ventured the path of political and county life that had been grooved by his grand-father and father. His political career effectively smothered his intellectual life. He would end this silence at the age of forty-three in the summer of 1624.

In February 1599, in a marriage contracted upon him by his mother, Herbert, not quite seventeen, married his cousin Jane Herbert, age twenty, who was the daughter and heiress of Sir William Herbert. This too was a practical arrangement, for Jane Herbert’s inheritance was contingent upon marriage to one named Herbert. Herbert remained faithful for the first ten years. In the years of his young married life, his mother, Magdalen Danvers, attended closely to her son: she resided in his home in Oxford, encouraged him to be austere in his habits and duties, and ensured that his monies secured the rest of the family. Of her, Herbert recorded in his autobiography (Lee):

My mother, though she had all my father's leases and goods, which were of great value, yet she desired me to undertake that burden of providing for my brothers and sisters, which, to gratify my mother as well as those so near me, I was voluntarily content to provide thus far as to give my six brothers thirty pounds apiece yearly during their lives, and my three sisters one thousand pounds apiece. (43)

Herbert passed his private time in the rigors of study and sought not the company of young men in whom he observed “much ill example and debauchery,” but followed his books
closely. By age twenty-six, we find his ways tethered by marriage, fatherhood and county obligations but his proximity to Oxford helped widen his interests. Like his old tutor Thellwall, Herbert “without any master or teacher” attained knowledge of the French, Italian, and Spanish languages, “by the help of some books in Latin or English translated into those idioms, and the dictionaries of those several languages” (Lee 21). His interests included horse riding and fencing, the very skills instilled in the sons of France who attended academies and who valued these arts more than academics. Herbert was also a keen herbalist. As a respite from his language studies, he composed music and played his lute, which gave rise to Lord Herbert’s Lute Book (c. 1620-40). It was during his European travels that he gathered this variety of compositions. Herbert’s choice to be a scribe is an unusual one since lute books were commonly transcribed by noble women. The book consists of two-hundred and forty pieces which include ten of his compositions. Thirty-seven of the pieces are anonymous. The first fifty pieces consist of preludes, fantasies, pavans, galliards and courantes by various English composers. It also includes variations of popular pieces known in Europe (Dart 2). The book was begun in 1620 when the Golden Age of the lute in England was over. Herbert’s sentiment for a bygone age is rendered in composition.

John Donne’s appearance at Oxford was a timely distraction from Herbert’s attachment to compositions of the past. This chance meeting secured the acquaintance between Donne and the Herbert family. In 1601, Magdalen Herbert took up a London house and notable wits gathered there. This same year Donne secretly married Anne More. He also served the year as a member of parliament. Magdalen Herbert may have thought it prudent to develop a relationship with Donne for she became patroness to Donne in 1601. Donne later dedicated his holy sonnets to her and delivered her funeral sermon when she died in 1627. Herbert by age nineteen passed
his time between Montgomery Castle and the London House. In London, he mingled with wits such as John Donne and Francis Bacon who gathered in taverns and at his mother’s house. Perhaps it was Donne who initiated Herbert’s desire to become a renaissance man, for Herbert acknowledged in his autobiography his purpose in learning languages as “being to make [himself] a citizen of the world as far as it were possible” (Lee 23). Donne was twenty-nine when he met Herbert and would have transmitted some of his excitement and insight on his travels abroad. John Donne began a correspondence with Herbert between the years 1610-1612 while Herbert was a volunteer soldier fighting in the Low Countries.

In the closing years of Elizabeth’s reign, “curiosity rather than ambition” brought Herbert to court. He was spied by the Queen, who, having inquired upon his identity and lamented his having married so young, thereupon “gave her hand to kiss twice, both times gently clapping [him] on the cheek” (Lee 44). Before Herbert “then temptation spread its net…for the first time, and he enjoyed the entanglement.” He came to recognize that he was singularly handsome, “of swarthy complexion. He was often called the Black Lord Herbert” (Lee Viii). Herbert’s arranged marriage had shuttered him from certain attention. It seemed to surprise him that women found him attractive. He was clearly unfaithful once he sailed away from English soil.

On the accession of King James I, Herbert became a Knight of the Order of Bath on July 24, 1603. Herbert was twenty years old. He embraced the ideals of the order where “Honor, not righteousness was his first care” and “he was at any time ready to die for the respect due to him from other men; but what he exacted, he endeavored fairly to render again, though rather as the obligation of a gentleman than as a duty of a Christian” (Howells 2) all of which he swore to uphold. The character of Knight, as Hallam notes in History of the Middle Ages (1853) Vol. iii, subsided into that of gentleman; the one distinguishing European society in the sixteenth and seventeenth century as much as the other did in the preceding age (Smythe-Palmer 17).
Strutt’s *Sports and Pastimes* (1838), he observed that the chivalric Knight was one “endowed with beauty, as well as with strength and agility of the body; he ought to be skilled in music, to dance gracefully, to run with swiftness, to excel in wrestling, to ride well,….To these were to be added urbanity of manners, strict adherence to the truth, and invincible courage (Smythe-Palmer 22).

This chivalric order was a first-step in Herbert’s inclined political life. His role as knight preserved that Herbertian legacy of taking up arms for just cause. With his ambition dislodged, Herbert actively undertook the roles of magistrate and sheriff of Montgomery County in 1605. After ten years of this provincial status, the event of his mother’s marriage was a catalyst in his decision to travel the continent for a year. The marriage of Magdalen Herbert, age forty, took place in 1608 to John Danvers (1588-1655), courtier and politician, age twenty-one. Magdalen Herbert remained with Danvers until her death in 1627. Their marriage which Donne described “as the blending together of higher and lower strings of one sound” into an “evenness” of years must have grated upon Herbert who married Mary Herbert at his mother’s insistence. He promptly severed his loyalties on the domestic front and declared himself free to travel.

Herbert expressed his longing to travel the continent to his wife, who answered, “If [he] would needs go, she could not help it.” Herbert decided that “this, whether a license taken or given, served [his] turn to prepare without delay for a journey beyond sea, that so [he] might satisfy that curiosity [he] long since had to see foreign countries” (Lee 48). He took his leave in 1608 and journeyed to France with Aurelian Townshend, Cavalier poet and playwright, who accompanied Herbert to Europe as an aide fluent in French, Italian, and Spanish. Herbert, Howells notes, “[dedicates] himself to the pleasures of travel and knight-errantry, and we find him everywhere resenting insult, observing life, and noting manners” (6).
In Merlou, France, he was a guest of the Duke of Montmorency, where Herbert’s first act of knight-errantry was one of “undignified rusticity”: He chased a fellow to rescue a ribbon rudely plucked by said fellow from the Duchess of Montmorency’s daughter, about ten or eleven years of age. The gentleman resorted to returning the ribbon to the young lady, to which Herbert responded: “Madam, I will not contradict you; but if he dare say that I did not constrain him to give it, I will fight with him” (Lee 49). The Duke of Montmorency expelled the unnamed gentleman from his house; Herbert’s efforts to obtain satisfaction on the field were nixed.

In this year, Herbert routinely initiated duels determined to save the honor of friends. These friends would then need to extricate him from numerous dire circumstances. Of his knight-errant days Howells writes, “The prim young Herbert is learning what the contest for honor means in a land in which ‘scarce any man [was] thought worth the looking on, that had not killed some other in duel” (Lee 52). That year Herbert also found himself in the company of court socialites, political activists and intellectual thinkers. Herbert was well liked by the Duke of Montmorency, a loyalty that would serve him well in later years when Herbert found himself imprisoned in Lyons. His satirical poem “The State-Progress of Ill” was written by Herbert that year while he sat admiring the Duke’s picturesque gardens at his private residence in Merlou. A seasoned Herbert returned from his year’s trip, and recorded in his autobiography “that he was in great esteem both on court and city, many of the greatest desiring my company” (Lee 127).

His reputation as a charmer, however, found its way back to England by 1611, when he was challenged to a duel by Sir John Ayres regarding a picture of Herbert. Ayres’ wife had purportedly slept with the portrait between her breasts. Herbert caught sight of her clutching his portrait on one occasion when he entered her bedchamber and which she quickly hid from his sight. Although Herbert’s affections lay elsewhere, he received word that “John Ayres intended to kill [him] in [his] bed” (Lee 70). After Ayres’ failed assassination attempt, which involved a
knife fight with each on horseback, Herbert received word that Ayres would kill him with a “musket out of a window” (Lee 73). Herbert was eventually vindicated of impropriety by a letter written in the hand of Lady Ayres and placed before the Lords of the Privy Council.

For the next five years, Herbert served at least two stints as a volunteer with protestant forces in the Low Countries. In 1614, he offered his services to the Prince of Orange against the Spanish army. Between battles, Herbert played chess with the Dutch commander Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange, contemplated his philosophical ideas, wrote poetry and composed music in the sanctuary of his quarters. During a particular lull, Herbert offered to settle the war in a single duel. Both sides diplomatically refused but a restless Herbert crossed over into enemy terrain and wandered into the camp, where he encountered Ambrogio Spinola, the Spanish army commander, with whom he was invited to dine. At the end of the evening, Herbert offered his future services to Marquis Spinola against the infidels (Lee 103).

Just before his arrest in Lyons, Herbert visited Rome and sought accommodation at the English College and explained he wished to see Rome’s antiquities without scandal to the religion he was raised in. The regent who greeted him at the door dead-panned that he “never heard anyone before him profess himself of any other religion other than what was used in Rome” (Lee 154). Herbert returned from Rome by day’s end a marked man: “when the Pope being now ready to give his blessing, [he] departed thence suddenly, which gave such a suspicion of [him], that some were sent to apprehend [him].” Warned kindly by the regent to leave town, Herbert relocated residence but remained in the city to complete his tour.

At the insistence of the Duke of Savoy, he was to lead an expedition of 4,000 Huguenots from Languedoc into Piedmont to help the Savoyards against Spain. Arriving finally in Lyons, he was promptly arrested. The year was 1615. Herbert, who did not recognize the Governor of Lyons, addressed him in a brusque manner after his release. He was again imprisoned and a
friend petitioned for his freedom. Upon his second release, Herbert penned a challenge, for he thought himself “bound as a gentleman to resent it” (Lee 93). The Duke of Montmorency (son to the elder Duke of Montmorency), explained to Herbert that the Governor “conceived men in his place were not bound to answer as private persons for those things they did by virtue of their office” (Lee 94). Herbert sensibly dropped the matter at the urging of the younger Duke, who remembered well his father’s fondness for Herbert.

On his return to England, Herbert overhears in Brussels a group of men dishonoring the name of his King. Rising from the table, he faces them and utters: “You have spoken falsely, and I will fight with you all” (Howells 122). The controversy ends with everyone drinking into the night to the health of the King. He was not ten days in London when “a quartan ague seized on [him], which held [him] for a year and a half without intermission, and a year and a half longer at spring and fall; the good days [he] had while there, during all this sickness [he] employed in study, the ill being spent in as sharp and long fits” (Lee 97). During this sickness, he again overheard one “who spoke very disgraceful words of Sir Robert Harley, being then my dear friend, my weakness could not hinder me to be sensible of my friend's dishonor; shaking him therefore by a long beard he wore, I stepped a little aside and drew my sword in the street” (Lee 98). Herbert’s challenge, considering his state of health, was not taken seriously by the Lords of Council.

When The Privy Council first summoned Herbert he feared that “some complaint, though false might be made against me” (Lee 99) but he was unexpectedly appointed Extraordinary Ambassador to France. The year was 1618 and he received several hundred pounds as outlined. The rest, he learned from intimate friends, he would have to petition scrupulously from political benefactors on the continent. News of his funds reached his enemies (Lee Edition):
I had received now about six or seven hundred pounds towards the charges of my journey, and locked it in certain coffers in my house, when the night following, about one of the clock, I could hear divers men speak and knock at the door, …as soon as I heard the noise, I suspected presently they came to rob me of my money; howsoever I thought fit to rise, and go to the window to know who they were; the first word I heard was, “Darest thou come down, Welshman?” which I no sooner heard, but, taking a sword in one hand, and a little target in the other, I did in my shirt run down the stairs, open the doors suddenly, and charged ten or twelve of them with such fury that they ran away, some throwing away their halberts, others hurting their fellows to make them go faster in a narrow way they were to pass; in which disordered manner I drove them to the middle of the street by the Exchange, where, finding my bare feet hurt by the stones I trod on, I thought fit to return home, and leave them to their flight. (Lee 99)

Not long after his ambassadorial appointment, his altercation with a Sir Robert Vaughan received attention, and the Earl of Worcester reminded Herbert that “being now made ambassador, and a public person, I ought not to entertain private quarrels; after which, without much ado, he ended the business betwixt Sir Robert Vaughan and myself” (Lee 99) and finally Herbert sailed for France.

In March 1619 in France Herbert assumed a leading role at what was the onset of the Thirty Year’s War. His opposition to the papacy and Rome’s affiliation with Spain had made him supportive of international Protestantism. He had consequentially served as a volunteer soldier from 1610-1614 for the cause. Upon his arrival in France, a Venetian diplomat sparked rumors that Herbert was a fanatical Protestant (Hill 10). Herbert’s strong views on Rome soon clashed with the non-militant policy of James I. In a dispatch to London in September 1619, Herbert urged King James to send support to James’ daughter Elizabeth of Bohemia, the Winter
Queen, and son-in law, Protestant Frederick, Elector Palatine, against Spain. Herbert suffered in the silence of King James as Frederick’s army was defeated by the Catholic League at the Battle of the White Mountain in late 1620, a catastrophe which led to Frederick’s subsequent exile. This was Herbert’s first severe disagreement with James I.

Herbert next openly discouraged King James’ plan to promote a possible marriage between Charles I and Spanish infanta, Maria Anna of Spain. This led to Herbert’s second reprimand. Herbert was then ordered to conclude the marriage between Charles I and Roman Catholic, Henrietta Maria, the fifteen-year-old daughter of Henri IV of France. Herbert’s third reprimand was by far the most severe. On account of his impetuous temperament he misspoke in a vital meeting with Louis XIII.'s favorite, the Duc de Luynes. Luynes supported an aggressive policy against French Protestants, and Herbert, anxious to remonstrate, appeared haughty and aggressive to de Luynes, who retorted, “By God, if you were not Monsieur Ambassador, I would use you after another fashion” (Lee 120). Herbert responded: “My answer was, that I was an ambassador, so I was a gentleman; and therewithal, laying my hand upon the hilt of my sword, told him, there was that which should make him an answer, and so arose from my chair…” (Lee 120).

In customary style, Herbert stepped towards a fracas but James I received the news and promptly recalled him in 1621. The unexpected death of De Luynes, however, cleared Herbert and he was permitted to resume his position in 1622. Herbert’s good relations with both courts was then taxed by King James’ central strategy of dispatching two foreign secretaries, “each reporting to him separately, each was corresponding with a different group of diplomats (Hill 11). Rumors of Herbert as an atheist also swirled about him and soon there was talk of his secret works. When one Pére Séguerand became vocal on the topic of heretics, Herbert attempted to
disparage him to the Queen, but found himself maligned when she clumsily informed Séguerand of Herbert’s complaint.

In 1624, King James exasperated by numerous accounts of Herbert that he had received. called him home again. Herbert who once recounted an oath to “never to sit in a place where injustice should be done but they shall right it to the uttermost of their power” and “particularly ladies and gentlewomen that shall be wronged in their honor, if they demand assistance; and many other points, not unlike the romances of Knight Errant” (Lee 45) had found himself wronged by the realities of politics. Herbert ceased writing his autobiography. He had lost respect for his king and his taste for politics had ground to a close.

On the return trip, Herbert stopped off in Paris and published *De Veritate, prout distinguetur a revelatione, a verisimili, a possibili, et a falso* (On Truth, as it is distinguished from Revelation, the Probable, the Possible, and the False) for modest circulation. This treatise was likely begun in England in 1610 after his return from Europe. His ideas fermented by experience and observation had peaked by 1624. Deistic Herbert would later jest that he had looked for a sign and it had appeared in the form of a loud clap. This ‘clap’ was really his broody readiness to leave his intellectual mark on readers. As *De Veritate* quietly circulated, Herbert arrived home and found England politically changed. English court under Charles I was dominated by a younger cohort of politicians. The Earl of Carlisle and the Earl of Holland were appointed extraordinary ambassadors to France in Herbert’s place. Herbert’s efforts in France were acknowledged by Charles I with the title, meager by Herbert’s estimate, of Irish Peerage as Lord Herbert of Castle Island (County Kerry) in 1625.

Herbert’s disappointment with political life had resumed under a new king. When Herbert was commissioned by Charles I to work over Buckingham’s notes to defend his generalship of the expedition to the Isle of Ré. This commission provided Herbert with a handy
excuse retreat to Montgomery Castle. He labored on Buckingham’s disastrous Siege of Saint Martin-de-Ré of 1627 until 1630. In the interim, his mother died in 1627. The assassination of George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, followed in 1628 was another setback. Buckingham was his secure tie to title and moneyed acquisitions. Charles I in 1629 awarded Herbert the title Baron of Chirbury for his efforts on Buckingham’s notes. Herbert remained dissatisfied with the titles he had garnered under the reign of James I or Charles I. These titles had not served to resolve the debts he accrued during his diplomatic post, when he’d entertained, among many others, the Prince of Nassau, and had a hundred dishes served costing Herbert £100.

Again at Charles’s behest, he undertook a full history of Charles’s sixteenth-century predecessor, Henry VIII. Herbert retreated to Montgomery Castle and labored on the assignment from 1632 to 1639. He responded in 1632 to a general call-out for members of the council of war. When trouble broke out between Charles I and Parliament in 1639, Herbert was called upon to offer support. He attended the king at York in 1639 and supported Charles’ expedition against the Scots in 1639 but did not assume a conspicuous role. Strained relations between Charles I and parliament raised expectations for the onset of a civil war. His dissatisfaction with the Crown being acute, Herbert happily retreated to Montgomery Castle. Herbert chose then to decline the King's summons but his silence antagonized both the royalists and parliament. A royalist convoy camped outside Herbert’s castle walls ready to fight him. Then, parliament seized Herbert’s London library and held it ransom. With both sides pushed up against Herbert, he was forced to vocalize his political preference. On 5 September 1644, Herbert surrendered Montgomery Castle to Parliamentary forces led by Sir Thomas Myddelton. Parliament released his London House and Herbert was later granted a pension of £20 a week by parliament.

With this larger business of politics resolved, he settled up his private affairs, leaving whatever property and monies he had to his remaining sons. One son had found himself in dire
debt and the other, the eldest, assumed the various titles annexed to the family. In his will, Herbert left provision for his horses and monies for two retired soldiers to stand a token guard outside the gates of Montgomery Castle. In the summer of 1647, an ailing Herbert visited his friend Pierre Gassendi. In Paris Gassendi was the leader of a group of free-thinking intellectuals. He was also a philosopher, priest, scientist, astronomer and mathematician and someone who held a long-standing animosity for Descartes. Gassendi was in ill-health the same year his good friend Herbert died in August 1648 in London and was buried in the church of St Giles's in the Fields. Herbert’s last words, like most of his life, served to misdirect. When Herbert’s bold request of sacrament from the Lord Primate of Ireland, allowing that “if it did no good, it could do no harm,” was emphatically refused, he offered his last words of expectation, “an hour hence I shall depart,” whereupon he turned his face to the wall and “expired with great serenity” (Howells 10).

Over the years upon his return to England, Herbert had withdrawn further from political life to the solitude of Montgomery Castle. From this distance he could safely work on his writings unfettered by observant eyes. Herbert’s intellectual friendships, like his private thoughts, he sheltered from his political life. Herbert never detailed in his autobiography about his friendships with Gassendi, Casuabon, Donne and Jonson. The young man once groomed for political life had reeducated himself without ceremony. He preserved his rich intellectual side of by squirreling his thoughts into political poems and philosophical treatises. His retreat to his study at Montgomery Castle was a luxury hard won in a long, circuitous life of public scrutiny. His tension ended when he resolved to complete his philosophical treatises with single-minded interest.
Beneath the long shadow of an Elizabethan confidence, England’s sons, raised on privilege and education, prepared for secular life. Artists like Michangelo or Da Vinci had personified that emergent, rugged motif of a Renaissance figure which the fifteenth century transformed into an urbane ideal. By the sixteenth century, the topical writings of courtier figures Castiglione and Montaigne circulated amongst readers. *Cortegiano*, Castiglione’s practical guide for the courtier had begun circulating as early as 1518. Castiglione was fifty years old in 1528 when *Cortegiano* was actually published; he had written most of the first draft during his thirties. Castiglione (1478-1529), nobleman and diplomat, was a figure admired for his skill in arms and letters. He was an accomplished poet in Latin and a participant of that phase of the Renaissance that emphasized rules for language and rules for behavior (Burke 24).

Castiglione’s *Cortegiano* was a practical guide to professional conduct befitting the nobleman, who should study the “ideals of urbanity, chivalry, and courtesy, ideals which were most closely associated with the city, the battlefield, and the court” (Burke 18). In *Cortegiano*, Castiglione employs the dialogue device, a fashionable genre of the sixteenth century. The scene is a cosmopolitan setting where a variety of figures at ease gather to discourse. Castiglione’s rules broke into five intellectual qualities, five moral qualities, and eight physical qualities and the topics included discussions of the prefect courtier, the question of nobility, fighting, literary skills, conversational art, and visual art. The last of the speeches are in favor of spiritual love (Burke 28). Eager to ascend the political ladder, the ambitious figure embraced Castiglione’s ideals.

Castiglione⁹ however in *Cortegiano* also drew attention to the role of the courtier as one of affect. He described the figure as one who wore a mask, played a role, and thereby
institutionalized his persona at court. He warns his reader that he must give the impression that his art is natural and his figure is at ease with his surroundings. Castiglione alludes to the social atmosphere of court as a breeding ground for gossip and treachery. The chief skill of a courtier would be that skill of double-talk that served as a synonym for political negotiations. The word diplomat, Hill reminds us, derives from that Greek word meaning “twofold.” Etienne Du Refuge’s “Treatise on the Court” also presents the court as a place of danger and corruption. Du Refuge introduces his readers to topics of civility, affability, dexterity in avoiding topics, dissimulation of one’s own emotions, and knowledge of those of the prince in order to accommodate oneself to his humor. As for moral scruples, Du Refuge writes, “there is no help for it, it is sometimes necessary to use flattery to gain an advantage over these people –but not any kind of flattery” (Burke 122). The ambitious politician would likely have to impress, woo and influence others to achieve his political ascendency.

Castiglione’s success as an author diminished his political standing because he benefited financially from the release of Cortegiano. Castiglione’s standing became tenuous in an age where the court served as the moral centre. Burke notes that, by the standards of time, writing a book and having it printed was a somewhat ambiguous activity for a courtier where publication was associated with profit as well as fame. Burke suggests that Castiglione later turns to theory and to contemplation to compensate for his disappointments in a life of action. Castiglione in life and works is a figure of warning. He reminds the ambitious, unsuspecting courtier of the dangers of political life.

English readers also acquainted themselves with humanist ideas and a method of learning amplified by the work of French courtier-essayist Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592). Montaigne works, like Castiglione’s, prepared the way for the young sons of the renaissance to secure social footing. Montaigne, in possession of a gentle tractable disposition, was a model negotiator. He
distinguished himself as one with a capacity for independence and an absolute resistance when essential principles were involved, who sought to find the medium of two extremes, the superficial and the essential, that “Golden Mean.” Montaigne, spurred to protest as a conscientious citizen of Bordeaux, negotiated a truce to end the bitter rivalry which threatened France’s stability between the King of Navarre\textsuperscript{10} and the King of France. Both Kings were impressed by his outspokenness and his patient rationale. Montaigne soon settled the argument. In gratitude, the King of Navarre spent two days at Montaigne’s chateau in Bordeaux without his security detail. Montaigne sustained a successful career in politics but grew wary of political life and its effects on the psychology of the courtier. Montaigne like Castiglione also made this same turn away from the court.

Montaigne likely began his exploratory essays after the death of Étienne de la Boétie, his friend and intellectual confidante. Montaigne retired at age thirty-eight to watch over his estate and put his thoughts in order. He built himself a special library and retreated there to contemplate. His work \textit{essais} or “attempts” were produced out of this venture. The format of the writing was instructional, intimate, persuasive, and afforded the writer an air of eccentricity. Montaigne’s essays or “attempts” wrapped subject in a self-portraiture tempered by experience and reasoned judgment. On the subject of French polity, he noted the role of a faithful courtier or wise counselor as integral to the improvement and stabilization of France. Montaigne also observed that the politician dwelled in conditions of distrust and transient alliances. He insinuated in his essays that for the politician the private is implicated in the public out of the fear of being secretly monitored by an often abusive power (Archer 36). The private thoughts of the courtier are described by Archer as that “slow emergence of a transgressive self who sets up a counter-dominion of the mind, freed finally from political encroachments” (36). Montaigne facilitates this “counter-dominion of the mind” as topical account using the medium of the essay.
Montaigne’s *essais* strong-arm the possibility of a phenomenology of perception specific to sixteenth-century court society where the *moi* of the essay emerges as something to be sampled, watched over, and thus controlled, if only by itself (Archer 23). Montaigne writes in his essay “De L’experience:” “I have lived long enough to give an account of the practice that has guided me so far. For anyone who wants to try it I have tasted it like his cupbearer…” (Archer 19). Montaigne’s statement “I who am king of the matter I treat, and who owe an accounting for it to no one” (Archer 22) asserts his right to bear an independent view of the political arena.

While Castiglione and Montaigne personified the ideal courtier, their works whetted the appetite of England’s sons to experience first-hand the urbanity of Europe. In Herbert’s time France became a magnet for young Englishmen of fashion. Some came to master the courtly arts—riding, fencing, dancing, music-making in the style of young French aristocrats, who were not packed off to university, but trained at academics in riding and fighting. Others identified with the French scholars of the day who deplored the disesteem for letters and learning among the aristocracy, attributing it to the malign influence of the protracted civil wars (Hill 5). Herbert too fulfilled his desire to tour the continent in 1608 and we find him in that year much absorbed by the life there.

Herbert’s impressions of life France in 1608 was a country at peace under Henry VI after a generation of civil war between Catholics and Protestants (1562-94). He visited Henri IV at the Tuileries, and the King “embraced him in his arms and held him some while there.” The divorced Queen Margaret invited him to her balls, and gave him a place next to her own chair, to the wonder and envy of the assembled company. He even flirted with the princess Conti, who had a doubtful reputation. He quickly expanded his circle of acquaintances, with his Welsh looks and his wit charming them. Striking a note of jealousy, Herbert remarked that one
particular fellow was the only other more popular than him at the French court, his duel account being higher than Herbert’s.

An ambitious Herbert then had embraced his accession to courtier in 1618. Herbert was twenty-one when he was first brought into the intimacy of English court on the accession of James I, when Herbert was inducted as Knight of the Order of Bath on July 24, 1603. He embraced then this chivalric escutcheon. It was his connection to that infamous Herbert lineage of skills with arms. He followed up this auspicious start with the roles of magistrate and sheriff of Montgomery County in 1605. He stepped onto a higher rung of political life as a figure out of Baldassare Castiglione’s frame, possessing no less the likeness of a gentlewoman, with his “vivacity of mind,” “beauty and elegance of body,” “strength of soul,” than of a gentleman, with his “skill in arms,” “strength and agility,” and “loyalty.” As an English noble of Elizabeth's or James's court, he was not a stranger in the courts of Henry IV or Louis XIII.

Herbert’s autobiographical references to his heroic deeds, his popularity, and his dizzying social life seem to confirm the insinuations made by Joseph Hall in Quo Vadis? and Robert Burton in The Anatomy of Melancholy (1621) that the young Englishman was quickly absorbed by the “trivialities of fashionable life” (Lee Xii). But not all who travelled abroad sought singular amusement. In the “space of a single lifetime, England had gone officially from Rome to Catholicism to Catholicism under the supreme headship of the English king” as the sixteenth century came under that influence of intellectual orientation known as Humanism (Norton 493). Individuals like John Donne and Ben Jonson had travelled the continent and immersed themselves in its intellectual atmosphere. Herbert’s ties to London brought him into a close intimacy with John Donne and Ben Jonson and other wits. Their vibrant discourse filtered into his life. Herbert quickly learned however to compartmentalize his thoughts into private works that is until 1624 when he broke his silence.
In his autobiography, he spoke of his fondness for his host The Duke of Montmorency of Merlou, but neglected to mention that the Duke was head of a lead family of the French political group The Politiques, which supported toleration for Protestants as a means of retaining national peace and prosperity. They were a group viewed by others as advocating the active abandonment of religious conviction for political expediency (Hill 6), and that the Duke of Montmorency often drew Herbert into political discourse. Herbert mentions his appreciation of that “incomparable scholar Isaac Casaubon, by whose learned conversation I much benefited myself” (Lee, 56). But he neglected to mention that he had resided with this classical scholar and philologist Geneva born Isaac Casaubon (1599-1614) for several months who prompted him to attend various lectures of keynote figures. Herbert satirical poems “The State-Progress of Ills” and “Satyra Secunda of Travellers From Paris” were composed at Merlou in 1608 in the gardens of the duke’s home.

As a soldier in the Low Countries, Herbert witnessed first-hand the effects of power on the majority such as in Vercelli when lodging with the Duke of Savoy. Herbert was daily greeted with sumptuous feasts, but he noted the contrast of lifestyles between his host and that of his people. Inquiring as to how they survived the Duke’s taxations, he was told, “we are not so much offended with the Duke for what he takes from us, as thankful for what he leaves” (Lee 87). Herbert offered a gift of eighty pounds to the soldiers for their hospitality. On his way to Lyons to raise a protestant army, Herbert, hungry and tired, entered a solitary inn where he found the innkeeper woman starving, her inn and person raided by the Duke’s soldiers a day earlier (Lee 87). He left her money and departed elsewhere for the night. The young knight who turned into a soldier was confronted with endless war tied indefinitely to religious strife.
The position of courtier then placed Herbert in the onset climate of the Thirty Years’ War. Herbert would soon be caught up in James’ political ambition to replenish coffers and leverage himself politically. Under James’ watchful eye, Herbert had to undertake the rigors of political diplomatic negotiation. The Thirty Years’ War was a dirty one for a tactical James who willfully fed his courtiers contradictory orders and secretly thwarted Herbert’s negotiation efforts. Herbert’s view of that catholic–protestant strife from the fronts, where relations remained tenuous and lives were casually extinguished, stoked his own dislike for the papacy and was a prerequisite to all his political negotiations. Similar to the experiences of Castiglione and Montaigne, Herbert had to court the ideals of the age even as he struggled with the realities of political life. Herbert’s pressured role to conform to the expectations of James I threatened his career. While Herbert learned to employ a certain degree of wit, humor and deflection, his temperament, less tractable than Montaigne’s, was certainly his undoing.

The matter of his publication of *De Veritate* is 1624 unveils the life of this intellectual solitudinarian. Herbert’s sudden, bold act of publishing *De Veritate* is symbolic of his impatience towards endless political-religious strife. Herbert, dismissed from his post, arrived home to an England much changed. The younger courtiers under a new King were ambitious, and underhandedly so. They adopted a similar intolerance towards parliament as was inclined their new king, Charles I. An antiquated Herbert found that there was little place for him amongst them despite his efforts to renew standing and thereby reduce debts accrued. He retired to Montgomery Castle where he was absorbed in task of writing the bulk of his metaphysical treatises. He braced himself for political upheaval at the onset of the English Civil War in 1639. In 1644, he saved his library by showing allegiance to parliament. The saving of his precious library becomes an outward sign of his ownership of private expression.
After the establishment of the *essais*, the vogue for commendatory poems, elegies, dedicatory verses, letters, and literature of a personal nature sprung in England between the years 1610 and 1615 (Crane 12). Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was Montaigne’s counterpart in England and he produced popular aphoristic styled essays in 1597, with enlarged issues in 1612 and 1625. In his autobiography, Herbert too evoked Montaigne’s style of address. In a voice consistently intimate and personal, Herbert urged his reader to not to “commend an affected eloquence” or to “use overmuch the common forms prescribed in schools” (Lee 28). He concluded for his family and friends that it would be “much better for men to guide themselves by such observations as their father, grandfather and great-grandfather might have delivered to them, than by those vulgar rules and examples which cannot in all points so exactly agree unto them” (Lee 21).

Herbert abandoned the writing of his autobiography in 1624 but before he did he uncharacteristically dismissed the affair with heretical accuser Séguerand, and wrote “…though, as I ever loved my book and a private life more than any busy preferments, I did frustrate and render vain his greatest power to hurt me” (Howells 165). This unfinished autobiography recounts tales of knighthood and successes at court but suggests a mere one year for the learning of philosophy and six months of logic to his reader, “for I am confident a man may have quickly more than he needs of these two arts” (Lee 27). Herbert had learned to separate his public voice and compartmentalize his private expression.

Privately, Herbert basked in his innovative friendships with lead figures Donne and Jonson. Herbert had mingled with London’s wits from 1601 when his mother took up a London house. He responded to their humanist influences and their edgy blend of wit and rhetoric. Metaphysical poets like John Donne, George Herbert, Richard Crashaw and Andrew Marvell roughly opposed the “deliberately smooth and sweet tones” of Elizabethan poets with an adopted “energetic, uneven, and rigorous” style of wit and inventiveness paired with rational principles.
[Luminarium]. For Strier, Donne was helping to change the atmosphere to allow for a new literary activity (118).

Specifically, Donne and Jonson lead respectively that anti-Petrarchan versus Petrarchan literary atmosphere that descend upon English writers of the renaissance. The notable fusion of reason and passion in works led by stalwart poet Donne stirs the reader. Richard Strier’s work *Resistant Structures (Particularity, Radicalism, and Renaissance Texts)* speaks of a radical individualism that perpetuated Donne’s work to pinpoint him as a freethinker. Donne’s extravagant metaphorical comparisons are a sharp contrast to the classic grace of Jonson, a central figure of the London Wits who met at the old Devil Tavern. Ben Johnson in his work “Every Man Out of His Humor” (1600) defined wit as a synonym for ingenuity (Crane 7-12). Jonson’s masques were favored by James I and he was made poet laureate. Jonson also came to know James’ disfavor because of passages from his comedy *Eastward HO!*

Herbert’s works, as poet and philosopher, are caveats on the corruptibility of human nature. Even as Herbert flinched from the palpable corruption and disharmony before him, he valiantly sought the leçon of his age. Voltaire would write in 1767 that Herbert was “one of the first who had the daring to stand up, not only against the Roman church, but against the Christian church” (Hill preface). The distinctive writing style of Herbert’s metaphysical treatise is an intimate strategy of provocative argument that called for the reader to labor towards independent judgment. The spirit of a humanist Renaissance heralded that confidence that exudes in the private voice. From Montaigne to Bacon, from Donne to Jonson, to Herbert, these individuals developed a rich private response to the secular realm.
As poetic voice, Herbert reflects two diametrically opposite aspects of him that lived in this single body. In his love poems public, chivalric Herbert celebrates, woos and finds respite in the arms of his mistress. His lyrics idealize female form, celebrate love’s nuances and preserve feminine pride. When this chivalric poet hears the call of duty, he gently disengages from his paramour and courtship comes to an end. The poet’s celebratory mood is keenly felt in these poems. He lingers on images of love, heightened by his pleasure and observation that love while sweet is short-lived. The poet restless to be elsewhere disengages from his lover with purposeful charm. The other Herbert, private, edgy and free-thinking took to the lyric poem to satirize political life. His satirical poems are the emergence of his modern voice, awash with new and dangerous ideas. Herbert as avant-garde poet foresaw the end of the aristocracy and prioritized independence of voice as an essential component to the future of England’s denizens. The poem provided a private space for his thoughts to dwell, but even in his private works Herbert remained that guarded figure whose intent submerged into circuitous frame.

When John Churton Collins in his 1881 preface to *The Poems of Lord Edward Herbert* (published in 1665 in Latin and English), spoke of securing Herbert “a fair hearing and who henceforth will not be condemned unheard,” and thus resonating with the efforts of Walpole, he valiantly sought to restore Herbert’s poetic range before readers. Collins’ volume of Herbert’s poems collated seventy-five works of Herbert from copies obtained from the British museum and another from the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The work is divided roughly into Sonnets, Elegies, Epitaphs, Satires, Miscellaneous Lyrics, and the Occasional pieces. Few works are dated but
even a modest read exposes the vibrancy and depth of this poet who sheltered himself in one world as he lived out publicly the complexity of another.

Herbert’s love poems are a chivalric range of a gentle, medievalist figure who loved dutifully, who lost love, and who discovered enduring love. Herbert was not yet seventeen when he married twenty-one year old Mary Herbert in a marriage arranged by his mother. This earliest love poem was written to his wife Mary Herbert of ten years. It is an untitled farewell poem written before he left for Europe for one year. The poet appears inconsolable at the thought of this departure. He equates this parting to the experience of a “last breath” (1) in a “dying” (3) scene. The metaphorical intensity of the poem conveys the poet’s heightened remorse at leaving his loved one where “soul and soul” (4) must soon be parted. A chivalric Herbert turns his words into a parting scene like a loyal figure regrettably wrenched from his love interest:

I must depart, but like to his last breath
That leaves the seat of life for liberty,
I go, but dying, and in this death
Where soul and soul is parted, it is I
The deader part yet fly away

........................................

Sleep, Death’s Ambassador, and best
Image, doth yours often so show
That I thereby must plainly know,
Death unto us must be freedom and rest (1-5, 21-24)

The poet remembers his lover with fondness but ultimately ends this dutiful marriage for the possibilities adventure and renewal elsewhere. In Herbertian style, the poet does not betray his truer intent which is to “fly away” (5) from this provincial life. Herbert is impatient to shake-off this monotonous marriage which is for him a kind of spiritual sleep. He longed to partake of life and history in Europe before that final “freedom and rest” (24) that death will bring. The
“deader part” (5) of him will actually be lost once he has safely bid farewell to his wife and their marriage bed for an unknown future. The poetic voice of a disenchanted Herbert shows forbearance towards his lover but then his thoughts return decisively to private wishes as that ambiguous “deader part” will “yet fly away” (5). It is not a love poem, exactly, but a mixed review of life, liberty, and relationships built out of expectation and obligation. Herbert turns this farewell into a treatise that contemplates his value of individual liberty and choice. The poet certain which regret he can live with least, that of becoming man of the world, makes good on his departure.

In Herbert’s “Love’s End,” we see that he has become adept at ending courtships. Herbert knew the practicability of marriage and later the diplomacy needed to end his courtships. Chivalric phrases like “Thus ends my Love” (1), “Troubles my mind awhile” (4) and “this Debt Only's her due” acknowledges his mistresses’ charm. On the other hand, the use of the end-stopped lines in the first three lines of the first quatrain offers finality; here, the poet usurps sentiment with practicability as the initial two lines which read, “Thus ends my Love, but this doth grieve me most, / That so it ends, but that ends too,” then halts the moment with the phrase “this yet” (1-2). The imposed “yet” in the verse illustrates the poet’s control of the farewell scene. The poet has not surrendered his heart to this moment. His relief will come once he is “set/Free” (4-5), an enjambed line that transitions from quatrain one to the next quatrain:

Thus ends my Love, but this doth grieve me most,
That so it ends, but that ends too, this yet,
Besides the Wishes, hopes and time I lost,
Troubles my mind awhile, that I am set

Free, worse then denied: I can neither boast
Choice nor success, as my Case is, nor get
Pardon from myself; that I loved not
A better Mistress, or her worse; this Debt
Only's her due, still, that she be forgot
Ere chang'd, lest I love none; this done, the taint
Of foul Inconstancy is clear'd at least
In me, there only rests but to unpaint

Her form in my mind, that so dispossest
It be a Temple, but without a Saint. (1-14)

The poet rationalizes his departure with a clear conscience in the second quatrain with “that I loved not /A better Mistress, or her worse; this Debt / Only's her due” (8-9). This second quatrain with its enjambed lines also depicts his impatience to exit the farewell scene for the poet has cleared himself “Of foul Inconstancy “(11) and “there only rests but to unpaint” (12) the image of this fleeting match. The poet’s use of the words “unpaint,” “clear’d,” “set” and “case” reveals his verbal efficiency at clearing love’s path for newer opportunities. The line “It be a Temple, but without a Saint” (14) depicts his disillusion with love as symbolized by his current mistress. Herbert’s skillful practice at ending courtships secures his worldly personae and his general intimacy of the nature of women. While the poet enjoys love’s embrace, he is yet to be actually caught by a mistress. In “Love’s End” his temple of love has ejected its “Saint” (14) but preserves the ceremonial template for other suitable encounters.

Herbert, on the other hand, is unexpectedly subdued by a lover in the love lyric “Another.” The poem conveys a different side to Herbert as a lover and companion, one who regrets that he has taken leave of a lover. The implied celestial images of “bodies divine” and “Heaven’s lights” mix with molecular images of “earth’s properties and base” sustain love as earthy or real and therefore stripped of artifice:

Dear, when I did from you remove
I left my joy, but not my love;
That never can depart.
It neither higher can ascend,
Nor lower bend.
Fixt in the centre of my heart,
As in his place,
And lodged so, how can it be change,
Or you grow strange
Those are earth’s properties and base
Each where, as the bodies divine,
Heaven’s lights and you to me will shine

The poet still chooses to leave the “joy” of this moment but this love is “Fixt in the centre of
[his] heart,” “and lodged so,” that it remains constant. The poet’s reference “Heaven’s lights and
you to me will shine” (6-12) suggests that though he wanders elsewhere the union serves as a
fixed point of what love inherently feels like to him. Herbert’s love poems embody the restless
nature of the poet with a gentle heart and a fixed plan to move on.

Herbert’s subject of “Uncessant Minutes” in “To His Watch When He Could Not Sleep.”
is a counterpart response to his flight contextualized in his untitled farewell poem to Mary
Herbert. The poet is provoked by these “uncessant minutes” as each passing minute robs him
further of his wish to see the world. This early poem finds the poet confined to domestic life.
He has yet to live out his public ambitions nor has he discovered his modern voice. The young
poet feels trapped and has retreated to a world of contemplation, his solitary home for many
years in times to come as we come to see.

**To His Watch When He Could Not Sleep**

Uncessant Minutes, whil'st you move you tell
The time that tells our life, which though it run
Never so fast or farr, you'r new begun
Short steps shall overtake; for though life well (1-4)

May scape his own Account, it shall not yours,
You are Death's Auditors, that both divide
And summ what ere that life inspir'd endures
Past a beginning, and through you we bide (5-8)

An impatient figure, his personified account of time projects his tempestuous relationship to time
as a thing either waited out or to be lived by him. The poet encumbers time with the realities of
ritual, experiential, fixed, and historied. Ritualized time whilst it moves it “tell[s]/The time that tells our life” (1-2) couples with values of history, change, and experience. As “Tell” repeats in these initial two lines of the first quatrain, the latter appears to mock the former for its unfeeling presence. Time as ritualistic is unfeeling or mechanical provokes the poet whose insights of time as experiential change, as history burdened by memory and account, are weighed against time as eternal moment. Time is stilled by his domestic certainties. The poet retreats to his study where he can be true to his thoughts without intrusion.

The poet’s contemplation of time is not without hope. The poet charges ritual time with the understanding that “Short steps shall overtake” its “new begun,” (3-4). These “Short steps” are the conditions of “Fate” and “Decree” (9). The end rhymes of “tell,” “well” and “run,” “begun” in the first envelope quatrain support the poet’s conviction that in time he will escape these “uncessant minutes” (1). The poet’s tonal response to his personal entrapment ranges from contemplative, to accusatory, then to steely resolve as the poet takes control of his angst. In the second envelope quatrain, Time as “Death’s Auditors, that both divide / And summ what ere that life inspir'd endures”(7) will weigh the balance of his life and deliver him to a new beginning (6). The end rhymes: “yours” “endures” and “divide” “bide” truncate to depict time as transient. The poet’s feelings of torment will soon end and be reformed by some other event:

The doom of Fate, whose unrecall'd Decree
You date, bring, execute; making what's new,
Ill and good, old, for as we die in you,
You die in Time, Time in Eternity. (9-12)

In the final envelope quatrain, the end rhymes of “Decree” “Eternity” dominate over “new” and “you.” “Decree” and “Eternity” as elongated rhyme stress insinuate that time’s eternal plan or constant state will win out in the end. The poem’s summation of “You die in Time, Time in Eternity” (12) is a declarative statement that places the poet’s vexation in perspective. This rare
poem where the poet is between two worlds indicates signs of an edgier, contemplative poet. In this poem the poet is not afraid to shake time’s panoply of meanings in search of resolve. In later years, free-thinking Herbert yields towards even bolder thoughts.

When the door to his political life finally swung wide open, Herbert, a soldier and political figure, was exposed to the extensive power wielded by the church and crown over the lives of the majority. Herbert saw society as one subdued by a corrupt sovereign. The medium of poetry and philosophy facilitated then Herbert’s private elucidation of risqué topics. “The State-Progress of Ills” satirized sovereign dominance for its betrayal of subjects. The poems “The State-progress of Ill” and “Satyr Secunda of Travellers From Paris” were penned in 1608 during Herbert’s first trip to Europe. Herbert, twenty-six at the time, reflects in his poems his growing awareness of that “gulf between ideals the young accept a priori and reality” (Mangum 2). Herbert who had participated in the ritualized society of French court that year withdrew to the private lush gardens of Montmorency’s residence in Merlou to pen this subversive poem:

The State-Progress of Ill

I say, tis hard to write Satyrs. Though Ill
Great'ned in his long course, and swelling still,
Be like to a Deluge, yet, as Nile,
'Tis doubtful in his original ; this while
We may thus much on either part presume,
That what so universal are, must come
From causes great and far. Now in this state (1-7)

It is a lengthy poem that explores the word “Ill” in a multitude of ways. The word “Ill” becomes a metaphor for the injustices and the acts of corruption that the poet will encounter in public life. Like Montaigne, Herbert will retreat to a peaceful place to make sense of these events.

In the first section (lines 1-7), the poet who is disheartened by the magnitude of wrongdoing he encounters both as a soldier and a public figure observes the ills around him as
“Great’ned in his long course” and “swelling still” and is likened to a “Deluge” (1-7). The induced rhyme association of “Ill” and “Swelling still” sustains this ubiquitous condition. This observation fills the young knight with disillusion. His zealotry cannot curb this rising tide and contemplative Herbert seeks then to outsource the magnitude of ill to what “must come from causes great and far” (7). In the second section of the poem he attempts to qualify the source of ill:

Of things, what is least like Good, men hate,
Since 'twill be the less sin. I do see
Some Ill requir'd, that one poison might free
The other; so States, to their Greatness, find
No faults requir'd but their own, and bind
The rest. And though this be mysterious still,
Why should we not examine how this Ill
Did come at first, how’t keeps his greatness here,
When 'tis disguis'd, and when it doth appear.
This Ill having some Attributes of God,
As to have made it self, and bear the rod
Of all our punishments, as it seems, came
Into the world, to rule it, and to tame
The pride of Goodness, and though his Reign
Great in the hearts of men he doth maintain
By love, not right, he yet the tyrant here
(Though it be him we love, and God we fear)
Pretence yet wants not, that it was before
Some part of Godhead, as Mercy, that store
For Souls grown Bankrupt, their first stock of Grace,
And that which the sinner of the last place
Shall number out, unless th' Highest will shew
Some power, not yet reveal'd to Man below. (8-24)

In this section two, lines 8-30 provide insight into the origin, nature and power of ill. The speaker claims that Ill has “…some Attributes of God, / As to have made it self, and bear the rod” (18). Ill here is inherent to the individual and therefore inseparable as nature. The poet thus rationalizes that some ill is required in humans so that “one poison might free/The Other” (10-11). This is the Pasteur effect of “Ill.” The poet in accepting ill as integral to nature seeks not to
perfect the human figure but to develop a measure of tolerance for human imperfection. If human nature is prone to corruption, then the poet seeks to reconcile his ideas to this point. Ill as nature is an essential reminder to that the imperfect human needs to “tame / The pride of Goodness” (20-21) that flairs within. The poet therefore calls for individual regulation of this essential ill that is in humans.

“Ill” is then used in this poem to represent that “universal monarch with all the attendant power of majesty” (Mangum 4) as an exaggerated figure of corruption. Ill, then, as accusation is leveled at power figures who exploit their ill nature to rule as despots, and who “to their own greatness, find / No faults requir’d but their own, and bind/ The rest” (12-13). The corrupt ruler thus rules without conscience and willfully exploits and subdues its denizens for personal success. The poet cautions us on this ‘Ill” that it shall “number out, unless th’ Highest will shew / Some power, not yet reveal’d to man below” (30). The law of corruption, an ill ruling without conscience will prevail if not contested by some higher force which has yet to intervene. In the poet’s third section of “The State-Progress of Ill,” he concretizes ill as acts of evil or wrongdoing:

I note, that in
The yet infant world, how
mischief and sin,
His Agents here on earth, & easie known,
Are now conceal'd Intelligencers grown :
For since that as a Guard th’ Highest at once
Put Fear t’ attend their private actions,
And Shame, their publick, other means being fail'd :
Mischief chief, under doing of Good was vail'd, (36-44)

This third section (lines 31-74) manifests the workings of ill on earth in the form of “mischief and Sin.” The poet reminds the reader that the “Agents” of “mischief & sin” are “easie known,” and therefore possible to regulate. On the other hand, those who exploit its ‘strengths’ for wrong
do so strategically. These corrupters of the state “Are now conceal’d Intelligencers grown” (39-40) allude to the kinds of political trickery that Herbert himself came to know during the Thirty Years War. Intelligence becomes another word for covert operations to disguise the “private actions” of ruling exploiters. These next lines are from the fourth section of “The State-Progress of Ill” and attempt to explain the magnitude of covert corruption:

Since then, we may consider now, as fit,
State-government, and all the Arts of it,
That we may know them yet, let us see how
They were deriv’d, done, and are maintain’d now,
That Princes may by this yet understand
Why we obey, as well as they command.
State, a proportion’d colour’d table, is,
Nobility the master-piece, in this (77-84)

The third section transitions into the fourth section at line 75. The poet describes here the sovereign as “a proportion’d colour’d table, is / Nobility, the master-piece, in this” (83-84), sums up range of political power in terms of number and land acquisition. Europe’s history of religious conversion acquired force of number by dominating lands which forced denizens to favor the dominant religion of the state thus proportioned gaming power. The gamers here are despots who exploit the submissive nature of people for their end-game.

In this third section, the poet also asks the reader to reconsider the art of state, to know from where they were “derived, done, and are maintained’d now” (80) and thus raises the topic of culpability so “That Princes may by this yet understand/ Why we obey, as well as they command” (80-82). The topic of culpability is multi-sided. The individual asserts the poet is responsible for regulating the features of his inheritance, those ills, that manifest in mischief and sin. The state is culpable in its acts of coercion and must be regulated by the independent thinker who can moderate its strength to serve the people. The next lines are a sub-part of the fourth section of “The State-Progress of Ill” demonstrate the exigency to re-address the citizens role:
B' inheritance, while whom Ambition swayes,  
Their office is to turn it other wayes.  
Those yet, whose harder minds Religion  
Cannot invade, nor turn from thinking on  
A present greatness, that Combin'd curse of Law,  
Of officers, and neighbours spite, doth draw  
Within such whirlpools, that till they be drown'd,  
They n'er get out, but only swim them round.(111-118)

These lines of the fourth sub-section emphasize power as ill because it inflicts itself as a control rule and compels denizens to submit. The poet turns persuasive in this section, building an argument for the greatest rule, which is self-rule, for “While whom Ambition swayes, / Their office is to turn it other wayes” (111-112). The last lines of this section are compelling regarding the loss of individual in sovereign state echoed in the lines “that till they be drown’d, / They n’er get out, but only swim them round” (118). The essentials of Herbert’s metaphysical treatise is still raw here but we can see the direction he is heading as a philosopher: he seeks to emancipate the afflicted figure caught-up in religious strife.

The following lines are the very lasts lines of this three page poem “The State-Progress of Ill:”

Thus brief, since that the infinite of Ill  
Is neither easie told, nor safe, I will  
But only note, how free born man subdu’d  
By his own choice, that was at first indu’d  
With equal power over all, doth submit  
That infinite of Number, Spirit, Wit,  
To some eight Monarchs, then why wonder men  
Their rule of Horses?  
The World, as in the ark of Noah, rests,  
Compos’d as then, few men and many beasts. (119-128)

This final section that begins at line 117 offers a definitive solution to the conditioned individual of a sovereign state. These assertions leave little doubt of Herbert’s intentions to coax readers to embrace self-sufficiency. He concludes that the plight of the subdued figure is one cultivated
over time but in cooperation with the willingness of the individual to subordinate. The conclusion of this satire, which distinguishes “men” from “beasts,” attributes the latter condition to a failure to exercise free reason and free will. Herbert’s images of the “man” and “beast” in this 1608 poem seeks to aggressively drive out the “beast” in “man.” The “beast” personified is that unquestioning individual who becomes subservient to state rule. In cleansing the “beast” he sought to reform him and so restore wisdom to him. The word “beast” refers to either one who is ignorance or one who exploits. The “beast” thus becomes one who seeks advantage using the path of least resistance. Herbert’s intolerance for the non-contemplative figure is a clear point of his political satire. It is also a tacit principle of his cultural satirical poem which ridicules the impressionable or ignorant English figure.

“Satyr Secunda Of Travellers From Paris,” written also in 1608 when Herbert resided at Merlou, pokes fun at the young, impressionable Englishmen who traverses Europe but lacks discretion and discernment. Herbert addressed the poem to his close friend Ben Jonson. The opening line reads, “BEN JOHNSON, travel is a second birth / unto the Children of another Earth” (1). The topic of travel is one that Herbert must have energetically discussed with the likes of Jonson and Donne, both having made this trip in earlier years. Herbert disparages those other English travelers and invites Jonson to “laugh and look on with me, to see what they / Are now become; but that poorer sort, / A subject not fit for my Muse nor Sport” (38-39). He does not go so far as to call them “beasts” but his intent is to ridicule the figure to oust him from his blind capitulation.

Herbert’s satirical works displace the complacent figure of his time. Herbert took in the ceaseless toll of human life as a result of the protestant-catholic clash over numbers and range of influence. The mathematical reference is contextual to that renaissance climate of scientific progress and foreshadows this preoccupation in the century to come. Science of course will like
religion or politics provide those with power further means to subdue, corrupt or exploit. In this sense, Herbert’s “Ills” is a variable term that condenses power into number of acts, range of influence and facilitators of exploitation. Like Montaigne, Herbert was deeply troubled by the imbalance of power that he beheld in the public world of politics and religion. Montaigne sought the medium of the exploratory essay and Herbert followed the path of poetic license and metaphysical treatises. These avant-garde figures had learned to cultivate thoughts in privacy to ensure intellectual independence.
The excommunication of Martin Luther, and the provocative role of John Calvin whose writings sparked numerous wars in the lower countries, restored deism to an active pursuit in the renaissance. Protestant reformer Pierre Viret (1511-1571) was a Calvinist and a popular reformer at Calvin’s Genevan Academy and later in Nîmes, where he preached to swelling crowds. In his work *Instruction Chrétienne en la doctrine de la foy et de l’Évangile* (Christian teaching on the doctrine of faith and the Gospel) (Genève, 1564, 2vol.) Viret responded to this wave of religious reform by calling deism a new species of heresy (Wiener). Deism was really (in the words of the French Bishop Bossuet) “a disguised atheism” (Hill 23). Joseph Hall in the 1617 text *Quo Vadis* slights deism as “that close Atheism, which secretly laughs God in the face, and thinks it weakness to believe, wisdom, to profess any religion” (Hill 6).

In 1621 the term deism appeared in English print. It was referenced by scholar and clergyman Robert Burton (1577-1640) in his lengthy book *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Burton detailed the variety of melancholy that pervaded the lives of the English in the Jacobean era. Burton’s section on religious melancholy enabled a distinction between the deist and the atheist, between which there had been popular confusion. Part 3, Sec. 4, Member 2, Sub-sec. 1 of Burton’s work conveys this essential distinction that licenses the English deist:

Some are of the opinion that it is in vain to dispute with such atheistical spirits in the meantime, ‘tis not the best way to reclaim them. Atheism, idolatry, heresy, hypocrisy, though they have one common root, that is indulgence to corrupt
affection, yet their growth is different…”Tis true some deny there is any God; some confess, yet believe it not; a third sort confess and believe, but will not live after His laws, worship and obey Him; others allow God and gods subordinate, but not one God, no such general God, *non talem deum*, but several topic gods for several places, and those not to persecute one another for any difference, as Socinus will, but rather love and cherish. To describe them in particular, to produce their arguments and reasons, would require a just volume; I refer them to therefore that expect a more ample satisfaction to those subtle and elaborate treatises, devout and famous tracts of our learned divines (schoolmen amongst the rest, and casuists) that have abundance of reasons to prove there is a God, the immortality of the soul, etc., out of the strength and wit of philosophy bring irrefragable arguments to such as are ingenuous and well disposed ...(392)

Deism stands for a middling view between that of religious dogma and skepticism. Deists assert the belief that by rational methods alone [one] can know all the true propositions of theology which is possible, necessary, or desirable for men to know (Wiener). Deists also believe that reason and observation of the natural world can determine a Godly universe. In other words, God can be acknowledged by reason alone, acting upon observations of the natural world. Deists reject the notions of supernatural miracles, negating further the role of organized religion to interpret them. A final basic stance of deism that the natural world is governed by laws of nature that are not intruded upon by an interfering God. The doctrines of deism are congruent with the central tenets of enlightenment thought.

Herbert’s metaphysical treatise *de Veritate* is one of the earliest metaphysical treatises ever written by an Englishman. *De Veritate, Prout distinguitur a Revelatione, a Verisimili, a Possibili, et a Falso* (On Truth, as it is distinguished from Revelation, the Probable, the Possible,
and the False) (1624) & (1633) & (1645), (1659), and a French version (1639) is “Dedicated to every sane and unprejudiced Reader.” Herbert divided this philosophical treatise into two parts: First, he addressed questions that concerned the method or the conditions of knowledge to determine the nature and standard of truth. Then he outlined his metaphysical treatise on religion. Hill writes, “His Lordship seems to have been one of the first that formed deism into a system, and asserted the sufficiency, universality, and absolute Perfection of natural religion, with to discard all extraordinary revelation as useless and needless”(118).

On deciding whether to publish this first work, Herbert’s wit extends to praying for a sign and thereafter he heard a loud clap and took it as a one. Herbert however was no Catholic. Though he fought on behalf of protestants, he was no protestant either. The relationship of church and state had wreaked havoc on Europe. Herbert did see a need to separate these two great powers and minimize their causal relationship. As an end to his means, Herbert brought all religious systems to the test of reason. To this end, truth here must be methodically ascertained rather than be complicit in the supernatural miracle. Herbert wrote in his autobiography (De Veritate):

as the frame of my whole book was so different from anything which had been written heretofore, I found I must either renounce the authority of all that had written before me concerning the method of finding out truth, and consequently insist upon my own way, or hazard myself to a general censure, concerning the whole argument of my book. (163-164)

Lee in his introduction to *The Autobiography of Edward Herbert* notes that “Herbert passes by all acknowledged contemporary authorities, and anticipates opinions and methods that are junior to him by at least two centuries” (Lee Introduction). Herbert instead worked out the questions authorities professed to answer himself. “No authority,” he resolved, “deserved a
slavish adherence. A philosopher must think for himself, and have no personal nor professional ends to serve.” He read “such books as were accessible to him on the subjects with which he dealt,” but none satisfied him and he rejected all their conclusions (Lee Edition 164). In his pursuit of the virtues of honesty and transparency, he embraced “doctrines imprinted in the soul in its first original.” In general, and as an alternative to Christianity in particular, he sought a universal, “natural” creed “accessible to all men” (Hill preface).

Each chapter of *De Veritate* brings the reader closer to an understanding of its central ideas. Herbert’s art is to provoke the reader to seek independent review on the nature of truth and to use this approach to re-examine religious assumptions. Herbert writes: “Our lot would indeed be unfortunate if, while we possessed a reliable rule for the perception of external objects, we had no means of recognizing accurately inner eternal truths when they are arranged in due order” (De Veritate72). His application of the rational to theological matters is intended to dismantle the authority of religion without compromising individual faith, whilst rejecting supernatural events, miracles, or scriptural revelations. Herbert writes: “The work is published with the aim not of arousing controversy, but of closing it, or at any rate, making it unnecessary. So much, then, I desire the reader to apprehend” (Herbert 74).

In *De Veritate* Herbert attempted to find a medium between faith and skepticism. He drew his reader into the conclusion that truth is universal and eternal and known by the interaction of the faculties—instinct, will, sensation, and reason—with the apprehension of objects, appearances, concepts, and truths of intellect. This view was supported by his thesis that man is born with implicit “common notions” which provide the foundations for all truth, law, and religion. Herbert asserts here common ground propositions between all religions, present and past, and labels these innate propositions “Religious Common Notions”: there is a God; God ought to be worshipped; virtue and piety are the essential components of any religion; vice is
expiated through some form of repentance; there are rewards and punishments after death (Butler 2).

There are thirteen chapters to *De Veritate* in all (a number still useful to one who is non-superstitious). Each chapter is an effort to break down common notions that are the substrate of the belief process. Herbert begins his work with a general examination of the conditions and definition of truth, breaking them down into conditions and classes. Next, he uncovers the conditions and faculties of perception. Finally, he addressed common notions perceived by the senses that give rise to unquestioned thoughts or supposed truths. But these chapters are not his primary destination. These chapters are to persuade the reader to doubt that which is assumed and thus he lays the foundation for his primary cause which is the call into question common notions concerning religion. He breaks down these common notions into features of revelation, probability, possibility and falsity.

Herbert took a philosophical leap with his method of classifying and analyzing the nature of truth to secure the endgame of his treatise. It was a presumptuous move to desquamate truth but his work aims to address that proclivity in humans to search and secure truths by themselves. It is also a circuitous work designed to ward off those who might suspect it of being a heretical text. Readers had to acclimatize themselves to his style of address, with its meticulous pairing of words and labyrinthine argumentation. In his address to the reader in *De Veritate*, he calls for patience and persistence from his readers:

> I have frequently pointed out that owing to the action of free will, or the Infinite within us, we can, if we desire, shut our eyes, stop our ears, and stifle all the promptings of our hearts. The truths I have here expounded are denied to such persons until they learn to use their faculties. (334)
Herbert’s remaining philosophical works were written after his withdrawal from political life. In *De Causis Errorum* (“The Causes of Errors” (1633 & 1645), Herbert expands upon his notion of the uniformity, harmony, and universality of truth by defining falsity as that which is neither true, probable, nor possible (World Biography). In *De Religione Laici* “A Layman’s Religion” (1633 & 1645) with *Appendix ad Sacerdotes* (1645), Herbert anticipates the theory of the natural history of religion adopted by David Hume a century later. Religious documents should be treated historically, and true religion is that which expresses the greatest conformity to the universal common notions (World Biography).

Herbert further developed the application of common notions to religion he had started in *De religione gentilium* (1663, *Ancient Religion of the Gentiles*). The universal characteristics of true religion are identified as the notions that there is one God, that He is worthy of worship, and that He rewards and punishes man, and that He judges him according to his practice of virtue and his sorrow for sin (World Biography). *De Religione Gentilium Errorumque apud Eos Causis* (1663) (The Religion of the Gentiles), is a work exposing the errors of paganism and is based on Herbert’s compilation of five forms of truth. This work is a treatise on what is now called comparative religion. This particular work caught the attention of Hobbes. Finally, Herbert composed *A Dialogue between a Tutor and his Pupil* (1768) with similar content to *De Veritate* but with his ideas more firmly in place, and more directed to his philosophical intent.

*De Veritate* of 1624 drew harsh critics, especially from the Catholic Church. All flagged Herbert as an atheist. When news of a private circulation of *De Veritate* reached the ears of the Catholic Church, an Italian priest, Gregorio Panzini, was dispatched to England to sound out Herbert’s attitude towards Rome. Panzini’s inquisition was little match for an ambidextrous Herbert and, unable to estimate the real threat of the work, he returned to Rome. The Catholic Church would only in 1633 understand its contents and place it on their forbidden list.
Although the Catholic Church placed *De Veritate* on their Index of Forbidden Books in 1633, an undaunted Herbert, published newer editions of *De Veritate* in 1633 and, in 1645, the treatise *De Causis Errorum* (The Causes of Errors), which includes unfinished work on logical fallacies. This central work subsists of *De Relgio Laici* (A Layman’s Religion) and *Appendix ad Sacerdotes De Religio Laici*. The German scholar Christian Kortholt gives Herbert pride (or infamy) of place in his book *Three Great Imposters* (1680), attacking Herbert, Hobbes, and Spinoza as an unholy trio of hypocrites who strove to undermine the Christian religion. Kortholt devoted his longest chapter to Lord Herbert’s philosophy of religion (Hill 118).

Herbert’s works will draw from Voltaire in 1767 the observation that “Herbert was one of the first of those who dared to stand up not only against the Roman church, but against the Christian church” (Hill preface). Voltaire notably observes of Herbert that he is “neither a Christian, protestant, an atheist, or indifferent, he is isolated from others.” From this epistemological island, Herbert earns his place in the company of the major deists—all of them (in Peter’s Gay’s words) “powerful agents of Modernity” (Hill 119). Newton wrote a treatise of pagan theology in which he adopts a position closer to that of a deist like Herbert than to any form of Christianity, but it was never published (Hill 118). Newton’s reluctance serves to remind Herbert’s readers of the constraints under which he wrote a century earlier. One cannot overestimate the importance for Herbert to conceal and reveal at the same time. Herbert, unlike Newton, did not at the end shy from voicing his controversial ideas. He did, however, wrap them in language often abstract or obscure so that they were squirreled away.

The *Index Expurgatorius* censored, amongst others, Herbert, Voltaire, Descartes, Bruno, Hume, Locke and Rousseau. In its zeal, the Roman Catholic Church and governments gave birth to copyright law, a by-product of the See’s efforts to regulate and control the output of printers. In 1501 Pope Alexander VI issued a bill against the unlicensed printing of books, and in 1539 the
Index Expurgatorious, or List of Forbidden Books was issued for the first time. Herbert stands at the fountain head of author royalties. Every published author owes him a debt. Milton raised his baton for free speech in Areopagitica (1644) as a response to imposed governmental licensing. This tradition of revolt against the suppression of thought and speech laid the groundwork for our modern intellectualism and democratic freedom. Herbert was its vanguard. Herbert’s De Veritate further challenged restrictive notions of the term gentleman. De Veritate is a direct challenge to despots of any time by calling for intellectual independence in readers. The rational thinker facilitates his own liberation, Herbert contends. The work calls for the reader to examine his notions of truth as a means of addressing traditional conformity.
Conclusion

During the singular life of Edward Herbert, he was many men. In the year 1608, Edward Herbert encountered himself as a man of the world: urbanized, eloquent and adventurous. In his early years Herbert took joy in fulfilling his self- and class-defined duty to others. In public life, he was boastful, charming, and eccentric. He ventured far while he was abroad, but intellectually remained secluded from public realm. Herbert learned to live his life compartmentalized grand in his outward shows, yet in his private thoughts edgy, seeking a modern solution for the difficulties of his time. His squirreled his thoughts into his arts, but his choleric temper called out to him to live life as a free and reasonable creature.

In truth, he lived life as a double-agent. He served both his country and his private thoughts intermittently without detection. Herbert does not record in his autobiography the expansive intellectual stimulation he garnered during this trip to Europe in 1608. His autobiography never reveals the strikingly original intelligence, the poetic edginess so cultivated in his works. In his later years he took pleasure in dismantling the conventional philosophy and religion of his society — a system designed to hold the lives of the majority tenuously—their beliefs ransomed for prosperity and survival. He was forty-two the year he published De Veritate.

In the days of his English Alamo, at the onset of the civil war, as the royalists raged outside the castle walls, Herbert wrote new works expressive of ideas that had matured since De Veritate. At sixty, with England as the object, Herbert looked into the next century and saw that
it lay in the hands of the opposition, and that the flames of aristocracy were spluttering. Indeed, Charles I was executed one year after the death of Herbert, who passed away peacefully even as Cromwell marched in the distance, soon to destroy Montgomery Castle.

In one sense, Herbert’s abandonment of Charles I was a predictable reassertion of baronial primacy. Herbert’s fierce independence hearkened back to the middle ages; the English Lord was socially prior to the bourgeois society that Cromwell helped bring into being. It was Sir Thomas Myddelton (1550–1631) who came to arrest Herbert at the onset of the civil war. As a youth Myddelton was apprenticed to a grocer in London and made his fortune in trade. He was a member of the Grocers' Company, a member of Parliament, a founding member of the East India Company, Sheriff of London in 1604 and Lord Mayor of London in 1613. In 1644, he ransomed Herbert’s library at his London House. It is altogether in character that Herbert valued his books more highly than the safety of the English monarch. Herbert had served his Crown well but found the Crown lacking in reciprocity. Myddelton’s move from humble beginnings to political position demonstrate that essential change of class ascension. If Myddelton had moved beyond monarchy towards and England ruled by merchants and money, Herbert was moving in the opposite direction, back to a world of tournaments, duels, and armed retainers. He remained an ancient aristocrat in the era of bourgeoise arrivistes. Neither group had any special reverence for an anointed king.

Soon parliament would be made up of numerous upstart figures who lacked that privileged upbringing afforded to the aristocracy. Herbert would have approved. In speaking out Herbert diminished and undercut the very noble roots he had come to enjoy and take for granted. This political mindset of Edward Herbert would one day belong to the future. He wrote his Epitaph conscious of his lofty ideals:

Reader,
The Monument which thou beholdest here,
Presents Edward Lord Herbert to thy sight,
A man, who was so free from either hope or fear,
To have, or lose this ordinary light,
That when to elements his body turned were
He knew, that as those elements would fight,
So his immortal soul should find above
With his Creator, Peace, Joy, Faith, and Love.

While a conventional bow to Stoic imperturbability, this epitaph makes pointed reference to those “elements” that would fight, perhaps a typically shrouded allusion are a reference to this pioneering free-thinker who in his public life had sworn to uphold justice and whose world spluttered at the enormity of the ills he faced. Herbert lived two-thirds of his life as an intellectual solitudinarian because of active service to the crown and he came to appreciate the solitude and comfort in private expression. Readers are unaware that this enigmatic figure dwelled so freely amongst the famous wits of his day, and that at twenty-six was already an impressive satirical poet. At forty-three he revealed himself as a bold philosophical figure. Although, partly by his own design, his readers struggled to grasp the import of his argument, and that Edward Herbert had dared to sound the first alarm of the Enlightenment. It is only now that the impressively double figure of Lord Herbert can be understood to have ushered in a world that, in his day, lay still over the horizon.
Poems of Edward Herbert of Chirbury

To his Watch, When He Could Not Sleep

Uncessant Minutes, whil'st you move you tell
The time that tells our life, which though it run
Never so fast or farr, you'r new begun
Short steps shall overtake; for though life well
May scape his own Account, it shall not yours,
You are Death's Auditors, that both divide
And summ what ere that life inspir'd endures
Past a beginning, and through you we bide

The doom of Fate, whose unrecall'd Decree
You date, bring, execute; making what's new,
Ill and good, old, for as we die in you,
You die in Time, Time in Eternity.

Love's End

Thus ends my Love, but this doth grieve me most,
That so it ends, but that ends too, this yet,
Besides the Wishes, hopes and time I lost,
Troubles my mind awhile, that I am set

Free, worse then denied: I can neither boast
Choice nor success, as my Case is, nor get
Pardon from myself; that I loved not
A better Mistress, or her worse; this Debt

Only's her due, still, that she be forgot
Ere chang'd, lest I love none; this done, the taint
Of foul Inconstancy is clear'd at least
In me, there only rests but to unpaint

Her form in my mind, that so dispossess
It be a Temple, but without a Saint.

Another

Dear, when I did from you remove
I left my joy, but not my love;
That never can depart.
It neither higher can ascend,
Nor lower bend.
Fixt in the centre of my heart,
As in his place,
And lodg'd so, how can it be change,
Or you grow strange
Those are earth's properties and base
Each where, as the bodies divine,
Heaven's lights and you to me will shine

The State-Progress of Ill.

I say, tis hard to write Satyrs. Though Ill
Great'ned in his long course, and swelling still,
Be like to a Deluge, yet, as Nile,
'Tis doubtful in his original ; this while
We may thus much on either part presume,
That what so universal are, must come
From causes great and far. Now in this state
Of things, what is least like Good, men hate,
Since 'twill be the less sin. I do see
Some Ill requir'd, that one poison might free
The other ; so States, to their Greatness, find
No faults requir'd but their own, and bind
The rest. And though this be mysterious still,
Why should we not examine how this Ill
Did come at first, how't keeps his greatness here,
When 'tis disguis'd, and when it doth appear.
This Ill having some Attributes of God,
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As to have made it self, and bear the rod
Of all our punishments, as it seems, came
Into the world, to rule it, and to tame
The pride of Goodness, and though his Reign
Great in the hearts of men he doth maintain
By love, not right, he yet the tyrant here
(Though it be him we love, and God we fear)
Pretence yet wants not, that it was before
Some part of Godhead, as Mercy, that store
For Souls grown Bankrupt, their first stock of Grace,
And that which the sinner of the last place
Shall number out, unless th' Highest will shew
Some power, not yet reveal'd to Man below.

But that I may proceed, and so go on
To trace Ill in his first progression,
And through his secret'st wayes, and where that he
Had left his nakedness as well as we,
And did appear himself,

    I note, that in
The yet infant world, how
    mischief and sin,
His Agents here on earth, & easie known,
Are now conceal'd Intelligencers grown :
For since that as a Guard th' Highest at once
Put Fear t' attend their private actions,
And Shame, their publick, other means being fail'd :
Mischief chief,under doing of Good was vail'd,
And Sin, of pleasure ; though in this disguise
They only hide themselves from mortal eyes.
Sins, those that both com- and o-mitted be,
Once hot and cold, but in a third degree
Are now such poisons, that though they may lurk
In secret parts awhile, yet they will work,
Though after death : Nor ever come along,
But sudden fruitful multiply e'r done.
While in this monstrous birth they only dy
Whom we confess, confess live which we deny.
Mischiefes like fatal Constellations
Appear unto the ignorant at once,
In glory and in hurt, while th' unseen part
Of the great Cause may be perchance, the Art
Of th' Ill, and hiding it, which that I may
Ev'n in his first original display,
And best example, sure, amongst Kings, he
Who first wanted succession to be
A Tyrant, was wise enough to have chose
An honest man for King, which should dispose
Thofe beasts, which being so tame, yet otherwise,
As it seems, could not heard: And with advise
Somewhat indifferent for both, he might
Yet have provided for their Childrens right.
If they grew wiser, not his own, that so
They might repent, yet under treason, who
Ne'r promis'd faith: though now we cannot spare,
(And not be worse) Kings, on those tearms they are
No more than we could spare (and have been sav'd)
Original sin. So the those Priests that rav'd
And propheci'd, they did a kind of good
They knew not of, by whom the choice first stood.
Since then, we may consider now, as fit,
State-government, and all the Arts of it,
That we may know them yet, let us see how
They were deriv'd, done, and are maintain'd now,
That Princes may by this yet understand
Why we obey, as well as they command.
State, a proportion'd colour'd table, is,
Nobility the master-piece, in this
Serves to shew distances, while being put
'Twixt sight and vastness they seem higher, but
As they're further off, yet as those blew hills,
Which th' utmost border of a Region fills
They are great and worse parts, while in the steep
Of this great Prospective, they seem to keep
Further absent from those below, though this
Exalted Spirit that's sure a free Soul, is
A greater privilege, than to be born
At Venice, although he seek not rule, doth scorn
Subjection, but as he is flesh, and so
He is to dulness, shame, and many moe
Such properties, knows, but the Painters Art,
All in the frame is equal: that desert
Is a more living thing, and doth obey,
As he gives poor, for God's sake, (though they
And kings ask it not so) thinks Honours are
Figures compos'd of lines irregular,
And happy-high, knows no election
Raiseth man to true Greatness, but his own.
Mean while, sugred Divines, next place to this,
Tell us, Humility and Patience is
The way to Heaven, and that we must there
Look for our Kingdom, that the great'st rule here
Is for to rule our selves; and that they might
Say this the better, they to no place have right
B' inheritance, while whom Ambition swayes,
Their office is to turn it other wayes.

Those yet, whose harder minds Religion
Cannot invade, nor turn from thinking on
A present greatness, that Combin'd curse of Law,
Of officers, and neighbours spite, doth draw
Within such whirlpools, that till they be drown'd,
They n'er get out, but only swim them round.

Thus brief, since that the infinite of Ill
Is neither easie told, nor safe, I will
But only note, how free born man subdu'd
By his own choice, that was at first indu'd
With equal power over all, doth now submit
That infinite of Number, Spirit, Wit,
To some eight Monarchs, then why wonder men
Their rule of Horses?
The World, as in the Ark of Noah, rests,
Compos'd as then, few Men, and many Beasts.
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End Notes

1 Some scholars have put forth a date of 1583 for Herbert.

2 These quotes are taken from Herbert’s favorite morning prayer that he read daily.

3 Herbert’s county is named after a village in Wales. The spelling “Chirbury” is correct; although, it is unclear when or how the alternative spelling was put into use.

4 Herbert’s slew of works include historical, literary, philosophical, and other writings: De Veritate, Prout distinguatur a Revelatione, a Verisimili, a Possibili, et a Falso (On Truth, as it is distinguished from Revelation, the Probable, the Possible, and the False) (1624), (1633), (1645), (1659), and a French version (1639); De Causis Errorum “The Causes of Errors” (1633), (1645), De Religione Laici “A Layman’s Religion” (1633), (1645), Appendix ad Sacerdotes (1645); Expeditio in ream Insulam (1656); De Religione Gentilium Errorumque apud Eos Causis (The Religion of the Gentiles) (1663); A Dialogue between a Tutor and his Pupil (1768), an autobiography, The Life of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1764); an historical work, Life and Reign of King Henry the Eighth (1649), The Expedition to the Isle of Rhé (1656), Occasional Verses (1665), his Lute Book, and a newly-discovered masque, Amazon.

5 Powis Castle lies one mile south of Welshpool in northern Powys, mid-Wales, where its famous landscaped gardens containing large Italianate terraces and clipped yew trees, as well as many rare plants. Herbert’s sister married Lord Clive in 1784 and filled the castle with many Indian artifacts and treasures. Powis Castle is now owned by the National Trust.

6 This house also called Lymore and Herbert retired to it during the troubles of the civil war.

7 Montgomery Castle was later destroyed by Oliver Cromwell.

8 The whole book was likely assembled and bound in France. It resembles other French bindings in olive morocco with crossed palm branches. It contains a mixture of old English and newer French pieces that reflect influences from his years in France. Several of the pieces appear to have been corrected or revised by Lord Herbert some years after they were first copied into the manuscript; these corrections are in blacker ink associated with the very last pieces in the book. To paraphrase Dart, the music is written in French tablature for a six-course lute with diapasons, being noted below the six-line stave; but – somewhat less usually – mensural notes are used throughout, instead of the special symbols characteristic of most early lute music. At the beginning of the book the classic tuning of the lute is used, but as the book progresses one or two less customary tunings are introduced (3). The Lute Book is on display at The Fitzwilliam Museum, a UK gallery (Fitzwilliam). It was donated to the gallery after a private buyer bought the book for a mere £1,500.

9 Montaigne is known to have read Castiglione and paraphrased him at two points in his essays, to condemn affectation in speech and dress alike and to declare that actions show grace if they are carried out with nonchalance (Burke 76).

10 Navarre
A historical region and former kingdom of southwest Europe in the Pyrenees of northern Spain and southwest France. Inhabited from early times by ancestors of the Basques, it was ruled by a Basque dynasty from the 9th to the 13th century. The southern part was annexed to Spain (1512-1515), while the northern part remained an independent kingdom until it was incorporated into the French crown lands in 1589.

11 Casaubon, staunchly neither catholic nor protestant, and who remained politically plagued, settled in Paris as the king’s sub-librarian in 1604 until 1610 where he attained the reputation as a leading scholar. Casaubon, the son of French Huguenots, was vulnerable to Catholic mobs, but did not renounce Protestantism. Casaubon mistakenly looked towards England as a possible new home and was received by James I as an intimate theological advisor. James I summoned him frequently to his many residences, but Casaubon was largely unwelcomed by English courtiers.

12 *The Amazon*, A Masque. Little is known about Herbert the dramatist, but his interest for drama probably cultivated through the practice and performance of plays at school. *The Amazon*, a masque written by Edward Herbert was found recently in a folder marked “Old Poems” and buried in a trunk at in an attic in Powis Castle. The manuscript is written in a pre-bound booklet of foolscap size and set out in a manner typical of professional dramatists of the period. The Guardian speculates the masque was cancelled because of Herbert’s entangled plot, but 1618 is the year Herbert was appointed British ambassador to France and prior to this appointment he struggled from a long sickness, presumably malaria. According to the Guardian, this drama features two Amazon girls who discuss the general uselessness of men. The women disenchanted by men highly favor divorce: “Yf they did require divorcée / They might enjoy it, without mor remorse / of doinge ill, than gamesters that give ore / When they are losers” is the only line released to the public to date. The plot is tortuous, involving pirates and the kidnapping of the king’s son, but ends surprisingly in praise of a love sung by two young men (Guardian). Felix Pryor of Bonhams notes many revisions and notes by Herbert are on the work. The manuscript was sold on November 10th, 2012 in New Bond Street, London for £90K (Paulfrasercollectibles). Dramatic performances with masked features was a familiar practice of aristocratic medieval Europe. The chief development of the masque was further popularized under the reign of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I and entails a succession of changing scenes, music, and crowded figures. The Puritan Revolution of 1642 put an end to this elaborate show. A feature of a particular celebration, Herbert’s *Amazon* was due to be performed before James I and his court on New Year’s Day in 1618, but was cancelled.

13 As a young boy, French-born Isaac Oliver had escaped the wars of Religion in France by moving to London in 1568 with his Huguenot parents Peter and Epiphany Oliver. Studying under Nicholas Hilliard in Gutter Lane he became known as an English portrait miniature painter. Some of his work is housed in Windsor castle and his pen drawings are located in British Museum. A drawing by him from 1586 of *The Lamentation* suggests he returned to Europe to apprentice and as the years between 1577 and 1587 are chronologically lost, it casts doubt on how and who really influenced his use of naturalistic settings: “soft, illusionistic style” and his preference for Chiaroscuro offer a supple three-dimensional realism to his work. His work differs from that of Hilliard and these traits met with his disapproval. But, after the death of Elizabeth I, Oliver’s naturalistic style made him a favorite of James I court. The work which captures the youthful and idealistic Herbert would have been painted sometime after he was created a Knight of the Order of Bath in 1603 and before his year-long tour of Europe. Herbert’s graceful hands are reminiscent of his mother Magdalen Danvers and his dark-haired looks a legacy of the males on the Herbert side.

14 London born William Larkin was best known for his iconic portraits of members of the James I court. His work captures elements of the Jacobean era incorporating embroidery, lace, jewelry, and layered textiles. It is James Lees-Milne who identifies the above portrait of Edward Herbert as the work of
Larkin. This portrait was previously attributed to Isaac Oliver. Milne’s made this deduction upon reading Herbert’s autobiography where he notes that a portrait of him was ordered by a Richard Sackville and drawn by a painter Larkin. His discovery is later supported by technical analysis of other portraits made of Herbert. Larkin’s works traditionally feature a long elegantly draped curtain at the back of the figure. The lightly modeled fashion of the figure surrounded by props and gilded with jewelry or lace ended with the likes of painters Hilliard, Larkin, and Robert Peake the Elder. Elizabethan and Jacobean court portraiture emphasized the wealth and status of the sitter rather than the character. The works above of Herbert, however, appear suitable to his personage. A more self-possessed Herbert is looking out towards the viewer. A younger Herbert in the same robe of the Knight of Bath is available but the painter is unknown. Herbert is portrayed here in his robes as Knight of Bath. In addition, two works are purported to have been painted by Václav Holler (known in England as Wenceslaus or Wenceslas and in Germany as Wenzel Hollar (13 July 1607 – 25 March 1677), and William Holl Sr, or by William Holl Jr.