

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review  
**Band:** 7 (1899)  
**Heft:** 26  
  
**Artikel:** Lancelot Andrewes  
**Autor:** Nairne, A.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403444>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 07.01.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## LANCELOT ANDREWES.<sup>1)</sup>

---

The outlines of Andrewes' career are to be found, traced by himself, in his book of Private Prayers, sometimes in his thanksgivings, sometimes in his intercessions. He was born and baptized in the parish of All Saint's Barking, in 1555; was educated at the Cooper's Free School and at the Merchant Taylors' School in London; then at Pembroke Hall Cambridge, of which he became afterwards Master. He was Vicar of S. Giles' Cripplegate, Prebend of Southwell, S. Paul's, and Westminster. King James made him Dean of Westminster, Bishop of Chichester, Bishop of Ely, and lastly of Winchester. He was also the king's Almoner. He died in 1626, and is buried in S. Saviour's Church, Southwark. On his tomb the entry in Laud's Diary is engraved "Sep<sup>ris</sup> 21<sup>o</sup>, Die Lunæ, Hora matutina fere quarta, Lancelotus Andrewes Episcopus Wintonensis, meritissimum lumen orbis Christiani, mortuus est". Casaubon called him "très docte, très modéré, et d'une singulière humanité".

Those were the days of controversy, and gentle and pious as Andrewes was, he could not, or King James would not let him, keep out of it. His *Tortura Torti* and *Responsio ad Bellarminum* were the chief fruits of his controversial labours. Their history is briefly this.

After the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, King James proposed an oath of Allegiance which was taken by some of the Roman Catholics while by others it was refused. In 1606 the Pope, Paul V., put forth a Breve, forbidding them to take

---

<sup>1)</sup> The references are to the pages of the Oxford Edition of the Sermons (1841—1843), and to the pages of the Original Edition of *Tortura Torti* and the *Responsio*, which are marked in the margin of the Oxford Edition of 1851.

the oath, and this proving ineffectual, another Breve followed in 1607, and Cardinal Bellarmine wrote a letter to George Blackwell, the Archpresbyter in England. Thereupon King James wrote his "*Triplici nodo triplex cuneus*", against the Pope and Bellarmine.

To this Bellarmine at once answered, but not in his own name, with "*Responsio Matthæi Torti Presbyteri et Theologi Papiensis ad librum inscriptum Triplici nodo triplex cuneus*": and to this Response, Andrewes replied in turn with "*Tortura Torti sive ad Matthæi Torti librum Responsio*". King James however did not think it improper to reply to his adversary himself and added a *Præfatio Monitoria* to his book, in which he treated the whole subject over again at greater length. Against this "Preface" Bellarmine again wrote—this time putting his own name to his book. Andrewes again answered him with his "*Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini*". Both of Andrewes' books are written in Latin in a clear and forcible style. In *Tortura Torti* he defends the king's authority and attacks the doctrine of the Papal supremacy; in the *Responsio* he also examines other points of doctrine and discipline in which the Roman is at variance with the English Church.

The great question raised by the oath was that of the supremacy of the Pope, and in this narrow form—"Has the Pope power to forbid subjects to show allegiance to kings whom he has excommunicated?"—Andrewes proves from Holy Scripture, the canons of the General Councils, the Fathers, and the facts of history, that in no case ought excommunication to hinder this allegiance; that the Pope can have no power under any circumstances to interfere with kings and kingdoms which he himself considers to be outside the pale of the Church; that this power of excommunication was not given to S. Peter alone but to all the Apostles, and that there is no proof that, if it had been, the power would have descended to the Pope. Christ alone is the Head of the whole Church, and His Vicar is not the Pope, but the Holy Spirit, as Tertullian has said. In each kingdom, however, the king must be the Head of the Church in that kingdom, he is *Vicarius Dei in regno suo*, not to teach doctrine, but to preserve order. It was so among the Jews; it was so in the early Church; the Bible orders it, and the Fathers understood the Bible in that sense.

“Sed protrita jamdudum obiectio hæc de Petri pastione. Quære vero alium, si placet, cui persuadeas; Rex illam non moratur. E cerebro vestro illa est, e *decretis alatis*<sup>1)</sup>; Scripturæ eam nesciunt, Ecclesiæ priscæ nec audita, nec visa est. Erit per Dei gratiam *de Grege Dominico* Rex noster, nec agnoscet Romani *Pastoris* fistulam. Unum ille quidem Pastorem universi gregis agnoscit, non alium tamen, quam Christum ipsum, cujus de Grege honorem sibi ducit quod sit: Quo de Grege etiam, sic est; ut et *Dux Gregis* sit sub Christo Pastorum Principe. Sic ille quidem est, sic sunt et alii (certe sic esse debent) Reges Christiani ad unum omnes, jura si sua nossent, et vel vires eis, vel animus non deesset. T. T., p. 53.”

Andrewes denies that Bellarmine has any right even to call King James a heretic. The king, he says, does deny the Pope's supremacy; that we ought to pray to the Blessed Virgin; to seek the intercession of saints—though not that they do intercede for us; that private masses should be celebrated in which no one partakes of the Body and Blood of Christ with the priest; but all this he denies *with the early Church*. He holds that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, for it was instituted by our Blessed Lord to be both a sacrifice, i. e. a commemoration of His sacrifice or a *sacrificium commemorativum*, and a sacrament or *alimonia spiritualis*; but he denies that the one use can be separated from the other—“*Sacrificium* quod ibi est Eucharisticum esse: cujus sacramenti ea lex, ut qui illud offerat, de eo participet: participet autem accipiendo et comedendo (uti jussit Servator)”. [Responsio, p. 184.] “Memoriam ibi fieri sacrificii damus non inviti. Sacrificari ibi Christum vestrum de pane factum nunquam daturi.” Transubstantiation we deny, and also your right to mutilate either sacrament or sacrifice by administering the elements to the people in one kind only. The adoration of the sacrament we refuse, but Christ in the sacrament we do adore. “Nos vero et in mysteriis carnem Christi adoramus, cum Ambrosio; et non id, sed eum, qui super Altare colitur. Male enim quid ibi colatur quærit Cardinalis cum quis, debuit.” Works of supererogation we do not take account of, since it is idle to talk of rendering more than is required till we have first rendered all that is required. As for relics, we would be willing

<sup>1)</sup> The italics here and in the other Latin quotations are Andrewes' own.

to adore them in the same way and no other as we adore the volume of the Gospels, or the sacramental vessels; so, we say, are representations of the Cross to be revered, not, in the strict sense of the word, adored. The worshipping of images we call idolatry, and we do consider that you worship them. For Purgatory no certain evidence can be found in Holy Scripture, and so we refuse to accept that doctrine. In all this we agree with the early Church, i. e. the Church when it was still undivided, the Church whose doctrine and laws can be found in the three Creeds, the decrees of the first four General Councils, and the writings of the Fathers of the first five centuries, the Church which based her teaching on the Bible.

These positions are established by very numerous quotations, both from the Scriptures and from “the impartial volumes of the Church Catholic”. Mark Pattison says that Andrewes was not exactly a learned man, but was well acquainted with the stock passages which were used in controversy: he knew the “apparatus theologicus”. In that case we can only be amazed at that vast apparatus for controversy which had been elaborated in those days. If Andrewes did not enlarge it, he at least was thoroughly master of it. But the important point is that the appeal he makes is always to history. What is the fact about the belief of the early Church?—that is the question Andrewes asks. Again and again the argument is summed up with this result of its windings—“We are in agreement with the early, undivided Church.”

In this summing up lies the value of these books. The English Church still allows much difference of opinion in its members. There are many English Churchmen to-day who would not agree with Andrewes in all he teaches; there were many in his own day who did not. But it was by him and some other men of his day that the firm, broad principles of Anglican theology were, not indeed laid down, but reduced to order and established. His position in the history of the English Church may perhaps be thus described. The Reformation of the English Church began in the time of Henry VIII. In his reign no change of doctrine was proposed; all that was done was to throw off the supremacy of the Pope: the King became the Head of the Church in England instead of the Pope (who had at least claimed that position hitherto). In the next reign the reform of

doctrine began, and the double shock to the Church was very great. Few Englishmen really understood what was and what was not important in Church matters. To some there seemed no real difference between English and Roman teaching, and for a certain time it was quite possible that, if circumstances should favour it, England might return to communion with Rome. That however was made impossible by Mary. The severities of her reign left the nation utterly hostile to papacy. The doctrines of the papacy were repudiated, not perhaps because their merits or errors were properly understood, but because they were associated in the minds of Englishmen with cruelty, tyranny and impertinent foreign aggression. On the other hand, even in Edward's reign, a party was growing stronger and stronger who wished to go as far as possible from Rome in every possible way, and who took certain foreign reformers as their model, and it seems that neither the leaders of this party, nor the people in general saw any thing of the risk they were running—if circumstances had favoured it, England might at any moment have overstepped the boundary of the Catholic Church, and become, what the Papists already called her, a sect, and a sect without any intelligible laws to restrain her from changing and changing continually. At a later time, some might say, this did happen; but, if so, the principles of the true Church in England had been clearly settled, and after a short period of trouble, the country came back to them.

In these earlier days the man to whom we owed our safety was Cranmer. Under his direction two Prayer Books were composed in Edward's reign, and though some considerable changes were made in the second in consequence of the pressure of the Puritan party, still Cranmer gave way on no vital point, and all through the years of wavering that followed, the Church had a service-book in which it claimed to be Catholic; to hold the three Creeds; to have Bishops, Priests and Deacons; to have authority to bind and loose; to expect a new birth in Baptism; and to receive the very Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion. So long as that book belonged to it, it could not pass the dangerous line.

In Elizabeth's reign a settlement was made. The Queen took care that the English Church should be, under her rule, what it has continued to be ever since—part of the Catholic

Church; (for few would deny that the Commonwealth, though it withdrew all legal sanction from the Church, yet failed to interrupt its life.) But Elizabeth's settlement was one which proceeded rather from law than from the judgement of the nation. The judgement of the nation was still unsettled. The opposition of the Puritans was still strong, and produced Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, a book in which the principles were shown upon which Andrewes and his contemporaries were to work. But Hooker did not base his argument upon those principles. He was concerned rather to show the reasonableness of the English order than the principles upon which the English Church claimed to enjoy unbroken life. He understood those principles, and we can find them in his book when we read it now. But it may be doubted whether most men in his own lifetime cared to find them. Quiet security and settled government in Church and State were what men were looking for then, and for them, if the English Church could satisfy Englishmen to worship together in unity, on whatever grounds, that was enough.

But by the time James came to the throne the farther question had to be answered. Rome was then reasserting her power in many parts of Europe. Scholars and well read men were everywhere becoming dissatisfied with the various forms of Puritanism, and some of them were returning to the Roman Church, because they found her, and her alone, in agreement with antiquity. The most learned Divines in England were obliged to study the controversy with Rome, and to study it from this point of view. They tried this agreement of hers with antiquity, and found it wanting. A modified or, so to speak, modern antiquity agreed with Rome, but not the true and uncorrupted antiquity. On the other hand they found in the English Church nothing which compelled them to differ from the true antiquity. It was rather surprizing that, after all the changeful and turbulent years of Reformation, this should be the case. But it was the case.

Here then the English Divines took their stand and laid down this plain and simple principle of theology in their Church. They accepted as their faith that which the early, undivided Church had believed. The early Church had based all its belief on the Holy Scriptures—that then was a principle which the

English Church held and which the simplest Englishman understood. If an early Father were found in any place to contradict the Bible, his authority could not be accepted on that point. But it was probable that no *consensus* of the early Fathers could be found to contradict the Bible on any point. On the other hand much mischief could be done and had been done by this or that private person among the moderns putting their own interpretation on difficult passages of scripture, whilst Rome had sometimes erred by trusting to a mere *provincial* judgement. All such mistakes were to be avoided, first, by comparing scripture with scripture, and secondly, by following the interpretation of the whole and undivided, that is, the early Church, whenever it was possible to do so. The period of authority could be defined. It included the first four General Councils and no more—the Councils, that is to say, which men like S. Gregory and S. Isidore had recognized as having a different kind of authority from that of all later ones.

“Nihil vero in eo novum facias, quod nobis *novas sectariorum opiniones* objicis. *Antiquum obtines*. Nobis vero *opiniones novas?* Imo narro tibi, si *novæ* sunt, nostræ non sunt. Provocamus ad antiquos, ad antiquitatem usque ultimam. Quo *novum* quidque magis, eo minus gratum nobis; quo minus *novum*, eo magis; nec ulla auribus nostris gratior vox accidit, quam illa Servatoris, *Ab initio fuit sic*. Neque vero hæresin alia magis ratione definimus, quam si *veterum* trium Symbolorum, vel si *veterum* quatuor Generalium Conciliorum ulli contraveniat. Annon hoc est, odisse *opiniones novas?* Nec innovamus quicquam; renovamus forte, quæ apud veteres illos fuerunt, et apud vos iam in *novitates* abierunt... *novatis* et vos *novalia*... quodsi quid antiquum retinetis, id ita interpolatum est, apud vos, ut nemo veterum redivivus agnoscat: ut qui Ecclesiam Romanam veterem in vestra hodie Romana quærat, is operam luserit.

T. T., 80—81.”

It was henceforth to be a question of fact—what has the belief of the Church been from the first? The theories of Puritans and of Papists were equally untrustworthy, not theories but facts were to be the starting point.

It is impossible to forget that at this very time Bacon was working out his principles of inductive science. At certain periods certain ideas are, so to speak, in the air. This idea of



the inductive method was in the air in the days of Elizabeth and James. New facts—facts of physics, or geography, or history, were being discovered one after the other. Men were beginning more and more to mistrust any reasoning which did not start from facts. Here we find the new inductive method applied by Andrewes and his school to the science of divinity, the search for the true faith.

“Provocamus ad antiquos — usque *ad ultimam antiquitatem*.”

The aim is a far reaching one. As time goes on inquirers discover more and more. Those who examine antiquity come to know more and more of it: they penetrate to knowledge farther and farther back. It seems that Andrewes faced the difficulty. It might be possible that in some things the English Church should be obliged to modify her teaching. If she should find herself in the light of future knowledge differing in any respect from the teaching of the earliest Christian times, she would do so—*provocamus ad ultimam antiquitatem*. In the same spirit Cranmer had placed between the Litany and the Communion Service that Eastern prayer in which we ask that the Lord will give us “in this life *knowledge of His truth*”, a prayer which the English Church grew to love so well that in the next generation to Andrewes it was added to the daily services of morning and evening prayer. The prayer is the complement of the appeal.

Two questions here occur to us. (1) Did Andrewes consider the Romanists to be part of the true Church at all? (2) Was he right in finding in the early Church such a doctrine as he held about the supremacy of kings?

(1) Strictly speaking it would seem that he did not. They are heretics he says, no one more so. They have innovated, and by their arrogance and exclusiveness they have made themselves the Donatists of these days. There are grounds for supposing that the Pope is Antichrist. On the other hand the *protest* of the Anglicans when they parted from Rome was that they did so only till she should also reform what had become corrupted; the barrier between them could easily be removed. Perhaps we may say that Andrewes goes as far as and no farther than the 19<sup>th</sup> Article goes—“As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome

hath erred; not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith". He prays for the Western, but not separately for the Roman Church.

(2) The doctrine of the king's supremacy has been looked upon as important in the theology of Andrewes and his school. We must notice carefully that it does not mean that the king is to have the position in or over the Church that the Pope claimed. He was never to be a teacher of doctrine, nor of course would he exercise priestly functions. He was to be the supreme ruler whom the Church would obey so long as he commanded nothing which could be shown to be contrary to Scripture. Above all he was to have the right of "calling assemblies"; the Church's Councils were to be summoned by him alone. This Andrewes proves in a sermon on "the Two silver Trumpets". The reference is to Numbers X, 12, and the title of the sermon agrees well with the chivalrous and almost romantic devotion which was rendered by these Churchmen to the Stewart Kings. Andrewes is learned and almost convincing. He proves the custom, but the doubt remains whether the custom was founded on a doctrine. "A time there was when they were infidels, kings and kingdoms both": in that time the king had no supremacy of this kind. What should be the rule if in process of time it happened that all religions were tolerated in a kingdom, or even that some of the king's authorized ministers were not Churchmen, or not Christians? The Bishop's words are very noble and as we read we could wish to be convinced, but it appears at least possible that he has made the mistake of taking for a point of faith that which is really but a rule of expediency and order, a rule which the Church might alter.

Andrewes does not appear at his best in controversial writing. "They say", wrote Chamberlain to Sir D. Carleton, "that the Bishop of Chichester is appointed to answer Bellarmine about the Oath of Allegiance, which task I doubt how he will undertake and perform, being so contrary to his disposition and course to meddle with controversies." It is in his sermons that his power and delightfulness are seen. In them he is "sui certus et de alto despiciens". If he refers to opponents it is in a peaceful gentle way, such as would befit one of the "courtiers of the house of God". He loves to point to the true way of unity; a way he found not in controversy but

in doing duty,—obeying conscience. “Yea further the Apostle doth assure us, that if whereunto we are come and wherein we all agree, we would constantly proceed by the rule, those things wherein we are otherwise minded, even them would God reveal unto us. That is, He maketh no controversy, but controversies would cease, if conscience were made of the practice of that which is out of controversy. And I would to God it were so: and that this here, and such other *manifeste magna* were in account”. (Serm. on 1 Tim. III, 16, vol. I, p. 36, cf. p. 167, 191).

At the same time he has faith enough to wait for the true unity “Glory and Peace; but Glory first, and then Peace. There is much in the order. Glory to be first, else you change the clef—the clef is in Glory, that the key of the song. That is to be first and before all. Peace to give place to her; Glory is the elder sister. And no *Pax in terris*, unless it be first considered how it will stand with *Gloria in excelsis*.” (I, p. 223.)

It was reverence even more than charity which made him shrink from controversy as it made him loth to discuss such secrets of the divine will as election, predestination and the exact way by which grace works in man. When he had to give his judgement on the Lambeth articles this was how he began.

“Quatuor priores articuli de Prædestinatione sunt et Reprobatione; quarum illa ab apostolo dicitur, *ὁ βάθος!* hæc a propheta, abyssus multa; Rom. XI, 33, Ps. XXXVI, 6.

Ego certe (ingenue fateor) sequutus sum Augustini consilium: mysteria hæc quæ aperire non possum, clausa miratus sum, et proinde, per hos sedecim annos, ex quo presbyter sum factus, me neque publice neque privatim vel disputasse de eis vel pro concione tractasse; etiam nunc quoque malle de eis audire quam dicere.”

Most of the sermons which we have of Andrewes were preached before the Court on the great festivals or holy days of the Church—Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsunday. The doctrines taught in them are therefore the great fundamental doctrines which all Christians unite in holding—“the eternal generation of the Son of God; His glory with the Father before the world was; His co-eternity, co-equality and con-

substantiality with Him; His miraculous conception; His supernatural Birth in the fulness of time; the union of the two natures in one Person; the great objects of His mission and man's consequent obligations;—the distinction of Persons and the unity of essence in the Godhead; the divinity, personality and agency of the Holy Spirit in particular; His procession from the Father and the Son; His threefold coming; His office, His works, His gifts, His place in the economy of Redemption; the power which He confers in Holy orders; the danger of grieving Him; the necessity of receiving Him; His indwelling; the comfort He imparts; the meetness with which He endues the soul for the inheritance of the Saints in Glory." (Pref. to Oxford Ed. of sermons, vols. I and III.)

Andrewes has done, what only a great preacher can do—treated a well known subject in a straightforward way, and yet said never a word that does not teach us something about it which we had not thought of before. This was due partly to his piety, but partly also to his learning, the long preparation of his life, and the careful preparation of each sermon. He was "full of thoughts"; "in preaching he had such a dexterity that he was quick again as soon as delivered"; "He ever disliked often and loose preaching without study of antiquity, and he would be bold with himself and say, when he preached twice a day S. Giles' he prated once." In one of his sermons of the Sending of the Holy Ghost he says "Ever emptying presupposeth filling . . . . . It is but a grammar note, that of Hierome's, but it is to the purpose, upon the word *quem docebo scientiam*, that *doceo* if it have his right, would have a double accusative; not only *quem*, "whom", that is an auditory; but *scientiam*, what, that is "knowledge". So as he that hath not *scientiam*, should not have *quem*; and they that get themselves whom to teach, and have not *scientiam*, what to teach, go they never so oft into the pulpit, it is not *sicut dedit Spiritus*, the Holy Ghost gave them neither mission nor commission" (III, p. 137); and again in the same sermon, "And where it is required that not only the tongue have this fire, but that it sit and bide by us, sure it is that volubility of utterance, earnestness of action, straining the voice in a passionate delivery, phrases and figures, these all have their heat, but they be but blazes. It is the evidence of the Spirit in the soundness of the

sense, that leaves the true impression; that is the tongue that will sit by us, that the fire that will keep still alive" (p. 141).

One set of sermons was preached in Lent and their subject is "Repentance and Fasting". Here again all doubtful disputations are avoided; every thing has a plain and practical end. Andrewes teaches how to repent and therefore how to amend. He makes much of the "fruits meet for repentance". "O Domine, novum supervenisse spiritum novæ vitæ ratio demonstret; nam pœnitentia vera, nova vita", is his short petition in his *Preces Privatæ*, and it might be used as a kind of abstract of these sermons. The "novum spiritum" is not forgotten. No one had a deeper belief than Andrewes in the need of God's gift and help in this matter: a man does not pray for five hours every day, as Andrewes did, if he has not such a belief. This side of the doctrine is stated plainly enough in his sermons, but though plainly, shortly. It would not seem to him a point to enlarge on. He knew, and his audience would know their need in this respect, nor would they question God's promise; it would serve no practical end to reassure himself or them about that. Where men fail is in doing their own part, and Andrewes accordingly addresses himself chiefly to showing us the way to do our own part. Nor does he spend time, which is all too short for what he has to say, in urging and exhorting. His exhortations are like the Apostles', brief and such as follow naturally out of his exposition. To a sincere and thoughtful hearer therefore they come with tenfold weight. Andrewes is bent on becoming holy, on finding himself, and showing to his hearers the way to this; and his sermons are in the main a tracing of that way as it lies in Holy Scripture.—"Now, mark these four well: 1. fear, 2. sorrow, 3. anger, 4. desire, and look into 2 Cor. 7, 11. if they be not there made, as it were, the four elements of repentance, the constitutive causes of it. 1. Fear, the middle point, the centre of it. 2. Sorrow, that works it. And if sorry for sin, then of necessity 3. angry with the sinner, that is ourselves, for committing it. It is there called indignation, and no slight one, but proceeding *ad vindictam*, to be wreaked on ourselves for it. 4. And desire there is too, and zeal joined with it to give it an edge. These four, the proper passions all of repentance, and these four carry every one, as we say, his fast on his back. Much more where they all meet, as in true earnest repentance they all should" (I, p. 386).

This "indignation" he makes much of—"Sorrow, if it have no power to revenge, grows to be but a heavy dull passion; but if it have power, indignation and it go together... set down this: that *ἀγανάκτησις*, "indignation", is the essential passion, and *ἐκδίκησις*, "revenge", or this "rending" here, the principal and most proper act of a true turning unto God" (p. 372). It is this which obliges a truly penitent person to fast. It is evident from several passages in these sermons that there was some prejudice against fasting in Andrewes' time, but he preaches it plainly, as an ordinance of the English Church, commanded in Holy Scripture to be observed. On the other hand he is quite as plain about the need of fasting properly. Fast and be proud, for instance, is no true fasting. "As for meat and drink, the devil never takes any, keeps a perpetual fast for that matter; but feeds on pride as one doth on his meals, and surfeits that way as much as any epicure."

In the time of the Stewarts men had a different notion of "wit" than we have now. There was indeed a kind of wit used then which is extinct now. It seems to us hardly reverent to use wit about sacred things, but in that elder wit there was no irreverence. Andrewes is full of it. His sermon on "Mercy and Truth shall meet", is one continued exercise in wit, and yet none of his sermons is so full of piety and reverence as this; none so full of the *heart* of religion. "Those that observe the similitudes of things," wrote Hobbes, "in case they be such as are but rarely observed by others, are said to have a good wit." We may perhaps consider part of this good wit in Andrewes to be his habit of comparing text with text, of finding hidden resemblances and secret sympathies in all parts of the Holy Scriptures. This indeed is a favourite way of his of—not proving, but—displaying the truth of the Christian religion. All is a harmony when once the Incarnation of Christ, His Resurrection, and the sending of the Holy Spirit are believed.

He has however as good a judgement as he has wit, and is perfectly clear as to how far these resemblances may be pressed. Of Lam. 1, 12, he writes "According to the letter, it cannot be denied but they be set down by Jeremy in the person of his own people... what then... 'out of Egypt have I called my son' was literally spoken of this people too, yet is by the Evangelist applied to our Saviour Christ... of all which

the ground is that correspondence which is between Christ and the Patriarchs, Prophets, and People before Christ, of whom the Apostle's rule is, *omnia in figura contingebant illis*"—Andrewes will go by rule in this as in all else.

And this leads us to notice the wonderfully intimate knowledge he had of the Bible. He finds authority thence, or illustration for every thing he says. He studded the margins of his sermons with references to texts in which he remembered some subtle resemblance to his thought;—sometimes one that exists only in the Vulgate or in some single Greek or Hebrew word. Almost the same might be said of his reference to the Fathers. For controversy he may have known but the stock places, the "apparatus theologicus", but in the devotional study of the Fathers he seems admirably versed; he not only quotes them when he writes, but he seems to be ever passing unconsciously into their language: a chance word of his own sets his memory at work.

Nor is it only in the Scriptures that he finds these likenesses and shadowings of eternal things. We can fancy he was born with the soul of a poet. His language is poetical in a masculine and intellectual way. He has the poet's knowledge of mystery in all he sees and believes: and a poet's love of nature and insight into the meaning of natural things. This, an Englishman delights to believe, is rather characteristic of English theologians. Our Cathedrals, architects say, are country Cathedrals. They stand in fields with the trees round them, while other nations build theirs in the streets of their cities. In the same way our divines have loved, like Hooker, to behold God's blessing spring out of their mother earth, and have seen in nature a sacrament of heavenly things. So Hooker did and George Herbert and Keble and Newman, and we might add perhaps Izaak Walton and Tennyson. Andrewes takes this sacramental view of nature. It is to him something more than a suggestion: it is a partial revelation of divine truth; one of the means by which we may be raised to hope, turned to repentance, or led to a better manner of life.

Thus St. James' *τροχὸς γενέσεως* pleases his fancy—"Being thus turned to our hearts we turn again and behold the *τροχὸς γενέσεως* as St. James termeth it, 'the wheel of our nature', that it turneth apace, and turns off daily some, and

them younger than we, and that within a while our turn will come that 'our breath also must go forth, and we turn again to our dust'" (I, p. 361).

Thus he meditates on the Resurrection—"Therefore it was also that the Resurrection fell in the spring, the freshest time of the year; and in the morning, the freshest time of the day, when saith Esay 'the dew is on the herbs'. Therefore, that it was in a garden (so it was in Joseph of Arimathea's garden) that look, as that garden was at that time of the year, the spring, so shall our estate then be in the very flower and prime of it" (II, p. 231).

Yet all this is restrained by soberness and wisdom. Bacon's prayer might have been used by Andrewes, Bacon's friend: "Thy creatures have been my books, but thy scriptures much more. I have sought Thee in the courts, fields and gardens, but I have found Thee in Thy temples."

It was perhaps this union of the poet with the theologian in Andrewes which made him so free from narrowness of mind, so apt to see the other side in things, and cautious in the logical applying of dogmas. He disliked "that exegesis, *id est*". In his Catechistical Doctrine he says "And according to that, Heb. IV, 12, 'the word is a two edged sword', it is a special point in preaching that their words must have two edges, for else the back commonly doth as much hurt as the edge doth good. And that is when they do not meet with both extremes; as when they speak of obedience, they deal as if they would take away all disobedience and would have a man never to disobey". These Lectures, as we have them, seem to be printed from a pupil's notes, and Andrewes may have worked out the idea more exactly in his Lecture, as he certainly did in his own conduct of affairs and preaching. A good instance is his sermon on "The power of Absolution", where he finds that in St. Joh. XX, 23, Our Lord did give to His Apostles and after them to priests, the power of remitting sins, a power subordinate to and derived from God's power—*Remiseritis* from *Remittuntur*—yet a power whose act God ratifies at once and certainly. But he carefully adds—or rather his very argument is this—"There are divers acts instituted by God, and executed by us, which all tend to remission of sins," as Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, the preaching of the word, prayer, and the prayer of the priest.



But here something further seems to be meant; “and not to hold you long, I take it to be the accomplishment of the promise made of the power ‘of the keys’, which here in this place and in these words is fulfilled, and have therein for me the joint consent of the Fathers. Which being a different power in itself, is that which we call the act or benefit of Absolution, in which *as in the rest, there is in the due time and place of it a use for the remission of sins* (V, p. 95). In his notes on the Prayer Book, i. e. notes which he made in his own Prayer Book for his private eye, he wrote more freely—“propter male abolitas publicam *ἐξομολόγησιν*, et privatam auricularem”,—and “the sovereign benefit of absolution”. Yet this does not really go beyond “there is in the due time and place of it a use” etc., and it is neither sensible nor charitable for a man to put all his private meditations into his public speeches:—“A sad wise valour is the brave complexion”.

Of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Eucharist, as Andrewes is fond of calling it, there is frequent mention in these sermons. Many end with an invitation to partake of it—a Good Friday sermon ends with such an invitation. After the strife of controversy in *Tortura Torti* and the *Responsio* it is delightful to read these simple and devout expositions of the doctrine. Andrewes raises in our minds the very highest reverence towards the sacrament, for he always expounds it by likening it to the Person of Christ: and he stirs up in us the greatest desire to enjoy the sacrament, or, if we may use the words, love for it, for he speaks such high and hopeful words about the state of one who has even prepared himself to receive, still more of one who has received it.

“And the gathering or vintage of these two in the blessed Eucharist, is as I may say a kind of hypostatical union of the sign and the thing signified, so united together as are the two natures of Christ. And even from this sacramental union do the Fathers borrow their resemblance, to illustrate by it the personal union in Christ.... That even as in the Eucharist neither part is evacuate or turned into the other, but abide each still in his former nature and substance, no more is either of Christ’s natures annulled, or one of them converted into the other.... but each nature remaineth still full and whole in his own kind.”

....“Which benefits are too many to deal with. One shall serve as the sum of all: that the very end of the Sacrament is to gather again to God and His favour, if it happen, as oft it doth, we scatter and stray from Him.... And as to gather us to God, so likewise each to other mutually.... All under one head by the common faith; all into one body mystical by mutual charity.... And even thus to be recollected at this feast by the Holy Communion into that blessed union, is the highest perfection we can in this life aspire unto. We are then at the highest pitch, at the very best we shall ever attain to on earth, what time we newly come from it; gathered to Christ, and by Christ to God; stated in all whatsoever He hath gathered and laid up against His next coming. With which gathering here in this world we must content and stay ourselves, and wait for the consummation of all at His coming again. For there is an *Ecce venio* yet to come” (I, p. 281—283. Sermon on Eph. I, 10).

The style in which these sermons are written is to a modern reader somewhat strange. To begin with they are filled with Latin words and phrases, and these seem at first sight to be often introduced for no sufficient reason. It is no doubt the fact that to Andrewes and the writers of those days Latin was a more familiar instrument—at least in Theology—than English. The difficulty which we find in the English which Hooker wrote a generation earlier is largely due to this. He was using an instrument with which he was not quite familiar. So to Andrewes the Latin words occur first; and what seems to us unnatural was really very natural to him.

Possibly however the taste of King James had something also to do with it. The sermons which were preached before him are more adorned with Latin than those which were preached before Elizabeth.

There is one thing however which this familiar knowledge of Latin produced in Andrewes which we do, even at first sight, appreciate. It made him clear, like a Roman author, in arrangement and even in expression. For unlike Hooker, Andrewes uses short sentences, which are constructed in the simplest way, and might for the most part be read off word for word into Latin. He must think clearly who would write like that.

Then on looking closer, we find that these Latin words and phrases are not introduced at random. They are meant to give emphasis to certain ideas; also to mark the divisions of the subject. A mere list of the Latin words would often supply a rough analysis of the sermon; and they would do this better than a list of English words, for the Latin is easier to remember. "Explanations *viva voce*", said a famous schoolmaster speaking of grammars, "should be in English for apprehension's sake; the formulæ or rules should be in Latin for exactness and recollection's sake." The same might be applied to sermons.

What has been said of Andrewes' Latin tags and catch-words might also be said of the verbal plays and assonances of which he is fond. They may seem out of place to some, and so prove Hobbes right who said that "in a sermon there is no gingling of words that will not be accounted folly". They do however make his arguments clearer and more easy to remember, and those who like them in George Herbert's poems will not dislike them in Andrewes' sermons.

Clear and plain however as Andrewes is, he is fond of using from time to time short and pregnant sentences which do not yield their full significance to a hasty consideration. He might remind us sometimes of the late Archbishop Benson. If it be lawful to imitate him in taking an illustration from the Vulgate, we might say that his sermons have the two qualities of excellent discourse, (1) *Aperiam in parabolis os meum*; (2) *loquar propositiones ab initio*. He uses enigmatical, far reaching utterances now and then, and for his common method he eschewed academic language and an abbreviated allusive style, but set out the whole of his argument with care and patience from the beginning. The first of these belongs to wit, and is profitable for sowing seeds of thought in the hearer's mind; the second belongs to urbanity and is apt to persuade.

Lastly the pleasure we take in reading these sermons arises largely from the pleasure the bishop took in writing them—at least, so it seems. He seems to choose a text and follow with delight the wider and wider circles of truth into which it leads him; and as he shapes his discourse to express what he finds there, fancies, hopes, affections crowd upon him, and he marshalls every thing in its order "without" as he put

it once himself, "going a step out of his text", and is glad both to learn and to teach.

People's tastes however differ in sermons as in other things. "A Scottish Lord, when King James asked him how he liked Bishop Andrewes' sermon, said that he was learned, but he did play with his text as a jackanapes does, who takes up a thing and tosses and plays with it—Here's a pretty thing and there's a pretty thing" (see Nichol's Progresses, II, 47). If James disliked this criticism, still he would understand it. The Scottish Lord was but *virtutibus vicina vitia affingens*. But the common judgement of those times was nearer Fuller's—"He was an unimitable preacher in his way; and such plagiaries who have stolen his sermons could never steal his preaching; and could make nothing of that, of which he made all things as he desired" (Worthies, II, 66).

Of the best and (though he never meant it to be so) most famous work of Bishop Andrewes—the *Preces Privatæ*—little can be said here. Books of controversy and expositions of doctrine may be examined and criticised with freedom, the private prayers of a good man not so well. "Reliqua ideo istius Præsulis scripta æstimare magni, ut sæculum nostrum plane amat, et collaudare forte soles: sed tamen hoc potius te frui vellem, hoc familiarius lectitare, quo vere Christianam et æterni simillimam vitam amodo tibi formare poteris" (Præf., Ed. Oxon. 1675). This Prayer Book is used to-day by many English clergymen, either in the original Greek and Latin, or in Newman's beautiful translation. The more her clergy use it, the better it will be for the Church of England, if the daily practice of devotions which are drawn from the Holy Scriptures, the ancient service-books of the Church, and the heart of a saintly prelate, has any power to mould the character of those who follow it. In his prayers Andrewes followed the guiding of pure antiquity even more freely than he could in his public writing and speaking. Like Cranmer and Laud he was versed in Liturgiology and was especially fond of the ancient *Greek* services. He quotes them, adapts them, and interweaves parts of them with his own thoughts much as we find Old Testament language interwoven with new thoughts in the Magnificat and Benedictus. This leads us to remark that no one can properly understand the 'intention' of the English Book of Common

Prayer, unless he studies the Greek Liturgies as its compilers had studied them: it is anything but an adaptation of the old Missals and Breviaries.

In his prayers, as in his sermons, Andrewes' poetical nature appears. Most of them are arranged in rythmical verses, and the idea of the sacramental use of nature is everywhere present. One who used these devotions once said that he was much struck to find Andrewes so careful to give thanks for the *water*; but the fact is, there is hardly anything he does not give thanks for. In the same way there is hardly any class of men he does not intercede for. "*Usque ad sordidas artes et mendicos*" is the regular ending of his general intercessions.

All through the book the thought runs of the need of forgiveness and the need of holiness, and this is answered by the continual setting forth of the nature of God, and the facts of the Gospel.

His love of Holy Scripture and trust in its sufficiency is more clearly seen in this than in any other of his works. In many parts of the book there is not a line but has its reference to Scripture set against it, and sometimes he goes on for several pages doing nothing but interweave text with text: the words of the Bible come to him more naturally than his own.

We will end by quoting one of his prayers for the Church.

ὑπὲρ           Καθολικῆς,  
                   Βεβαιώσεως, καὶ ἀνξήσεως αὐτῆς.  
                   Ἀνατολικῆς,  
                   Ἀναρρόύσεως, καὶ ἐνώσεως αὐτῆς.  
                   Δυτικῆς,  
                   Καταρτισμοῦ, καὶ εἰρηνεύσεως αὐτῆς.  
                   Βρετανικῆς,  
                   ἐπιδιορθώσεως   λειπόντων } ἐν αὐτῇ.  
                   ἐπιστηρίξεως   λοιπῶν        }

The Church of England, as Andrewes understood it, was no *Via media*: it was more akin to a counsel of perfection. It refused to make religion popular, while it aimed at making the people religious. It taught that forgiveness was not to be expected without amendment of life: that the Holy Communion must be prepared for sincerely, and actually partaken of by

those who would receive the benefit of it, or worship God in it; that difficulties in faith cannot be cleared away without labour and obedience to conscience; that God's will is in many things too wonderful for man to explain. Those who say that this Church exists only on paper seem to mean that it has been found to be a true one only by the researches of learned men. But what learned men have taught may be understood and acted upon by men who are but tolerably educated. Since Andrewes' day English labourers have learnt to read the Bible which he helped to translate, and it is not impossible that as education in England widens and deepens, the Church which Andrewes obeyed may become more and more truly the Church of his people.

Rev. A. NAIRNE.

---