

ABSTRACT

Pulpit Rhetoric and the Conscience: The Gunpowder Plot Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes

Neil Barclay Johnston, Ph.D.

Mentor: Robert H. Ray, Ph.D.

Sermons were the dominant form of literature during the seventeenth century; thus, their role in shaping many aspects of England's literary, social, and political history warrants more thorough exploration. Too often, in an effort to highlight dynamics of power struggles at various political and ideological levels, we tend to ignore the power of the individual conscience to rise above the immediate context's power struggle. Lancelot Andrewes' sermons were among the most frequently printed in that period, and this study opens the door of exploration slightly wider by considering the role that conscience plays in a portion of his state-mandated sermons.

The modern era's relationship to the conscience differs considerably from the Renaissance and the Reformation understanding, and thus, I provide an overview of how the conscience worked in that period. Further, to provide a context for the development of his conscience, two other aspects of his work are examined: his treatment of the Decalogue, and his private devotions. These two works display both a public and a private expression of Andrewes' convictions, illuminating crucial commitments to

theological and moral tenets. This significant background material supplies what is lacking in the sermons themselves: historical antecedents for the apparent exaltation of the king and the state ground these expressions in gratitude and obedience to God. Moreover, as is seen from the shift in emphasis that Andrewes' rhetoric takes in these ten sermons, they are much more than anti-Catholic and pro-English propaganda. They are, in fact, sacred epideictic efforts that use the politically ordained occasion for spiritual ends: to give praise to God for the Gunpowder Plot deliverance, to rebuke the treasonous act and the traitors who plotted it, and to issue a renewed call to obedience.

Pulpit Rhetoric and the Conscience:
The Gunpowder Plot Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes

by

Neil Barclay Johnston, B.A., M.A.R., M.Div

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of English

Dianna M. Vitanza, Ph.D., Chairperson

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

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Robert H. Ray, Ph.D., Chairperson

Phillip J. Donnelly, Ph.D.

Martin J. Medhurst, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
August 2011

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2011 by Neil Barclay Johnston

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
DEDICATION	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
THE ROLE OF CONSCIENCE: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO CASUISTRY AND CASES OF CONSCIENCE	7
LOCI OF A PREACHER’S CONSCIENCE:	
THE DECALOGUE	14
<i>PRECES PRIVATAE</i>	15
GUNPOWDER PLOT SERMONS	16
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL CONTEXT	17
ACTS OF UNIFORMITY AND SUPREMACY	21
PRE-ARMADA APPROACH	23
POST-ARMADA APPROACH	26
COURT INFLUENCE AND CHURCH INFLUENCE	29
CHAPTER THREE: LANCELOT ANDREWES—A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY	35
EARLY LIFE AND ACADEMIC PURSUITS	35
ELIZABETHAN SERVICE	38
STUART SERVICE	41
CHAPTER FOUR: ANDREWES’ CONSCIENCE AND THE DECALOGUE	50
RECTIFYING THE CONSCIENCE	51
KNOWLEDGE AND HUMILITY	53

THE PREFACE: TRUE KNOWLEDGE AND HUMILITY	57
KEY COMMANDS OF THE DECALOGUE	61
THE FIRST COMMANDMENT	62
THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT	70
THE EXPOSITION OF THE FIFTH	72
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	73
PARTICULAR OBSERVATIONS	75
THE NINTH COMMANDMENT	87
CHAPTER FIVE: <i>PRECES PRIVATAE</i> —THE CONSCIENCE AT WORK	94
THE STRUCTURE	96
“SUNDAIE”	103
“FREIDAIE”	111
SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	124
CHAPTER SIX: THE GUNPOWDER PLOT SERMONS—ENCOMIUM AND OPPROBIUM	128
CONTEXTUAL POPULARITY	133
THE SERMONS	135
THE YEARS PREACHED AND THE TEXTS USED	137
EXAMINING THE ELEMENTS OF ENCOMIUM	142
EXAMINING THE ELEMENTS OF OPPOBRIUM	154
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION	173
BIBLIOGRAPHY	181

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

As is generally the case when such an endeavor as a Ph.D. is undertaken, many people participate in crucial and varied ways to bring the prolonged process to completion. My case is no different, except, perhaps, that those involved span the globe. Beginning locally, I would first and foremost like to thank my longsuffering and kind director, Dr. Robert H. Ray. From my first graduate course through to the end of the dissertation, he has encouraged and inspired me by his teaching, his thorough research and concise writing, and his diligence and attention to detail in many roles. Additionally, in spite of my scheduling problems—due in part to two motorcycle accidents and other vicissitudes—he accommodated me, even in the midst of his own teaching and research load. He has admirably and graciously done so, returning my chapters with great promptness and helpful suggestions. Additionally, I must mention the various members of my committee—Dr. Phillip J. Donnelly, Dr. Martin J. Medhurst, Dr. James E. Barcus, and Dr. Lydia A. Grebenyova—all of whom have played crucial roles in this undertaking. In particular, I mention Dr. Donnelly, for he has graciously offered his insights, wisdom, and encouragement during the development of some of the most seminal ideas. For academic stimulation across the Texas border, immediately east, my thanks go to Drs. Keith Callis and Michael Travers, colleagues who have helped me keep on task and offered excellent advice. I am grateful also for the support, encouragement, and generosity of the faculty and administration of Louisiana College for their patient and enduring encouragement. British scholar, Dr. Stephen Prickett, Regius Professor Emeritus of English at the University of Glasgow and Honorary Professor of the

University of Kent, made suggestions during the prospectus stages I found very helpful, and Dr. Peter McCullough of Lincoln College, Oxford, was very affirming in our correspondence regarding my initial research and the formation of my argument. I also thank Dr. Robert Tennant, a visiting scholar from Scotland with whom I spent many hours on one memorable and enjoyable occasion. As a scholar working with sermons himself, he helped me formulate my approach to this neglected area of literature. My thanks also go the Theological College of Central Africa, Ndola, Zambia, for my first taste of teaching in a higher education context. Back on the North American continent I owe thanks to Brian Botha, a friend of many years: it was he who first suggested to me the idea of teaching in the context of higher education. He has remained in touch throughout the pursuit of the degree, giving needed encouragement. My parents, David and Doris Johnston, are yet more significant in their support of my efforts, for their prayers and love have been unstinting for more years than all others. My debt of gratitude to them shall never be paid in full. Penultimately, I would especially like to thank my children, Daniel and Elissa, for patiently enduring my prolonged absences. My ultimate thanks I give to God who has given me the grace and strength to endure, and my wife, Kathleen, who has faithfully and conscientiously provided me time and encouragement to finish this task.

To Kathleen

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

*Pulpit Rhetoric and the Conscience:
The Gunpowder Plot Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes*

Those familiar with seventeenth-century crown politics know the tensions created by the alliance of church and state, for, in fact, the power of the crown to shape ecclesiastical policy had a long precedent. Indeed, one of Henry VIII's titles was the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and while another title bequeathed considerably earlier upon him by the Pope as "Defender of the Faith" proved ironic—at least from the papal perspective—the prerogatives attached to this rhetoric firmly wed the crown of state to the bride of Christ. Thus, when James I of England came to the throne in 1603, no subject of his could have been surprised to find him very interested in helping shape the policies and direction of the English church.¹ Kenneth Fincham observes this dynamic in his editorial introduction to *The Early Stuart Church, 1602-1642*:

The Church's teaching aimed, as the word religion means, "to bind together" society with a common set of beliefs, so its government was too important to be left to clergymen; yet as a key ideological agent for the crown, the Church's pulpits were platforms for criticism as well as compliment. So powerful was its authority and influence, that the early Stuart Church became the battleground for rival visions of English society, fought out at court, in Parliament and in the parishes of early Stuart England. (1)

¹ Just how influential this precedent was for James I is evident in his "Royal Directions to Preachers" (1622), wherein he carefully sets his proscriptions upon preachers in a historical context when he declares, "[. . .] the abuses and extravagances of preachers in the pulpit, have bin in all tymes repressed in this realme [. . .] as the very licensing of preachers had begininge by an order of the starrchamber, the eight day of July in the ninetenthe yeare of King Henry the eight our noble predecessor" (Fincham 211).

Pursuing Fincham's observation that the Stuart Church became the battleground for the various "rival visions," I examine Lancelot Andrewes' Gunpowder Plot sermons that assert the claims of the crown yet also show a remarkable resilience to merely becoming the King's "yes-man." Instead, we find that the role of conscience functions as the arbiter, even above and beyond a presumed unflinching loyalty to the king. The sermons of the most influential preachers—those who regularly had the king in their audience—reveal how the increased hazards of this battlefield were negotiated. As I examine more of the historical background and works of the period, the pulpit ministry's shaping of seventeenth-century England will come into sharper focus. For now, however, a situating of my argument and its justification follows.

The early Stuarts' precipitous ecclesiastical policies contributed significantly to the shift in the religious, social, political, and literary culture of the period; few would argue against such an assertion. The nature of this shift, while wide-ranging, does seem to turn upon several developments within the sphere of the knotty relationship between the church and the state. Not least of these shifts is the change in the very power structure of the crown, Parliament, and the church; thus, this study examines some of the forces at work to affect this transformation. More specifically, this study will look at the role of the conscience as manifested in what is arguably the foremost court preacher of the period, Lancelot Andrewes. This change in the balance of power and the implosion of the Stuart reign can be traced in the rhetoric of the pulpit. While I do not claim that Andrewes' sermons contribute directly to the unrest of the period, a certain kind of polemical approach applied by Archbishop Laud in the arranging and editing of the Bishop Andrewes' posthumously printed works did contribute to key points of friction.

In particular, as Laud well knew, the high esteem in which Andrewes was held lent weight to the assertion of the divine right of King Charles I, thus limiting Parliament's role and consolidating power in the throne. As a result of this foregrounding of Andrewes' work, filtered by Laud and Buckeridge, scholars can make unwarranted assumptions about Andrewes and his influence. One such scholar, in fact, is Thomas S. Nowak: his presuppositions fail to take into account the role that conscience played in the period. Instead, working from a model that privileges the power of the state over the power of the individual, Nowak asserts that the Gunpowder sermons are produced by the national government of England and "helped to reinforce the English people's 'Old Testament' mentality, and further convinced them that they were truly God's chosen people" (v). Moreover, since he believes that these sermons, "having been written, in a very real sense, by society itself [...], the preacher had much less freedom than either the poet or playwright in what he could say and how he could say it" (10). Problems immediately arise from such an understanding, however, as soon as the power of an individual's conscience is introduced. In particular, when it comes to the conscience of one who premises matters of both faith and practice upon the scriptures and preaches from this perspective, a wholly different dynamic appears within the texts and the rhetoric of the sermons.

To return, though, to consider how the preacher's conscience bends the message to his audience, one must realize that sacred rhetoric is directly related to the tension inherent within the role of the preacher as one bound by conscience to speak "the word of the Lord" in a manner consonant with the dictates of the Scriptures. The grim spectacle of Marian martyrdoms commemorated in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* testifies well to the

power of a captive conscience, and therefore, consciences bound to a higher authority than the early Stuart kings need fuller exploration. A particularly significant manifestation of the conscience's power in a public, political, and ecclesiastical context is most uniquely found in the court sermons. In his 1998 study, *Sermons At Court*, Oxford scholar Peter McCullough notes:

Both literary scholars and historians, for example, have effectively shown how court masques could blend political criticism with courtly compliment. But the most frequent and literary enterprise that could be used to both trumpet and shout down royal policy at court, the sermon, has gone unexamined. [. . .] [R]eligion at court, particularly its presentation and consumption from the court pulpit, was a crucial cultural and political "point of contact" in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. (2)

If these scholars have correctly observed the data, then it is time to redress the oversight of this area of research: the implications of better understanding the influence of the "court pulpit" inevitably result in a fuller appreciation of the period. Endeavoring to help fill this gap, my effort explores how Andrewes, guided by his convictions, seeks to persuade his courtly audience through the content, form, and force of his sermons, not to the mere political end of conformity to the crown's dictates, but also to improvements in the moral tenor of the court that jeopardize cherished ideals of behavior. Furthermore, as McCullough notes, examining "royal tastes in preaching also reveals unopened windows into the souls and minds of princes whose religious convictions have notoriously evaded biographers" (*Sermons* 3). While one of the more remarkable elements of the period—the "apotheosis of court preaching" during James' reign (101)—is the abundant variety and range of both political and doctrinal positions of the court preachers that mark the conflicts of the era (3), Andrewes' sermons are exceptional for their consistently faithful

commitment to the King's prerogatives but still show a mind that runs in an independent vein.

Currently, various arguments vie for the upper hand when assigning the *prima causa* of the reaction against the policies of the crown.² For example, the old historian approach has been replaced by more nuanced accounts; namely, the revisionist historian Thomas Cogswell posits that the anti-Calvinist elements such as Archbishop William Laud and Bishop Lancelot Andrewes were primarily responsible for this shift toward the crown's greater and more aggressive dominance over the church. The older opinion, promoted by predominantly Whig sympathizers, is what mars the interpretations of seminal historians like Perry Miller. This approach asserts that the Puritan influence—the Calvinists—were the primary movers who precipitated this cataclysmic shift.³ Recently, modern scholarship such as that of Peter Lake, Patrick Collinson, Kenneth Fincham, and Deborah Shuger has scrutinized political and theological aspects of the shifts that occurred, attempting to clarify to a greater degree the complex contributing factors that converged to create the changes in English society. There remains, however, a need to explore other dimensions of this shift in power, and a neglected intersection is that of the *occasional* sermon as a repository of markers, specifically, the Gunpowder Plot Sermons preached in the presence of the early Stuart kings.

² Perhaps even using the Aristotelian approach to assign a first cause is misleading, for in the nature of politics and power, causality is more complex than discrete systems of thought convey.

³ A good deal of attention has also been given to the Puritan influences within Parliament, and with good cause, for men like Cromwell and Fairfax were men who held firm convictions informed by their beliefs derived from Puritan teaching in Cambridge and through popular lectureships.

Adumbrations of this shift are evident in the popular medium of the day; namely, they are in the pulpit oratory that the majority of English citizens heard. And while studies of English pulpit oratory of both breadth and depth have appeared—a magisterial treatment by W. Fraser Mitchell and an editorial offering from Stanley Fish,⁴ to name just two—very little examination of pulpit oratory takes into account the multifaceted dimensions that shaped the rhetoric of these specific sermons. With the notable exception of the work of Oxford scholar Peter McCullough,⁵ the role of this genre of religious prose is largely ignored. In these three aforementioned works, while these scholars examine the context of the times with the knowledge available to them, only McCullough addresses specific policies implemented by the early Stuart kings in the context of occasional sermons preached before these two monarchs. Thus, the new developments in the historical research of this period warrant a re-examination of the sermonic prose in its more complete context. As Ferrell and Lake state in their introduction to *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, literature and history 1600-1750*:

Until the last decade, the only, and therefore standard, general studies of the early modern sermon were four in number: Mitchell's work (1932, reprinted in 1962) *English Pulpit Oratory*, Alan Fager Herr's *The Elizabethan Sermon: A Survey and Bibliography* (1940), Millar McClure's *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642* (1958), and J.W. Blench's *Preaching in England in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (1964). [. . .] These were all seminal studies [. . .] [b]ut further study of the sermon has largely failed to evolve beyond the three aspects of the early

⁴ Mitchell's *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* first appeared in 1932. Currently out of vogue (and thus, out of print), it nevertheless is an excellent and thorough examination of pulpit oratory in its theory, practice, and criticism in the seventeenth century. Additionally, Stanley Fish makes a valuable contribution in his collection of articles found in *Seventeenth Century Prose* (1976).

⁵ One of McCullough's contributions to this early Stuart period of study is entitled, *Sermons at Court: Politics and religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (1998).

institutionalized study of Renaissance English literature that set the agendas of the four defining monographs: the history of English prose style, antiquarian literary history, and a preoccupation with “the Metaphysical.” (Ferrell and Lake 3)

Their point is well taken, for such approaches must necessarily focus on discrete studies that do little to integrate the larger role of sermons in shaping political, cultural, and literary history. Endeavoring to address this nearly quiescent state of research, my approach limits the range of the material covered by these earlier studies to sermons preached by a man recognized as a strong supporter of the crown. Lancelot Andrewes’ loyalty to the Church of England and its temporal head, James I, is stable, certainly, but that stable support should perhaps be understood as respect for his position as distinct from his person. Whereas previous work has generally attempted to group sermons by ecclesiastical allegiance, my study will shift the locus to one that examines manifestations of the individual’s conscience that reveal strained loyalty to commitments. The Gunpowder Plot sermons preached before the court by Andrewes, the shifts in tone, rhetoric, texts, and application convey a clear picture of the conscience’s influence on the early modern period’s most popular literature as exemplified in one of the foremost and most respected of its preachers.

The Role of Conscience: A General Introduction to Casuistry and Cases of Conscience

Modern concepts of the conscience and how it works depend almost entirely upon psychology as defined by Freudian and post-Freudian therapeutic analyses. These many and varied models, while having hugely different interpretations of the formation and role of conscience, yet manage to hold at least one thing in common. Namely, the Enlightenment conviction of the power of the rational mind to understand human

behavior underlies the psychotherapeutic approach. In brief, the conscience—or as Freud labels it, the “superego”—imposes order on the chaos of the passions through the application of feelings of guilt, remorse, and shame. One’s society shapes and forges this conscience in its own image, of course, and those unfortunate souls that fail to live up to the standards of that particular society through a lapse in the proper functioning of the conscience must suffer the consequences of disrupting the order of that society. This approach all sounds very plausible today; however, the dilemma that it imposes on understanding the importance of conscience during the seventeenth century should be immediately evident: men and women informed by religious convictions and beliefs—and the literature of the period clearly attests to the preponderance of those so persuaded—conscience was nearly elevated to the voice of God within the person. It was part and parcel of the *imago Dei*, a leading idea in both Protestant and Roman Catholic theology that prevailed as the leading premise upon which morality and the conscience was based in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To conceive of the conscience as something derived from merely human institutions, with religious convictions subsumed under the heading of cultural and political influences, would have been alien to their approach. In fact, preaching aimed at the conscience and its proper formation to return it to its rightful role, to its status of an “erected wit,” as Sir Philip Sidney alludes to it.⁶

Given this perspective, the role that the conscience plays in the Reformation and post-Reformation periods is critical. To gloss over it is tantamount to minimizing one of the keys at work in shaping British society. Unfortunately, the multiple and lengthy works on the conscience produced during these two centuries by a wide variety of authors

⁶ In *Defense of Poesie*, Sidney states, “our erected wit maketh us know what perfection is, and yet our infected will keepeth us from reaching unto it.”

lie neglected. Overlooking a peculiarly distinct feature of the intellectual, political, and moral landscape is easily understood if we remember how our own tastes dictate what we observe. Reader-response theories, while not without problems, do teach us that each age has its own penchants and proclivities that tend to impose that reader's culture into the interpretive task. If time is taken, though, to assemble some of the references to the conscience from the period, we discover that this dimension of human experience must enter into the equation of sound interpretation. To illuminate, a few examples follow that feature the prevalence of the conscience's role.

William Ames' *Cases of Conscience* stands as one example in this phenomenon of marginalized works. Given the centrality of the conscience in what follows, it is only appropriate to present first the period's foremost advocate of the conscience's workings:

The office of Conscience [. . .] is one in necessary things; Another in things of middle and indifferent nature. In necessary things Conscience hath two acts, 1 To binde, 2 To inforce to practise. Conscience *bindeth* according as it is informed of the will of God: for *in itself it hath the power of a will of God, and so stands in the place of God himselfe. Gods will as it is understood, or may be understood, binds* the Conscience to assent; As it is acknowledged and received by Conscience, it binds the whole man to obey and doe it presently. Conscience bindeth a man so straitly that the command of no creature can free a man from it. (Booke 1, Ch. 3, 1-4, italics mine)

Ames' claim is clear, particularly given the last sentence: that "no creature can free a man" from the constraints of the conscience posits ultimate authority in the individual's understanding of what is God's will.⁷ Since multiple sovereigns of England could and did conscript their subjects to subscribe to practices contrary to those loyal subjects'

⁷ Interestingly, this approach echoes Luther's famous resistance to papal authority when required to retract his heretical writings: "I am bound by the Scriptures adduced by me, and my conscience has been taken captive by the Word of God, and I am neither able nor willing to recant, since it is neither safe nor right to act against conscience. God help me. Amen" (Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times*, 504f.)

consciences, latent seeds of civil disobedience lie in Ames' assertion. Such a conviction dominates the early modern period, though, and it explains the many martyrdoms among both Roman Catholics and Protestants of that era. A question arises at this point: while Ames himself asserts such, does it inevitably follow that Andrewes agrees? The answer lies in examining his teaching on the Decalogue, the nature of his personal, private prayers, and his beliefs as manifested in his sermons, but presently, more examples of the primacy of the conscience follow.

One compelling literary example that demonstrates the potent force of the conscience appears in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, and there, it is an ineluctable force. The scene is well known: to finally determine the guilt of his uncle, Hamlet decides that "The play's the thing / Wherein [he'll] catch the conscience of the King" (Act. 2 sc.2 ll. 606-605). Seeking confirmation of the specter's trustworthiness, Hamlet's ultimate deliverance from his ethical dilemma lies entirely in the power of his uncle's conscience. If this reliance is far-fetched, then the play within the play is more farcical than genuine, and as such, loses its credibility. However, Shakespeare makes this scene—Act. 3. Sc. 2—the climax, and the suspension of the audience's disbelief rests on the conviction that even a jaded and seared conscience reveals guilt. Granted, this manifestation of the power of the conscience depends on a contrived thing, that is, the creative presentation of a staged response. To assert such, however, misses the point, for Shakespeare's astute application of the conscience's role succeeds because of the understanding of the period.

Another significant contemporary source comes from King Charles I himself, for as one shaped by the spirit of his age, Charles offers a glimpse into why he presses his

claims as far as he does: he writes from Newcastle to Alexander Henderson for advice on May 29, 1646. His request for help closes with the following:

[. . .] I have another obligation, that to my particular is a no less tie of conscience, which is, my coronation oath. [. . .] Now consider, ought I not to keep myself from presumptuous sins? and you know who saies, What doth it profit a man though he should gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Wherefore my constant maintenance of Episcopacy in England (where there was never any other government since Christianity was in this kingdom) methinks, should be rather commended than wondred at; my conscience directing me to maintain the laws of the land: which being only my endeavors at this time, *I desire to know of you, what warrant there is in the word of God, for subjects to endeavor to force their king's conscience, to make him alter laws against his will.* If this be not my present case, I shall be glad to be mistaken; or if my judgment in religion hath been misled all this time, I shall be willing to be better directed; till when you must excuse me, to be constant to the grounds which the king my father hath taught me. (Basilikon 76, italics mine)

Tellingly, he alludes to the words of Christ in the gospel of Matthew. By doing so, he makes an implicit claim that he is in danger of losing his soul should he swerve from his commitment to episcopacy, for to do so would be presumptuous. He further supports his course by pointing out the lack of warrant from “the word of God” for subjects to coerce his conscience. The crux of the conundrum for Charles I lies in the imposition of one group’s convictions upon the consciences of others, especially if these convictions are equally derived from the “revealed will” of God. The King’s appeal to the sanctity of the conscience reflects the context of the debate as it had unfolded. Not only so, but the King himself seeks advice that is grounded “in the word of God,” reflecting a very similar mode of thinking to Ames’ understanding of how the conscience ought to work. In other words, the conscience girds the struggle for power within the various factions at work.

In the next example, John Locke looks at some of these inherent tensions when the conscience is conscripted. Nearly forty years removed from the Civil War, in his

influential *Letter for Toleration*, he argues for the disentangling of politics from religion and the allowance of a broader range of religious expressions free from the coercive arm of the state. He sets forth various rational arguments in support of his position, not the least of which is his following observation:

But, to speak the truth, we must acknowledge that the Church (if a convention of clergymen, making canons, must be called by that name) is for the most part more apt to be influenced by the Court than the Court by the Church. [. . .] [O]ur modern English history affords us fresh examples in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, how easily and smoothly the clergy changed their decrees, their articles of faith, their form of worship, everything according to the inclination of those kings and queens. *Yet were those kings and queens of such different minds in point of religion, and enjoined thereupon such different things, that no man in his wits [. . .] will presume to say that any sincere and upright worshipper of God could, with a safe conscience, obey their several decrees.* To conclude, it is the same thing whether a king that prescribes laws to another man's religion pretend to do it by his own judgement [sic], or by the ecclesiastical authority and advice of others. (Locke: *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, italics mine)

Locke overstates the ease and smoothness of the clergies' shifts, but his reductionism reinforces the centrality of the conscience's role above a nationalistic or ecclesiastical dictum and the individual's right to determine matters of religious belief. He avoids, of course, mentioning the roles of subsequent sovereigns who had essentially succeeded in imposing Episcopal polity, suggesting his own compliance with the status quo, but the privileged dictates of the individual's religious conscience over and above the coercion of others is evident, regardless.

Locke's understanding of the conscience is considerably different from that of Ames in that he sees it as primarily informed by habit, the habits of the community in which a person lives. This understanding naturally flows from his principle of the *Tabula Rasa* and his attendant conviction that man has no innate principles (*Concerning Human*

Understanding 13-4). Ames, however, following William Perkins, asserts that while the principle or *synteresis* of the conscience is a habit, the habit is formed as a result of the conscience's functioning as intended by God, who creates man in his image (*Cases* 4, 5). Nevertheless, both Locke and Ames utilize a common warrant: such a premise could only exist in a climate wherein the conscience still functions as a viceroy, guiding deliberative discussion and action in both public and private spheres.

Thus, while the material above represents diverse approaches to the conscience's role, the conscience stands out prominently. In the social, political, ecclesiastical, and broadly cultural aspects of the British nation, it functioned as both the informer of morality and the shaper of public law. To narrow the scope of the argument, though, an essential dimension of this influence explores how the conscience of the preacher bends its effort to persuade the hearers of sermons to think and feel as consistently as the *imago Dei* demands. Resident within this powerful concept is the implicit conviction that the conscience is intended to be the "voice of God" that serves to guide the state, the church, and the individual to choose wisely according to the revelation in the scriptures. Such a premise explains why sermons were the predominant literature of the day, and thus, Andrewes' sermons on the Gunpowder Plot are a repository of the enduring power of the conscience controlling a leading form of literature in the seventeenth century.

To illuminate the context that shaped the period's struggles of conscience, the second chapter lays out some of the historical shifts that precipitated the Gunpowder plot. Elizabeth's state policies and commitments regarding matters of faith and conscience impinged on adherents of the Roman Catholic church within her realm, and James I did nothing to substantially change her directives, and this chapter delves into some of those

elements. The third chapter then moves from the more general and national perspective of the period to that of Lancelot Andrewes' personal development. The details included in the brief biography demonstrate the remarkable consistency of Andrewes' own convictions as attested by both his contemporaries and the assessment of those who through the years have continued to examine his life, works, and influence. Additionally, this chapter serves to humanize him as more than simply an influential church figure. Doing so reminds us that power is not necessarily about imposing one's own will.

*Loci of A Preacher's Conscience:
The Decalogue, Preces Privatae, and Ten Sermons*

Chapter Four examines a work of Andrewes written relatively early in his career: The Exposition of the Ten Commandments. Delivered while he was still at Cambridge, the distinctive, searching, and thoroughgoing style with which he exhaustively opens the moral law illuminates Andrewes' character and convictions. Published posthumously, as many of his works were, it comprises nearly 900 pages in quarto form, the introductory material alone extending over the first 125 pages. The length of the work is daunting to modern readers, but such was the interest in that time, and the introductory material lays the foundation for what follows, emphasizing the essential need for the correctives that the Decalogue brings. Accordingly, some time will be spent in this fourth chapter outlining the nature of his argument for reasserting the centrality of the moral law. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study, despite the fact that all the commandments are considered organically related to each other, only the first, the fifth, and the ninth will be covered.

The rationale for choosing these three commandments is straightforward. The

first commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” is the call to a whole-hearted commitment to the God revealed in the Scriptures and lies at the heart of all the other commands. The fifth, “Honor thy father and mother,” relates to how authority is understood in not simply familial terms, but also in the context of society as a whole. Thus, it speaks to adherents’ obligation to those who are over them in government—no small matter when considering the authority of the Church and the State. Finally, the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor,” warrants treatment because of its relevance to bearing witness to the truth, not just in forensic matters, but also in the arena of integrity of the conscience, an obviously interior kind of quality peculiarly oriented towards self-examination. For example, in the Larger Catechism of the Westminster Confession (1647), one application of the commandment is made: “One must not think too highly or too lowly of oneself.” Such an approach insists on self-assessment, and this, if done sincerely, will lead to humility and confession—key aspects of historical expressions of the Christian faith.

Andrewes’ Devotional Life: Preces Privatae

Next, in Chapter Five, to gain an appreciation for the maintenance of his conscience, a slender volume that Archbishop William Laud received from Andrewes at his deathbed in 1626 will be considered. While it has consistently stood the test of time as an invaluable devotional aid, the *Preces Privatae* also amply demonstrates the private dimensions of Andrewes’ prayer life. Here we find the expressions of him *coram Deo*—before the face of God. As such, the intensely personal nature of the prayers will serve as a marker of his sincerity and a gauge of the nature of his conscience, for it is nearly axiomatic that what a person is in private reveals his or her true nature.

These two aforementioned chapters will thus demonstrate the basic moral assumptions under which Andrewes works and how his conscience shapes his Gunpowder Plot sermons, for they are not preached in a vacuum: if the preacher is convinced that there is one to whom he is eternally accountable, evidence suggests that the spiritual elements outweigh the political agenda to reinforce the Stuart crown and the place of the English Church as the new Israel.

Gunpowder Plot Sermons

Finally, the study culminates in a study of the Gunpowder Plot sermons, for it is in these that the conscience's sway is manifested in a uniquely public manner. In that these sermons are preached before the king and the attending court over a period dating from 1606 to 1618, we find revealed the changing nature of Andrewes' focus. In doing so, we discover that the deciding arbiter that shapes the tenor, tone, and passion of Andrewes' sermons is not so much a foremost desire to serve the King and the State, but rather, his conscience requires him to call all hearers, in both a public and private context, to conform to the will of God.

CHAPTER TWO

Historical Context: Conscience, Recusants, and the Stuart Hope

Lancelot Andrewes' Gunpowder Plot sermons must be understood in the light of the assassination attempt that created them. Thus, this chapter looks at some of the salient exigencies of the period. Since I argue that Andrewes' conscience is the ultimate arbiter of his sermons—indeed, of his life—two things need attention: foremost is to establish Andrewes' allegiance to the Protestant ethos that informs his conscience (this task will be taken up more fully in chapter three); secondly, to note that the events leading up to the plot contextualize and clarify several important elements: the prominence of preaching, the spiritual-political dimensions of the times, the anti-Catholic sentiments, and the enduring struggle of keeping a clear conscience.

Taking these aforementioned elements as a whole, a key impetus to the dramatic shift of the early modern period is the Reformation's assertion of an authority above that of the Roman Church. To put it succinctly, in those countries committed to the Protestant faith, the authority of the institutional church gives way to the authority of the Bible. Thus, whereas the Roman Church argued that the Scriptures were given to the Church for her to interpret and apply, the Protestants insisted that the Scriptures were given so that it could establish the Church and correct its erring ways. Herein lies the watershed of the Reformation begun by Luther: the Bible as "the Word of the Lord" was binding upon the individual's conscience over and above that of the Church's interpretation of it. As such, the relatively straightforward hermeneutic principle that asserted the perspicuous nature of the Bible gained ascendancy over the minds and hearts of Protestant clergy and laity

alike. In turn, such a conviction created a hunger for preaching based upon the Scriptures, for it was the authoritative means to know God and walk uprightly. Ultimately, many Protestant sermons vied against sacraments that were more numerous than what Protestants felt were warranted, images that represented a violation of the second commandment and further led astray believers, stained glass depictions of Bible stories and characters, altars on which Christ's body and blood were reconstituted as yet another sacrifice, vestments as symbols of Roman traditions of the mediatorial power of Rome, and priestly roles as means to keep the conscience clear through means of confession, absolution, and penance. In the articulation of the Book of Common Prayer, however, the *via media* meant that not all Roman practices were as suspect as some reformers asserted. Furthermore, while all Protestants were in basic agreement on the central place of Scripture, the scriptures themselves do not clearly articulate certain matters of ecclesiastical polity and nuances of faith with the clarity that some insisted that it did. Needless to say, the role of the individual interpreter's understanding of some of these more ambiguous matters left large spaces for disagreement. People of conscience struggling to work through such thorny concerns inevitably formed into like-minded parties that yet again threatened to destabilize the status quo of the Elizabethan settlement.

While the conscience's significant role in the early modern era tends to be underappreciated, such de-emphasis is understandable: philosophical, political, social, and psychological theories inadvertently create, if not a jaundiced view of the conscience's role, at least a skeptical one. Uppermost in this catalogue of causes, constructs of a philosophical nature arose in reaction to the complexity that centuries of Judeo-Christian

teaching on the conscience had created. For example, Hobbes and Locke in England, and Spinoza in Spain, endeavored to design systems of thought that could deliver the body politic from the morass that a casuistic-laden religion had variously imposed.

Admittedly, these men had other issues that they were simultaneously addressing, but one of the primary concerns focused on finding a relief from the war-torn effects of protracted religious conflicts. Furthermore, the modern neglect of the role of the conscience is partially explainable as an aversion to the intrusion of religious elements within the state.

Nevertheless, in spite of the miscarriages and perversions that a regnant church and state might impose, a frank acknowledgement of the importance of the individual's conscience is needed: its influence on a genre of literature that informed and sharpened the battles of the day, both figurative and literal, ought to be self-evident. In its role as motivator and clarifier, the sermon was one of the most highly developed forms of rhetoric in that period. Consider Abraham Wright's interesting work published in 1656, *Five Sermons in Five Several Styles*: Wright, a Fellow of St. John the Baptist's College, Oxford, provides representative rhetorical samples in his book of sermons that display various approaches used to explicate a text and apply it with due diligence. In it, he demonstrates how pulpit rhetoric morphs under convictions of the polity and theology of such leading lights as Lancelot Andrewes and Bishop Hall among the Anglicans. The Presbyterian example is a sermon preached at Saint Paul's, London, by Dr. Maines, while Wright chooses a sermon by Mr. Cartwright of St. Mary's, Oxford, as representative of the Congregationalists. Finally, he also includes a fifth sermon that represents the "Independent Way" (W3685 209 1). Further, the emphasis that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries placed upon the importance of the conscience as the seat of reason,

coupled with the attendant need to act in accordance with one's convictions, produced some of the most articulate and sustained discourse relating to the role of politics and religion. As a means of developing a careful and measured response to the bewildering array of competing systems of ideas, sermons—and the accompanying cases of conscience—remained popular throughout the century.

However, while these sermons were intended to inform, instruct, sensitize, train, and persuade the consciences of the hearers and move them to action, these sermons also reveal the mind and convictions of the preachers. Rhetorical approaches reveal how readily the three categories of style—plain, elevated, and grand, according to Augustine's reiteration of the classical tradition (*De Doctrina* ch.4)—came into play, and scholars have done an excellent job of categorizing the various rhetorical devices used in the English sixteenth and seventeenth century sermons. There remains, however, a great deal of work to examine how these prominent preachers managed to negotiate the challenging terrain of religion and politics. Herein lies a key ingredient to understanding some of the energy that fueled not only the civil war and an execution of a monarch, but additionally produced a massive volume of tracts, pamphlets and tomes that sought to establish a sure foundation upon which society could build an enduring, just, and benevolent culture. These sermons provided presses with a ready source for marketable material, fueling both the proliferation of cases of conscience that came off the presses literally by the tens of thousands, and, arguably, energizing the major political, social, cultural, and ecclesiastical changes of that time.

Given these factors, the merit of re-examining the role of the sermon from the perspective of the preacher's conscience is apparent. The approach is relatively simple: if

the preacher exhorts with a clear conscience, that is, in good faith, then the efficacy of the message is greater, the message more compelling, and the hearers' convictions become stronger. Consequently, the sermon's force to shape opinion and action increases. Thus, contextualizing is needed: to properly position the role of the conscience in the Gunpowder Plot sermons of the early seventeenth century, the historical antecedents need attention.

In one of the most influential and thoroughgoing works of the early modern period, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*, William Ames establishes how the conscience is rightly informed:

From hence it appeareth that the perfect and only rule of Conscience is the revealed will of God, whereby a mans duty is both showne and commanded. For *Synteresis* in a more large sense consisteth, partly of morall principles that are naturally in us, together with their conclusions; and partly, of those which God besides them hath injoyed. But the revealed will of God whereby man knows his duty, containeth both these. Hence it is only that the *law* of God onely doth bind the Conscience of man. (Conscience 6)

In such an assertion, one can plainly see the exclusion of the mediating role of the Roman Church. Harking back as it does to Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers—a doctrine that not only sees all legitimate vocations as “sacred labor” but also recognizes the believer's need to read the Scriptures for oneself in the vernacular—this reliance upon the Scriptures demands that believers become properly catechized and familiarized with its plenary message. To that end, steps were taken to ensure that the English people would not only hear the Protestant articulation of the Christian faith from learned expositors, but that the Bible would itself be readily accessible and inexpensively available to an increasingly large reading public.

Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity

Queen Elizabeth's approach to the divided loyalties of her people, when it came to religious convictions, was decidedly Protestant. In fact, her progress to the Palace at Westminster on January 14, 1558, gave the officials of London ample opportunity to affirm their and Elizabeth's decidedly Protestant convictions. Several pageants along the route to Westminster richly represented the move from the "bad days" of Mary's reign to the virtuous reign of Elizabeth. Alison Weir describes the progress in *The Life of Elizabeth I*, mentioning in particular detail the pageant at Little Conduit:

. . . [I]ts centrepiece was Time. The Queen gazed at it and mused, "Time! And Time hath brought me hither." The pageant depicted two pastoral scenes representing a flourishing commonwealth and a decayed one. A figure representing Truth emerged from between the two, led by Time, and received from Heaven an English Bible. A child explained in pretty verses that the Bible taught how to change a decayed state into a flourishing empire. Truth presented the Bible to the Queen, who kissed it and held it to her heart, thanking the City most warmly for it and "promising to be a diligent reader thereof." (37)

Such overt acts were clear representations of her commitment to the Protestant faith.

From contemporary accounts, these displays were met with hearty approval by both the populace and the leading members of both houses of Parliament.

In addition to her auspiciously Protestant progress and coronation service, Queen Elizabeth continued to exhibit a deliberate and consistently Reformation-shaped government. She exacted fines from those loyal Catholics who could not yield their allegiance to the Protestant British sovereign: she had little tolerance for the subjects who refused, for their consciences' sakes, to sign the Oath of Supremacy (1559). This oath served as a marker of loyalty for many years, creating one of the most troublesome dilemmas for people of conscience. Initially established by Henry VIII to secure fealty to

his headship over the English Church, Queen Mary removed it immediately upon her ascension, instead requiring all her subjects to affirm the supremacy of the Pope. After Mary's brief five-year reign ended, during which she earned the sobriquet of Bloody Mary, Elizabeth inherited the throne. As a Protestant, she revived the use of the Oath of Supremacy and applied its force to the same end that her father had before her. And while she was careful not to arrogate to herself the title of supreme head of the Church of England (as had her father), she did insist that, as the supreme *governor*, her subjects yield to her will.

Pre-Armada Approach

The nomenclature shift of “Governor” gave more room to Non-conformists than it did to Catholics, however, and thus, a roll call of the Catholic martyred under her reign testifies to her increased resistance to their voice of dissent.¹ Jesuits were barred outright from setting foot on English soil, and anyone not attending an English service of worship on a Sunday was summarily fined twelve pence.² Such an approach, intending to impose doctrinal conformity that circumvented and repudiated the influence of the Roman doctrine, created a sense of urgency and resolve among some of the English Catholics,

¹ See, for example, *Forty Martyrs of England: 1535-1689*, a work authorized by Pope Paul VI, in October, 1970. The actual number of those martyred in this 154-year span is estimated at 300. In fact, more than forty were executed during the reign of Elizabeth, but the forty enumerated in this particular work are those canonized as opposed to beatified. On the other hand, Queen Mary during her five-year reign executed 288 Protestants. Whether Protestant or Catholic, however, the consciences of the martyrs dictated that death was preferable over the violating of their dearly held convictions.

² For perspective on the significance of the twelve pence fine, one pence could buy access to either bearbaiting or to a play at one of the popular theaters. Four pence would buy a meal and a pint of ale at the local tavern. Due to increased Catholic incursions to undermine her reign Jesus' members—Elizabeth increased this fine to twenty pounds.

for their plight as marginalized and voiceless citizens intensified in the later years of Elizabeth's reign. Of course, from a political survival perspective, not to mention her literal survival, one could hardly blame Elizabeth's repressive approach, for the Spanish and Papal threats were real: the Papal Bull that officially excommunicated her meant that her Catholic subjects were no longer under any obligation to obey her. During the time of the English-enforced silence and minimal influence of the Recusants, however, Counter-Reformation developments on the continent continued apace. Most notably, the Jesuits' ranks swelled, their schools grew in number and influence dramatically, and the determined, disciplined rules of Ignatius Loyola were followed with great rigor and energy.

One example of this discipline that generated an enormous anti-Catholic response from the English Protestants is that taken from Loyola's foundational principles for the Society of Jesus, *The Book of Spiritual Exercises*, the Thirteenth Rule:

To be right in everything, we ought always to hold that the white which I see, is black, if the Hierarchical Church so decides it, believing that between Christ our Lord, the Bridegroom, and the Church, His Bride, there is the same Spirit which governs and directs us for the salvation of our souls. Because by the same Spirit and our Lord Who gave the ten Commandments, our holy Mother the Church is directed and governed.
(98)

Not only did such a directive explicitly challenge plain reason, it obviously intended to emphatically reassert the interpretative powers of the Roman Church above that of the individual's conscience. Under such a directive, the Roman Catholic Church could readily justify in the Roman adherents' consciences what the English saw as treasonous thoughts leading easily to treacherous behavior. Coupled with the papal bull that excommunicated her, such articulations and decrees were fully intended to destabilize

Elizabeth's reign and promote her removal. In fact, Elizabeth's spies, under the able direction of Sir Francis Walsingham, ferreted out several attempts on her life before the Armada. During this tense time, Elizabeth's northern cousin, Mary, Queen of Scots, was a person under close scrutiny well before her awkward appearance in England, for she was the next in line for the English crown, and, in her, the Recusants rested their hopes of a return to Catholicism.

After Mary was forced to abdicate her throne in Scotland, she fled to England and was imprisoned for 19 years. Her complicity in the Babington Plot while in the Tower of London precipitated her execution, and upon the discovery of such, upon the urging of Elizabeth's Protestant advisors, Mary was beheaded in 1587. Historian Garrett Mattingly argues that her execution helped launch the Armada prior to its readiness as Phillip II hoped to capitalize on the adverse reaction to her death (*Armada* 81). The exaggerated claims of the number of Roman Church sympathizers in England ready to rise up in arms upon the appearance of the Duke of Parma's feared army to combine with the might of Spain's navy probably further induced Phillip to act quickly. Since Parma's army failed to appear at the rendezvous, nor did the dread Armada appear in the Thames as expected, no rallying of the English Catholics appeared either. In fact, after the Armada's loss was finally confirmed and the bad news accepted in Spain and Italy, even Pope Sixtus V praised the qualities of Elizabeth as a leader (Mattingly 309). This victory was a real affirmation of her right to rule, as it were, and her powerbase was essentially unassailable from every reasonable perspective.³ If the queen would not spare her own cousin, and if God himself fought for her, sending the fierce storms that decimated the fleet even

³ The Earl of Essex's rebellion in 1601 can hardly be considered reasonable, for it was doomed from the outset from lack of effective planning and popular support.

further, then what hope had the Recusants to persuade her to change her repressive policies? Biding their time, they awaited the death of their sovereign, and it was with great hope that the Catholics approached James I of England upon his ascension to the throne.

Post-Armada Approach

After the Armada, Elizabeth I moved quickly, capitalizing on the nationalistic spirit and anti-Catholic sentiment that Spain's brazen move engendered among the English, taking further steps to secure the Protestant nature of the realm. Yet again, the Oath of Supremacy and Act of Uniformity were administered, the non-conformity fines were increased, and Walsingham's spies were as vigilant as ever. During this period, the English Church continued to use to good effect its support from the crown to consolidate further its recent gains, and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge continued turning out well-educated and committed ranks of reformed clergymen. Cambridge, in particular, where Andrewes was at Pembroke College, was a noted bastion of Calvinist theologians, and while Andrewes was not ranked among them, records clearly indicate that he had puritan friends and even attended some of their prayer meetings and scripture-studies (Lossky 10). In the following chapter, more details of Andrewes' Cambridge years will trace his development during this influential period; for now, though, it suffices to illustrate that he was in the midst of a vigorous and energetic period of reinforcing protestant principles of church doctrine and polity.

Given this brief sketch of the religious climate of the Elizabethan era, the eager anticipation of the Recusants to usher in a new era of greater tolerance toward their spiritual convictions is readily understood. Thus, when James VI of Scotland, the

Protestant son of the executed Catholic Queen Mary, came to the throne of England, Catholic hopes were high that greater toleration might follow his respect for his mother. Unfortunately, they hoped in vain, for while the Catholics yearned for concessions from the crown, other interested religious parties argued for a firmer Protestant grip on the royalty's policies. It was not enough that Roman Catholic, Separatists, Presbyterians, and Anabaptists were hoping for a change, for powers within the English Church were also jockeying for more influence. These moderate godly Protestants, working as fully franchised participants within the episcopal tradition, had the king's ear before two of the more radical extremes of the theological spectrum made their attempt to be heard.⁴

The two interested and diametrically opposed parties approached James I even as his entourage wended its way from Scotland. One group represented the Puritans' concerns to the king in the form of the Millenary Petition as the king prepared to accept the crown of England. Meanwhile, Thomas Percy, on behalf of the Earl of Northumberland, represented the interests of the Recusants and managed to gain some encouragement for the lessening of the Catholics' burdens. As evidence of this, James agreed and actually removed the fine levied against those who refused to attend the state-authorized religious services. And although this suspension of the Recusancy fines was short-lived, primarily in response to the Gunpowder Plot attempt, it is evidence of an initially reconciliatory stance on James I's part.

Two particular events occurred, however, that precluded James I from accepting and encouraging the influence of these two factions within his realm. The first event was

⁴ Four such men appointed to their influential positions by James I were known for their moderate Puritan approach: John Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; Laurence Chaderton, master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; Thomas Sparks and John Knewstubs.

Hampton Court Conference, a conference held by the king in January of 1604 in order to declare his convictions on a variety of important matters, not the least of which were the Lambeth Articles (1594) and the Millenary Petition. These documents, in addition to other concerns of the Puritans, articulated the hopes of Calvinist elements of the Church of England and effectively made more explicit some of the reformed doctrinal statements of the Thirty-nine Articles. However, the particular doctrine made most explicit was the thorny theological conundrum of predestination.

Four prominent Protestant men approached James I, hoping to receive his support for their cause; in spite of his tutelage under the prominent Scottish Calvinist George Buchanan—or perhaps because of it—James I rejected their requests in nearly every instance, insisting on maintaining the status quo. The only really significant action on James' part was to order a new English translation of the Bible. Nevertheless, mindful of the need to build a conciliatory tone that might help placate some of the anxiety of the godly Protestants,⁵ in February of the same year, James did make some stern denouncements against the increased activity of Catholics within the realm.

The second event, much different in tenor, followed relatively closely on the heels of the Hampton Conference—namely, the Gunpowder Plot. Its cause is readily attributed to the years of frustration felt by the Catholics who long labored under the yoke of the Elizabethan Settlement: the impatience increased under James I. His reluctance to grant further concessions to the Recusants catalyzed the Gunpowder Plot, beginning one of the

⁵ Following the wisdom of scholars building on the work of Perry Miller, I use this expression to delineate those adherents of Calvinism who chose to remain within the Church of England. Separatists and their spiritual offspring (such as the Quakers and Baptists), while certainly devout practitioners of their beliefs, lie outside the purview of this label. Men such as Edmund Spenser, Laurence Chaderton, Richard Sibbes, Thomas Adams and numerous others do meet this criterion.

most long-lasting and adverse reactions against Catholicism on a national scale in any period of western history. It shaped the course of national, ecclesiastical, cultural, and, by logical extension, literary development in England. From the time of the discovery of the plot shortly before and the subsequent apprehension of Guy Fawkes on the eve of November 5, 1605, until 1829, Roman Catholics were barred from holding public office. The repercussions of this plot effectively sealed the English society against overt political inroads and influence from the Roman Catholic Church for well over 200 years. Such was the entrenched intolerance of the English for the reach of papal power.

Court Influence on the Church and Church Influences on the Court

In addition to James I's staunch resistance to papal influence, there existed a movement back and forth between the ecclesiastical and royal halls of power that was very much part of the established form of church-state governing system; while concepts that challenged this model were extant—the Separatists, Presbyterians, and Anabaptists voiced such ideas—none had prevailed in England at this time. Latent within this quasi-theocratic form of government, two distinct perspectives on authority converged: that of an earthly and temporal power, embodied in the monarch, and that of a transcendent and eternal power, represented by the Church and her interests. In England's case, however, by virtue of the sovereign's position as the head of both the State and the Church, a conundrum of no small order lies underneath several layers of tradition. Crucial to the survival of this tenuous structure is an adequate means of maintaining an equal tension between what may well be defined as competing loyalties. While the court theoretically held all the cards—ultimately represented by James I and his policies—practically speaking, he was very dependent on the support of the clergy to maintain his position.

The influence of the court regarding its clerical appointments would not be without its *quid pro quo* by which the Church and its influence could moderate and effectively counterbalance the Crown's power. One of the means of giving the Church its voice was through the pulpit, and it is precisely in this area that we find James I more active than Elizabeth I. Until recently, modern scholarship overlooked the importance of sermons as vehicles of cultural change. Given the premise upon which my argument rests—that the power of the Protestant “religion as a historical and literary force” is exercised in preaching controlled by the dictates of conscience (Ferrell, McCullough 17)—close attention must be given to the prominence of preaching in the Jacobean context. Moreover, since Andrewes served as the *Stella Praedicatorum*, the Star of Preachers, his sermons yield ample material by which they can be measured.

McCullough asserts that while James is famous for his love of hunting, very little has been made of his love of preaching (*Sermons* 101). No other sovereign before or since has taken such an avid interest in hearing sermons. And while Andrewes was certainly one of his favorites, this favoritism did not preclude him from offering others of different theological convictions opportunities to persuade him of their oratorical talents. It is true that at times he would talk during the preaching of these sermons, perhaps a sign that the preacher's hortatory powers were weak, but more often than not, he appeared active in listening to them. Additionally, his tastes were quite eclectic. James' diverse tastes in sermon sampling may well have contributed to Andrewes' frustration over the hearing of sermons over the practice of prayer. It seems that while the parameters of orthodoxy were important to the king, he was not opposed to hearing preachers from the respective Protestant theological positions of the day: Calvinist or anti-Calvinist theology

was not initially of particular concern; rather, what he insisted upon was conformity to polity.

Having come from the staunch Presbyterian realm of Scotland, with the strict Calvinist George Buchanan as his childhood tutor, James apparently felt he had had enough exposure to the fractious Calvinist-Scottish system to rule it out as an option in England. He could initially brook subtleties of soteriological import or questions of the *ordo salutis* (the order of salvation),⁶ but he had no room in the pulpit for Roman doctrine or non-episcopalian government. As he noted currents of disaffection among members of the English church, James considerably curtailed this relatively magnanimous approach as he sought to prevent divisions over heads of doctrine and polity he saw developing in his realm. He used several means of doing so. For example, in 1617, James issued a decree circumscribing five different heads of doctrine. Only those holding the office of dean or above were permitted to preach on these thorny points of contention. This action may seem like a reasonable exercising of kingly prerogative, but it was hotly contested, for it fell at precisely the time of the Synod of Dordt.

This Synod was convened precisely to hammer out points of doctrine relating to the *ordo salutis* previously mentioned. In short, the Remonstrants sought to moderate some of the salient assertions of Calvinist doctrine as it had been distilled by Theodore Beza: the totally depraved nature of humanity, the unconditional election of believers by God, the limiting of the efficacy of the atonement to the elect, the irresistible nature of

⁶The “order of salvation” delineates the work of God in economy of redemption. As such, it arranges the elements that comprise redemption in a logical fashion: first, election, then effectual calling, followed by regeneration, then faith and repentance are manifested. Those of anti-Calvinist conviction tended to disagree with the arrangement of the order.

God's calling to salvation, and the inevitable victorious perseverance of the saints. For the King to forbid any preacher below the rank of dean from preaching on these matters was tantamount to muzzling a large number of the Crown's loyal clergy. Reformation theology essentially forced pulpits to wrestle with such concerns, and Calvinist adherents in James I's Church were in the majority. Ostensibly, James proscribed these doctrines for irenic purposes, but the specter of an anti-Calvinist influence like Bancroft and Andrewes looms large. In circumstances such as this, the problems that inhere in the system become quite obvious. At the crux of it lies the age-old dilemma of the conscience. Germane to the discussion of the influence of the court and reciprocating influence of spiritual "advisors" (for as such were the clergy seen), conscience figures heavily into the informing and shaping not only of the sermons preached before the sovereign and the court, but in the life and times of the era. In such a light, Andrewes' role appears more prominent.

In addition to curtailing some of the liberties of the pulpit, even to the extent of who could preach on what doctrines, James I continued to exercise the right to appoint clergy and assign the various posts as he saw fit; thus, he also guarded licensure of the clergy closely—unauthorized preaching meant time in the local goal, and in the most extreme circumstances, execution⁷—yet several other means of ensuring the cooperation of the Church were in place.

Conventional concepts that ensured the maintenance of the status quo appealed to human nature, for the relative peace of a current system, in spite of measurable inequities

⁷ Such was the case of the Separatist interviewed by Andrewes, Henry Barrow, imprisoned in 1587. Barrow was unconvinced by Andrewes of episcopacy as the *jus divinum* and was hanged six years later upon charges of printing seditious books.

and injustices real or perceived, were preferable to the threat of anarchy. Such was the threat that the Gunpowder Plot represented. What can be expected, then, is found. James and Parliament, in response to the unlooked for escape from disaster, created a perpetual occasion to commemorate God's mercies to the king, the church, and the nation. The occasion was not intended for secular purposes but rather that from every pulpit in the land, regardless of the weekday on which the anniversary fell, a sermon must be preached in order that the great deliverance could be appropriately marked.⁸

Into this occasional context we can insert the *Stella Praedicatorum* of the age. To reiterate, James' favorite court preacher spoke on this anniversary more than any other figure. James' death in March of 1625 meant that he had a total of eighteen years of appointing a preacher for marking the November 5th occasion. For ten of those occasions, he chose Andrewes. Nevertheless, while Andrewes' premier position afforded him many opportunities for potential political influence, it does not necessarily mean that he used it. The fluidity of relationships, though, is axiomatic: social creatures have a dynamic ways of affecting each other, especially if relationships are premised on trust and respect. Ample evidence exists that this power to mutually affect one another was so for Andrewes and his circle of friends. While his rhetoric employed in the Gunpowder Plot sermons reflects some of the court's influence on him, it is equally true that his presentation of the Plot both interpreted and applied the lessons to the court and others.

While the struggle for ascendancy of the Protestant religion in England continued on several levels, one significant crux of the contest lay in the realm of the individual's

⁸ Interestingly, even during the Interregnum, preachers would climb into their pulpits and declare the goodness of God for the deliverance of the realm. Thus, the weight of the singularly important deliverance on that occasion warranted proclamation even when the monarch was not in the picture.

conscience. How a person could navigate safely through the myriad shifts in doctrine, polity, and political decrees of the period without violating one's own proclaimed allegiance required Herculean efforts on the part of those committed to maintaining integrity. The record of the Gunpowder Plot investigation reveals that those who continued to believe in the Old Way, in spite of the pressures brought to bear on them by Elizabeth's policies, having conspired against King James I, paid with their lives. Their consciences required action in keeping with their convictions: it stands to reason that those who stood in opposition to them were equally ready to do the same should the tables be turned.

To return to Locke's observation about the trouble of the State's binding of the conscience, though, it is especially telling that his assessment touches on the heart of the problem with a state church. Can a monarch legitimately enforce compliance to a religion that a subject cannot embrace? Inevitably, if there is a modicum of sincerity in one's faith, the conscience is either violated when it yields to the state's coercive power, or the state is defied and must respond accordingly. Alternatively, if the individual's conscience is informed by a source of authority superior to that of the state, the state must insist on subjugating such persons. Thus, when the Reformation presented its agenda under the aegis of *Sola Scriptura*, *Sola Fide*, *Sola Christe*, *Sola Gratia*, *Sola Deo Gloria*, the battleground for the conscience was mapped out. The struggles that ensued from it brought a bitter taste to the mouths of many in the years that followed.

CHAPTER THREE

Lancelot Andrewes: A Brief Biography

Early Life and Academic Pursuits

Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626) stands as one of the English Church's most influential prelates. A recent biographer, Trevor Owen (1981), observes that his life spans the reigns of the last two Tudor monarchs and the first two Stuarts (17). The same might well be said of other figures during that period, yet his career as a notable scholar, linguist, theologian, polemicist, preacher, bishop, administrator of Pembroke College, and confidante of two monarchs is extraordinary in English history. He was born in Thames Street, London, to a mariner of "modest prosperity," Thomas Andrewes. His father had a shipping business in London, land in Essex, Redriffe, and Surrey, and also maintained a house on Tower Hill (McCullough, Oxford *DNB* 1). Thomas and Joan had thirteen children, and their first-born, Lancelot, had an early intellectual aptitude that did not escape either their notice or that of his headmaster, Mr. Ward. Upon Ward's recommendation, Andrewes was accepted to the prestigious Merchant Taylors' School, headed by none other than the renowned scholar-historian, Richard Mulcaster (Owen 18). Under Mulcaster, Andrewes flourished in his studies, excelling his fellow students by not only sheer intellectual powers but also through his diligent work ethic. McCullough asserts that it was primarily Mulcaster's "unusual emphasis on the arts of oratorical declamation in the performance of plays and on music theory and practice that left indelible marks in Andrewes' sermons" (*DNB* 1). His friend, John Buckeridge, who preached his funeral sermon, said of him:

. . . [I]n learning he outstripped all his equals, and his indefatigable industry had almost outstripped himself. He studied so hard when others played, that if his parents and masters had not forced him to play with them also, all the play had been marred. His late study by candle, and early rising at four in the morning, procured him envy among his equals, yea with the ushers also, because he called upon them too soon.
(Andrewes *Works V* 289)

This diligence accompanied him throughout his life, giving him a reputation of being a serious-minded and disciplined individual. Completing his course of study at Merchant Taylors' School, his talent and hard work were recognized at both Oxford—he was named a scholar of Jesus College, though he did not take up residence—and Cambridge (Lossky 9). The inconvenienced ushers apparently caught up with their sleep, for his respective teachers, Masters Ward and Mulcaster, both “contended for him” effectively enough to qualify him for placement within the university system (Owen 18). Leaving London at the age of sixteen to attend Cambridge, Andrewes' appreciation for his early education was not forgotten: in his will, he left “a benefice to Master Ward's son and a legacy on Mulcaster's” (*DNB* 1).

Andrewes chose Pembroke College and enrolled in September of 1571. His stellar application to learning while at Cambridge yet again accelerated him past his fellows, and some of his fellows were themselves noted for their own achievements: Gabriel Harvey, Edmund Spenser, and Thomas Dove—the latter two were fellow Merchant Taylors' students. According to Buckeridge, his progress there was due primarily “to his own pains and study” (Andrewes *Works V* 290). Graduating on February 4, 1575, he was then elected a Fellow of Pembroke Hall after a close contest with classmate Thomas Dove. The Bishop of Rochester, Henry Isaacson, Andrewes' secretary, friend, and first biographer (1650), claimed that while at Cambridge, Andrewes

“[. . .] had laid the foundations of all arts and sciences, and had gotten skill in most of the modern languages” (*Works Vol. 11*, v). His singular talent as a polyglot would serve him well in his ensuing career: his contemporaries would later refer to him as “The Interpreter-General,” a man capable of resolving the confusion of tongues brought about by the events of Babel (Owen 25). Since Andrewes was fluent in fifteen modern languages and six ancient ones, hardly a man in the entire kingdom could compete with his linguistic achievements (Nicholson 30). The means by which he achieved such multilingual success, besides what was undoubtedly a natural aptitude, required a single-minded focus. During Easter breaks he would return home to London, and his father, a merchant-sailor with many contacts, would line up various able foreign visitors to tutor him (Lossky 11, Owen 19). Later, in 1604, after his service at Cambridge had ended with yet another promotion, his facility for languages made him an excellent chair for the Westminster Company, one of the six translation committees set up by James I for the King James Bible.

Well before his service under James commenced, however, his reputation as a scholar was sufficiently prominent that he was offered a venue for reaching all of Cambridge and even into the surrounding countryside: an extended teaching opportunity while performing his duties as a fellow of Pembroke College came to him. For at least a one-year period in 1578, Andrewes, appointed as Catechist of the College, delivered a prolonged series on the Ten Commandments on Saturdays and Sundays. According to contemporary accounts, he performed this task with great effectiveness. Students crowded the lectures to hear him exposit this quintessential passage of Scripture. In addition, though Andrewes “throughout his life refused to put his works in print unless

commanded to do so by authority,” these same students circulated manuscript notes of these lectures from 1580 even through the 1650s (*DNB* 2). These sermons, preached during his time at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, reveal his thoroughgoing application of the precepts that have stood at the core of the Protestant catechetical traditions. Andrewes treats the Decalogue as the very essence of the moral character of a devout Christian; the import of his teaching on it reveals a decidedly biblical and mainstream Protestant sensibility in his approach—so much so, in fact, that two of his Laudian “posthumous defenders”—Peter Heylyn and Francis White—claimed that Andrewes dismissed the lectures as “immature works” (*DNB* 3).

The recognition by others of his abilities and rigorously regimented approach to study meant a fast, steady pace through the usual steps of preferment in the ecclesiastical track. This track would entail the following steps: first, after attending either Cambridge or Oxford, a man would be elected a tutor, then a fellow of the school he attended. Next, an individual who sought to serve in the context of the church would be marked for a vicarage, a Prebendary (an official Prebendary was entitled to a portion of the cathedral or collegiate church revenues), and a chaplaincy to a prominent member of the nobility. Generally, a position as Master over one of the “Oxbridge” colleges was the next step, and then an appointment as a dean followed. In the normal course of events, eventually, the sovereign would grant a bishopric. Under Queen Elizabeth’s watchful eye, Andrewes began this journey toward eminence and influence.

Elizabethan Service

A quick glance at a chronology of Andrewes’ life reveals the favor of the establishment upon his career. In 1586, he was appointed one of the Chaplains in

Ordinary to Queen Elizabeth—a position that required his presence at court on a rotating basis. According to McCullough’s entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, chaplains were placed on a *rota* in pairs, and the records reveal that November was the month appointed for his service to the queen. In that same year, he served as the Chaplain to no less a figure than the Archbishop of Canterbury, the staunch anti-Puritan-yet Calvinist John Whitgift.¹ His first extant court sermon was preached before Elizabeth in April, 1588, the same eventful year the English celebrated the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Perhaps one of his most significant endorsements came from no less a figure than that of Francis Walsingham, the influential Secretary of State for Elizabeth, who, according to Sir John Harington, had taken an early interest in Andrewes while he was still at Merchant Taylors’ (*DNB* 3). In Owen’s treatment of Andrewes’ life, he cites Sir John Harington regarding Walsingham’s interest: initially, he hoped that Andrewes could be persuaded to take up the position of Reader of Controversies “to maintain certain state points of Puritanism. But he [. . .] answered him plainly, they were not only against his learning, but his conscience” (Owen 21).² Three years later, in 1589, Walsingham had overcome his initial disappointment at Andrewes’ refusal, for through his patronage, Andrewes was made a vicar of Saint Giles, Cripplegate, the Prebendary of Saint Pancras, and the Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. Additionally in that same year, he was elected Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, a position of high repute that

¹ Whitgift helped the reform-minded clergy—the godly Protestants—to draw up the Lambeth Articles. In 1595, the strong-minded nature of Andrewes evinces itself through his opposition to Whitgift regarding these articles. In this year, he published in Latin his first controversial work, *The Judgment of the Lambeth Articles*.

² Harington’s remark is found in *Works*, vol. 11, Sir John Harington, *A Memoir of Bishop Andrewes*, p. xxxvi.

he handled with great competence. Receiving his Doctor of Divinity degree at the age of thirty-three, his rise through the ranks of the church was steady, and in a day when clerical standards of diligence and morality were suspect, Andrewes avoided calumny on these grounds.³ In fact, in a Latin sermon preached on February 20, 1593, at the opening of the Convocation of Canterbury, Andrewes directly addressed abuses in the church (Reidy 91). Furthermore, during his four years as the bishop of Chichester, there are at least four recorded instances of his taking action against clergymen within his bishopric.

Considered in themselves, such words and actions could be seen as merely part and parcel of his office and the tenor of the times. Nevertheless, taken in the context of Andrewes' consistent convictions and his stellar record of performance of his duties, the reasonable reading of the situation calls for an upholding of his diligent regard for probity within the clergy. Should more proof be needed to corroborate this assertion, one need only consider two other works of Andrewes that directly address the expectations that he had of himself and others charged with the care of souls: the first is his *Manual of the Direction of the Sick*, and the second is entitled *Articles To Be Enquired of by the Church-Wardens and Sworn-Men in the Primary Visitation of... Lancelot, Lord Bishop of Winton... Anno 1619*. These works, the former released posthumously, the latter as part

³ Two exceptions to this otherwise immaculate record occurred: one, when the plague struck London in 1603, Andrewes, in the company of King James, retreated from his charge of Cripplegate to the safety of Hampton Court, opening himself up to accusations of hypocrisy, a charge laid upon him primarily from the most staunch Puritans; and two, after much deliberation by the ecclesiastical council convened to hear the case, he voted along with a slim majority to annul the marriage of the third Earl of Essex—Robert Devereux's son—to Lady Frances Howard. James favored the annulment since his favorite, Robert Carr, was Howard's lover. Historically speaking, this decision, viewed in the aftermath of their collaborative murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, was seen as a significant error in judgment (Lossky 20-21).

of his spiritual oversight, testify of his commitment to the improvement of the spiritual and moral temperament of his flock.

Andrewes' prominence under Elizabeth's reign reached its apex in July of 1601 when she appointed him "on the recommendation of Sir Fulke Greville, and formal nomination by Sir Robert Cecil, to the deanery of Westminster" (*DNB* 6). Reflecting briefly on the varied supporters of his preferment, for those who recommended him for his advancement were from a wide theological spectrum—Walsingham, Cecil, Greville, and Queen Elizabeth—it is apparent that Buckeridge spoke honestly of his reputation: "[He was] without all ambition or suite of his owne, God turning the hearts of his friends to promote him for his great worth" (Buckeridge 18). This kind of evidence warrants the assertion that he was a man who sought to be ruled by a conscience shaped by the Scriptures and the sound traditions of the historic church. Thus, in spite of his careful articulations of minority opinions, he garnered support from many. One may safely conclude that his principled stances, even to the point of declining royal offers, speak well of his personal character and integrity.

Stuart Service

Almost as a symbol of the smooth transition from one regime to the next, Andrewes was present at the funeral of Elizabeth, assisted at King James I's coronation, and attended the Hampton Court Conference in January of 1604 as one of the advisors of James I. Later that same year, James commissioned him as a translator of the Bible: Andrewes was made chairman of the Westminster Company of translators that was responsible for the first twelve books. The version which ensued from that prodigious and contentious undertaking is still considered one of the most influential works shaping

the course of modern English language and literature. Nevertheless, Andrewes leaves some mystery surrounding his relationship to this work: his own sermon texts dated after the 1611 release of the “Authorized Version” draw exclusively from the Latin Vulgate and the English Genevan translation (Owen 24).

If these accomplishments were not enough, Andrewes’ appointment by James to preach to the court on the first occasion commemorating the thwarted Gunpowder Plot set a strong interpretive precedent for the realm of English Protestant preachers. Thomas Nowak argues effectively in his unpublished dissertation that the enduring anti-Catholic English policies were solidified through means of the traditional rhetoric of the Gunpowder Plot sermons (5-7): it was Andrewes who, by virtue of his having preached the first ten of these court sermons out of the next thirteen successive years, shaped the themes of those that followed. In fact, the King’s preference for Andrewes became crystal clear when, on September 29, 1616, he appointed Andrewes as Privy Councilor and then, three years later, followed this appointment with his installation as Dean of the Chapel Royal. In his role as a Privy Councilor, Andrewes exhibited remarkable indifference when it came to matters of political import, his sole concern being that of ecclesiastical import. While he attended the Privy chamber sessions diligently, if there were no matters of the church that might require his participation, he would even occasionally ask the King’s permission to be excused.

The import of such singular success in Andrewes’ life should not be lost: his connections to the royal presence, the influential members of the court, and the established ecclesiastical structure were many and firm. Given these connections, it is not surprising to find that accusations of his indebtedness to the king compromised his

effectiveness. A man with such prodigious gifts and abilities, coupled with his firm commitments and convictions, could easily levy influence on behalf of the King and gain favors for himself. In this vein, Nicholson's assessment of Andrewes, drawn from over 400 years later, is but one example.⁴ Despite declaring him the "first and the greatest of the Bible Translators," he makes an observation of Andrewes' position and political acuity while also noting Andrewes' prominence:

Lancelot Andrewes was a man deeply embedded in Jacobean establishment. He was forty-nine or fifty, Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge. He was also Dean of Westminster Abbey, a Prebendary of St' Paul's Cathedral, drawing the income from one of the cathedral's manors, and of Southwell Minster, one of the chaplains at the Chapel Royal in Whitehall, who under Elizabeth had twice turned down a bishopric not because he felt unworthy of the honour but because he did not consider the income of the sees he was offered satisfactory. [. . .] Andrewes, one of the most astute and brilliant men of his age, an ecclesiastical politician who in the Roman Church would have become a cardinal, perhaps even pope, was not going to diminish his prospects simply to carry an elevated title. (Nicholson 26)

In spite of this rather cynical assessment of Andrewes' motives for his declining the bishoprics, Nicholson notes important aspects of the man. In particular, Andrewes' aptitude for administrative diligence—in addition to his scholastic aptitude—was abundantly evident to his influential contemporaries. What the summary lacks, however, is the intensely personal and spiritual dimension revealed through Andrewes' private prayer life. In a more sympathetic reading of Andrewes' motives, Nicholas Lossky gives an entirely different interpretation of Andrewes declining Queen Elizabeth's offers:

In October of 1605, Andrewes was elected to the episcopal see of Chichester. Twice already he had been offered sees—of Salisbury (1596) and of Ely (1599)—and twice he had declined the offer, refusing to acquiesce in the alienation of revenues that Elizabeth required. But by this

⁴ Nicholson speaks here of Andrewes appearing on the scene in 1604, specifically in the role of Chairman of the Westminster Company of Translators.

time, all alienation of revenues by the crown having become illegal, Andrewes accepted. (Lossky 18)

As a churchman, Andrewes' conscience was more likely to view the crown's fiscal prerogative as usurping what rightly was meant for the see's oversight, for if one thing marks the character of Andrewes above all others, it is his highly-attuned conscience in not only doctrinal matters, but fiscal ones as well. Whereas Nicholson seems intent on assuming that Andrewes felt the income of the bishoprics inadequate, it is actually a matter of conscience. Since the crown was withholding a portion of the sees' incomes, thus restricting the sovereignty of the English church in matters of alms distribution, Andrewes declined the appointments. The subsequent acceptance of a see after Parliament had overturned Elizabeth's policy corroborates this assertion. When it came to due diligence in ordering financial stability, his abilities had already borne good fruit during his years as Master of Pembroke College, when, during his tenure, the College's financial outlook was significantly improved (*DNB* 4).

Of course, one of the primary means of keeping a conscience tuned in the Christian tradition is through a rich prayer life. Given the enormous responsibilities that were placed upon him as his years increased, one might conclude that he had precious little time to devote to prayer. Yet interestingly, contemporaries spoke of the frequency and length of his personal prayers. His typical day would involve five hours of prayer, utilizing the time-honored liturgical practice of following the cycle of prayer: it begins with first hour—matins, then moves through the various hours: the third, sixth, and ninth hours, respectively, followed by vespers. Readily documented in his *Private Devotions*, translated posthumously—they are primarily in Greek, but Andrewes also utilized Latin and Hebrew—the prayers reveal a man struck with a sense of his own unworthiness and

sinful tendencies yet ever confident in the grace and mercy of God. The following example draws from the opening section entitled Prayers of Deprecation:

O LORD, Thou knowest, and canst, and willest
The good of my soul.
Miserable man I am;
I neither know, nor can, nor as I ought
Will it.
Thou, O Lord, I beseech Thee,
in Thine ineffable affection,
so order concerning me,
and so dispose,
as Thou knowest to be most pleasing to Thee,
and most good for me. (*Preces Privatae* 129)

This prayer reveals the qualities of contrition and confidence that his contemporary biographers emphasize. A sense of God's gracious power and directed wisdom balances his own sense of weakness and indirection. Other such dimensions will become evident in chapter five, yet none with an eye for measuring sincerity can reasonably call Andrewes' spiritual convictions perfunctory. Further, while recreating the theological underpinnings of Andrewes' work, Lossky states, "the faith preached in the sermons is that which was lived daily by the preacher and which is revealed to us in the prayers collected by him in his book of hours" (30). In the light of this knowledge, we must note that while external checks and balances help moderate a lust for power, ultimately, an internal strength of conscience militates against self-serving motives much more effectively. Andrewes gives every indication of being a man who kept his various lusts in check through an active prayer life that empowered his unflagging service to the church and the king. Herein is where some of the confusion of modern scholarship arises, for while Andrewes was obviously King James' favorite preacher, it does not necessarily follow that Andrewes was the king's man.

To return to his particular service under James, however, one of the tasks assigned to Andrewes four years into the king's reign required him to give a point-by-point answer to a work of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, the chief papal apologist: *Responsio Matthaei Torti* refuted James' justification for the oath of allegiance enacted after the Gunpowder Plot (*DNB* 9). The polemical nature of this work was apparently contrary to Andrewes' irenic character, for a good friend of his, John Chamberlain, writes "I doubt how [he] will undertake and performe, beeing so contrarie to his disposition and course to meddle with controversies" (*Letters of John Chamberlain* 1.264). Nevertheless, *Tortura Torti*, the 400-page response, was published in June of 1609. Refuting papal supremacy and the pope's right "to dispense Catholics from moral and civil laws," Andrewes continued to uphold the right of the English monarch to rule over the English church (*DNB* 9). It is in this work and his subsequent response to Bellarmine's *Apologia pro "Responsione" sua* that Andrewes provides the clearest view of his doctrinal differences with Rome. In brief, its reception and subsequent use served to further establish the legitimacy of the English church and Andrewes' reputation as an able and careful scholar.

Additionally, when Andrewes was installed as bishop of Chichester in November of 1605, the king also granted him the highest position available automatically to a bishop—that of lord almoner. While the almoner was responsible for the distribution of royal alms, since the time of Elizabeth, the position had been given to "the sovereign's preferred preacher" (*DNB* 8). As the appointed preacher to the royal court, Andrewes preached annually (while his health allowed him) at Whitehall on the highest holy days: Easter, Christmas, and Whitsunday. Further, these duties included his preaching on the occasions of the Gowrie conspiracy and Gunpowder Plot. It is from these occasions that

we have the vast majority of his sermons, for nearly as soon as many of them were preached, King James required that they be published; posthumously, the task to gather and edit these sermons into a two-volume set—entitled *XCVI Sermons*—was undertaken in 1629 by William Laud and John Buckeridge. Such was the reputation of Andrewes in that day that factions from various sides of the ecclesiastical spectrum sought to use his name to bolster their arguments. While these sermons in their edited form do not convey Andrewes' apparent passion for balanced and persistent pedagogy from the pulpit, Lossky's scholarly examination of Andrewes as a preacher indicates that his liturgical approach to the key Christian holy days provided him with a sustained opportunity to expound the implications of Christian life and doctrine to the court.

Another indication of James' high regard for Andrewes appears in the king's including him in a progress to Scotland in March of 1617. Some criticism has been levied against Andrewes and King James on this occasion, for the tradition was that the nobility of the realm were responsible to host the King and his entire retinue of 5,000 men replete with 5,000 horses during these progresses: the cost for such put a sizable strain on the king's subjects in that impoverished region of his realm (Stewart 283-284). Andrewes was responsible for some of the ill feelings created in that he preached in Edinburgh before the king and Scottish lords regarding, among other things, the importance of establishing an English form of church government in a predominately Presbyterian land.

Eventually, of course, Andrewes' strength waned, and he found it increasingly difficult to meet his obligations. During this time, deputies were appointed to fill the court pulpit obligation from 1623 onward. His weakness in 1625 prevented him from

attending both James' request for his presence at his deathbed and his funeral, and although he apparently managed to attend Charles I's coronation in February of 1626, his health continued to deteriorate. His last court sermon is recorded as being on Christmas day in 1624 (*DNB* 13). Significantly, according to Buckeridge, "when his weaknesse grew upon him, and that by infirmitie of his body he grew unable to preach, he began to goe little to the Court, not so much for weaknesse, as for his inabilityie to preach" (Buckeridge 21). This observation reinforces that his sense of calling was not so much that of a political figure of influence but rather one of teaching, admonishing, and encouraging the court to godliness and conformity to the gospel of Christ. When he could no longer fulfill that spiritual role, the need to attend disappeared. This indifference to appearances at the court not only provides further evidence regarding Andrewes' priorities, but when combined with his frequent silence in and even the occasional absence from the Starr Chamber in times of good health, it also suggests a discomfort on his part with the milieu.

In that this biography is meant to be brief, the final revelatory aspect of Andrewes' character to consider is that displayed in his will: in such, more testimony is found of his generous and appreciative nature. Charitable gifts, "especially almsgiving," dominate its contents. As McCullough points out, in addition to his gifts to charities, "the web of mutual allegiances which he wove between his family, teachers, and pupils" make up a goodly portion of his bequeathals (*DNB* 13).

Relating the aforementioned qualities of Andrewes' personal integrity and devotional life to the argument under consideration, the likelihood of his psychologically being able to suppress his strong sense of dependence upon his heavenly sovereign in

deference to serve an earthly one is remote. None question his commitment to submitting to proper temporal authority, but foremost in his personal and public conduct, his sermons, his catechizing, his instruction to the clergy, and his prayers, he demonstrates a much more keen sense of loyalty to God. In fact, this intense loyalty can most readily account for his strong stance on submission to earthly powers.

CHAPTER FOUR

Andrewes' Conscience and the Decalogue

The title of Lancelot Andrewes' treatment of the Decalogue typically appears in seventeenth century publications as *A Patterne of Catechisticall Doctrine Wherein Many Profitable Questions Touching Christian Religion are Handled and the Whole Decalogue Succinctly and Judiciously Expounded*. The specific publication I have chosen was published in 1642, for Michael Sparke, Robert Milbourne, Richard Cotes, and Andrew Crooke, and the first matter to consider is its reliability. Inasmuch as Andrewes never submitted his manuscript for publication, nor did he ever apparently intend to have it published, a question might well be posed: how can we know that this is a trustworthy representation of his thought? The answer, to use Occam's razor, is that it resonates with his scholarship, his tone, his style, his themes, and his convictions found in works he did see published. Further attestation to its reliability also lies in its usefulness that extended over nearly a century of its popularity among a polity-divided clergy. In short, though its authority was diminished by Heylyn and White (on account of the Sabbath treatment) with the caveat that Andrewes "dismissed" it as an "immature work,"¹ the specific commandments treated here do not touch on that dimension of his thought, nor is there anything in the three commandments selected that appears contrary to the tenor of his later work. In fact, if anything, his later works seem to develop these seminal

¹ No extant record has been found to verify that Andrewes said such, but even if it were found, this would not imply a repudiation or retraction of its content, only that it was not as developed or refined as it could be.

approaches. With that said, it is time to look more closely at his once popular and still thorough treatment of these commands.

Rectifying the Conscience

The conscience's health, according to the Reformers' understanding, depended on correctly knowing the mind of God and then following it with due diligence—not unlike devout Catholics, it should be added. It consisted of a two-pronged approach: first, the intellect would assent to or comprehend the revelation. Then, the conscience, apprehending the validity of this will of God, required a commensurate obedience to it. For this apprehension to be complete, though, it relied on an experiential dimension. In short, conformity of life was requisite to a full understanding. The epistemological approach meant that all true knowledge of God, self, and the world, *begins* through properly understanding with the mind. A premium, then, was set not on a mystical experience but on comprehension of that which was set forth in the Scriptures. In order for this comprehension to occur, clear, reasoned, and compelling rhetorical practice was used to unfold a text so that hearers could then weigh the arguments presented and be convinced of their truth. Yet it did not end there, for God's will was to be lived, not simply intellectually understood. Apart from this dual reception, the movement from comprehension to apprehension was seen as impossible to achieve. In essence, if consciences were not affected, then the message was not received with faith and would come to naught; in the absence of the accompanying fruit of repentance and good deeds, the gospel seed had fallen on barren soil.

Premised as it was on the Scripture as a clear revelation of God's ways and commands, an enormous amount of time and commensurate amount of energy was spent

explicating biblical texts. The Protestant emphasis on the Bible's authority continued to hold sway over England's clergy above the Council of Trent's reaffirmation of tradition and the locus of papal power. On this point, polity and doctrinal differences that separated the Brownists, the Presbyterians, the godly Protestants within the Episcopal ranks, the Puritans, and the anti-Calvinists essentially disappeared. For all intents and purposes, unanimity on the supremacy of Scripture over late ecclesiastical councils and papal authority was solid.

Given this logo-centric commitment embraced by the reforming churches of Europe and England, the most certain way to counter what were seen as the pernicious influences of the Roman Church's teachings and practices was to catechize church members anew. This catechizing was part of Cranmer's vision with the transformed Book of Common Worship, but other efforts were also used. From the reign of Elizabeth until well into the late 1600s, a wide variety of lecturers continued to catechize and sermonize the English (Seaver 372-373). Weekday lectureships were established across many parts of England, particularly in the southern counties and London especially,² amplifying the Protestant teaching of the English Church (Dever 80). According to records gathered by Paul Seaver, the parishes within London that maintained active lectureships from 1585-1610 averaged forty-five (Seaver 127). While attendance on these occasions was voluntary, during the period that lectureships flourished, a substantial attendance was typical.

² Richard Sibbes, one of the popular divines during Andrewes' time, remarked on London's abundance of preaching: "I think that there is no place in the world where there is so much preaching" (Dever 80).

*Knowledge and Humility: The First Duties of the Mind*³

Not least among these lectures were sermons geared toward re-examining the Ten Commandments and reasserting their usefulness. Luther's application of the Decalogue, twofold in purpose—to convict sinners and to serve as a guide to the consciences of the saints—helped dislodge the Gregorian approach of the seven virtues and seven vices that long served as the accepted method of teaching morals.⁴ Andrewes proves himself in step with other reformers of his time when commenting on the import of Hebrews 7: 19 in relationship of the moral law to the gospel: “For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope, by the which we draw nigh unto God.” He elaborates by saying: “The end of the law bringeth two uses: 1. It bringeth us to know perfection it selfe. 2. It leadeth us to a better thing, it is our schoolemaster to Christ” (Wing A3140 95).⁵ “Perfection it selfe,” in this case, refers entirely to the perfections of both the law and the lawgiver; it is a compendium of God's holiness and goodness in relation to the covenant with his people. Andrewes further stresses the inability of the law to perfect us by observing that the holy commands were given in the midst of “a waste and barren Wildernesse, that yielded no fruit; which signifieth that the law should be so barren, that it should not yield so much as one soule to God” (95). While the passage from Hebrews 7 shows the clear abrogation of the law as a means of perfection, it actually simply

³ *An Exposition of the X Commandements*, p. 189.

⁴ For a literary example of this Gregorian approach, see “The Parson's Tale” in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*: the Parson begs off preaching from the Decalogue as one not adequate to the task of properly understanding it. Instead, he opts for the tried and true approach; namely, that of preaching against the seven deadly sins.

⁵ The Wing catalogue A3140 edition was published in London, 1640, in quarto form.

reinforces the contextual elements derived from the Exodus account itself. Andrewes demonstrates a keen literary analysis of details by considering four additional reasons that further support his perspicacious argument: first, not only is the quality of wilderness “waste and barren,” but also the specific mountain, Sinai, is foreboding, wrapped in clouds with thunder and lightning and prohibitions of approach. These signs reinforce the law’s unattainable quality; second, the person who received the commandments, Moses himself, as Andrewes emphasizes, is already condemned by the law as a sinner, having murdered a taskmaster in Egypt, and thus, Moses is later denied entry into the promised land. Furthermore, Moses’ ministry was one of “destruction” that displayed “God’s justice and wrath,” whereas Christ came raising the dead, healing the sick and casting out devils (Wing A3140 95). The contrast between the law of Moses and the grace of Christ is marked out again as he moves to his third point: “From the law it selfe: from the tables that were broken before the law could be delivered; which is, in the judgement of the fathers, that that covenant should be voyd” (95). Andrewes argues that when Moses literally broke the stone tablet containing the law, it prefigured the voiding of it by Christ. Of course, the implicit object of Andrewes’ argument here is a silent reference to the new covenant in Christ’s body broken for us, the better way. His fourth and final proof rests on the manner by which the law was delivered:

[w]ith the blast of a trumpet, that terrified the people, that was delivered with terrour, showing that that was a law of terrour, and that it should exact terrible things at our hands. But the delivery of the Gospell was contrary; for that was delivered with the comfortable songs of angels, Luke 2:14. “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men. (96)

The trumpet that terrified, the law of terror, the terrible impending judgment all serve the fourth point that contrasts Moses’ ministry to that of Christ’s. The doctrine is profound

in itself, but it also introduces a glimpse of Andrewes' developing rhetorical style: the vividness with which he portrays the "terroure" contrasts sharply with the angels' announcement. Alliteration abounds, not as an end in itself, but to reinforce the message: the tight compression of "trumpet," "that," "terrified," "terror," and "terrible" creates a stuttering, stammering quality highly suited to convey the terror of this terrible occasion. Its staccato quality renders the Mosaic covenant rough and jagged in contrast to the soothing quality of the "gospel delivered with comfortable songs of angels." While this stylistic approach is not prevalent in his catechism, it appears with greater frequency in his sermons and displays his sensitivity to the power of words. On a theological note, Andrewes clearly shows a dimension of discontinuity between the Mosaic covenant and the new covenant established by Christ.

Given this Protestant interpretive approach, Andrewes' convictions regarding the use of the Decalogue cannot be omitted from this study, especially since his involvement at Cambridge—a hotbed of Calvinist thought—brought him into close contact with men of nearly all these aforementioned theological persuasions. Further, this resurgence of interest in the Decalogue created an eager audience for hearing the already prominent and popular Andrewes explicate such a central part of historic Christianity. Originally presented as a year-long lecture series on Saturdays and Sundays at Cambridge in 1578, the work is lengthy. This length is due in part to a prolonged preface emphasizing the importance of reasserting the moral law. In order to try to balance some of the excesses of assurance supplied by some overly zealous Puritans—seen as presumption by Andrewes—the law's role was to teach the heart to fear. As Peter Lake observes, liberally quoting several of Andrewes' court sermons:

To avoid presumption Andrewes administered healthy doses of the law, as an antidote to the excessive servings of the gospel dished out by his contemporaries. For, “gospel it how we will if the gospel hath not the legalia of it acknowledged, allowed and preserved to it; if once it loose the force and vigor of the law, it is a sign it declines, it grows weak and unprofitable, and that is a sign it will not long last.” The law thus preached by the clergy was internalized by the laity as “fear.” (Peck 122)

Lake correctly reads Andrewes, for his early, middle, and late works do contain “healthy doses of the law.” Nearly belaboring the point, Andrewes taught that a right understanding of grace must start with a right understanding of the law. In fact, as this lecture series appears in this Wing A3140 publication, roughly the first 130 pages are preparatory. Not until page 133⁶ does the first commandment come under discussion. Even then, he delves further into the preamble of the law before laying out the first precept itself.

From this demonstration of careful exegesis, we can readily perceive Andrewes is at pains to point out the prominence of superstition and false religions when the Decalogue is neglected, and various historical examples of these errors are abundant. This concern explains the lengthy preface and warrants a brief examination of the material included in the preface. Keeping in mind that Andrewes addresses a university audience, many of whom will themselves teach these commandments from pulpits of their own, his care manifests not only a model to emulate, but it also displays key elements of his goal to properly equip his hearers for the enormous task before them. In doing so, we gain a glimpse into his pastoral concern.

⁶ Falsely numbered 165 in Wing A3140

The Preface: True Knowledge and Humility

Andrewes takes his cue for catechizing from the analogy of a building, derived as it is from that of Christ's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 7: 24, 26): "The wise man buildeth his house upon a rock," and likens the teacher to the builder, like St. Paul to a "wise builder" (1 Cor. 3:10). Thus, "[t]he course of Religion [...] is compared to a building [...], [t]he principles of Religion, to a foundation" (Wing A3140 14). This foundation is the crucial element in building properly, and Andrewes felt that many of his contemporaries failed to "digge deepe enough, till they come to the hard rocke" (14). And so, after looking at how religion should be taught, he carefully lays bare the ground of true religion by developing arguments that reveal the nature of atheism, "semi-atheism"—the questioning of God's providential care—the reliability of the Scriptures used (a salvo directed against "against the Turkes and Pagans"), and finally, whether the Christian religion is truly grounded on the "Word of God." The latter point addresses the veracity of Protestant doctrine over against "Jewes, Papists, and other heretickes" (14). Treating systematically and concisely these different heads, Andrewes then spends time on a key element that guides his thinking; namely, he reiterates the Davidic and Augustinian principle that man's chief good and happiness is to know God (15). This principle will receive fuller development shortly, but for now, a short digression is in order.

One may legitimately ask why it takes over 130 pages to cover such seemingly straightforward concepts, and yet, to understand Andrewes' conscience well from the distance of nearly 400 years, his method must be clearly delineated: while truth is simple, error is multiple. Andrewes recognizes the effects of the fall; humanity's nefarious

expressions of rebellion need exposure to the light. Thus, he speaks to the philosophies with the most reiterations: Stoicism, Cynicism, Epicureanism, Platonism, Manicheism, Gnosticism, and Arianism. The list goes on, though, for the idols created out of honor (politics), wealth, virtue, pleasure, and contemplation are revealed as fragile crutches in comparison to the true knowledge of God (Wing A3140 15). For example, Andrewes asserts regarding hedonism:

We should be more miserable then the beasts, if pleasure were our end; for they use pleasures openly and at liberty. Man in his most lawful pleasures, is ashamed to doe them openly; *apage felicitatem, que latebros quaerit*; away with that felicity that seeketh corners 2. They do it without remorse of conscience, man after he hath done it, is pricked in his conscience; and feeleth paine in himselfe. [...] In human pleasure, even in the most lawful, there is 1. A bashfulnesse; 2. A succeeding of a biting conscience. (16)

This “biting conscience” is proof that a merely sensuous existence provides no rest. In that this excerpt is but one out of six points used to tear down the idol of pleasure, it is this kind of detail that requires Andrewes to use such length. The quote also gives an example of his conscientious handling of his task. In addition, his appeal to the conscience underlines the role it plays as the voice of God calling to the superior and distinctive element within the human species—the *Imago Dei*. As he states: “[W]e may see there is a God by our conscience, God’s deputy, else why should the wicked be troubled in conscience if there be no God? (STC 6035 51). Likewise, other idols common to the human experience undergo the same kind of searching scrutiny.

After looking at “morall virtues,” he ends his opening exposure of these empty idols by simply stating: “...to conclude against them all demonstratively, that to come to any thing besides God, is not happinesse. [...] But to come to any thing but to God, *non facit terminum appetui*, doth not satisfie the desire; for God onely giveth rest to the

appetite” (Wing A3140 17). He then uses three pages to sum up the theme of “man’s chiefe good” (18-12). And here with these words the Augustinian principle comes to the fore. He displays his commitment to an Augustinian approach of the distinguishing of *frui* and *uti* in the right understanding of true knowledge; in other words, he insists upon the enjoyment of the creator and the proper utility of creation. By doing so, he establishes the solid foundation for the sections that follow and clears the path from the obstructions that clutter a right understanding of the Decalogue.

Andrewes continues his preliminary remarks by examining the qualities of genuine faith and right reason (21-24), giving proofs that God exists (25-34), asserting that there is a providence and refuting errors of the same (35-39), establishing the error of the gentiles plurality of gods (42-46), and then confronting the erroneous views of the Jews and the Turks (47-52). Continuing in the same vein, he then turns his energies to establishing the veracity of the Christian faith and the Protestant faith in particular (52-66).

Regarding this last section dealing with the Protestant faith, since my thesis relies upon the integrity of Andrewes’ conscience before God first and loyalty to the English crown second, it is worth noting one of his points:

All other Lawes teach us to enlarge kingdoms, and to be in favour with princes: But this our religion supernaturally teaches us that live, to hate life. And so the Prophets did not seek the favor of Princes, but rebuked them to their faces, and therefore this is that truth, which is not ashamed, and it is that truth which cannot proceed of man. (STC 6035 96-97)

These are not the words of a man who takes obedience to God lightly. He sees a precedent set before him that does not yield in the face of an earthly monarch’s desires or

commands. While never claiming that Andrewes always managed to live in accordance with his conscience, knowing the standard he applied to himself and others is useful.⁷

To continue with Andrewes' exposition, though, after dealing with evidence for the general truth of Christianity, he establishes "whence true interpretation of Scripture is gathered" in contradistinction from "the Papists" (Wing A3140 67-70). Only at this juncture is he then ready to look at the nature of the law in relationship to the gospel. He does so with his trademark scholarliness, demonstrating from pages 71-83 how the law is to be taught *before* the gospel, unlike the approach recommended by the Roman Catholic method in "the last Counsels Catechisme at Trident" (71). He now turns to consider the right end and use of the law (previously quoted on p. 52), following it with the preface of the law (84-98). While the preface of the law includes such headings as a study in the words "Jehovah and Elohim" (100, 101), the "Titles of God" (102-104), the "division of the law" (105, 106), and "Rules for the interpretation of the law" (106-109), a word needs to be said regarding an important hermeneutic principle Andrewes emphasizes. After having pointed out the inconsistencies of the Roman tradition of interpretive approach, he speaks to what he perceives as a dangerous precedent, namely, the "private interpretation":

[I]f they will doe as Stapleton doth, who maketh the interpretation personall, they fall into that extremitie that hee doth, saying, that the interpretation of an unlearned bishop, is better then the interpretation of

⁷ Having pointed out in chapter three that Andrewes allegedly showed favoritism to James in the Essex annulment case, I here offer an observation based upon this point of conscience: Andrewes' pastoral temperament and his keen awareness of the human condition makes it likely that the alienation that he saw within the shambles of the marriage convinced him that no recourse was left to salvage it. Had his conscience been convinced differently, like that of his chief opponent in the argument, Archbishop George Abbot, he very likely would not have voted on the side of the king's preference.

any learned man; which as the rest of their religion, is a most miserable, detestable error.⁸ (Wing A3140 118-119)

This significant point separates him further from the radical Puritans and nonconformists of the period and anticipates his later emphasis on not only preaching but also prayer and the sacraments as well, for these elements are unique to the church's sphere of influence.

After addressing these concerns, he then continues, considering "the ways in which we may be guilty of other mens sins" (110-113), and the rules for limitations of the precepts of the law (911-118), while the final two sections address "the propositions of the first commandment" and "the knowledge of God" (120-131). A brief closing exhortation speaks to "the forbidding of a sleight knowledge" (132).

To sum up his seemingly exhaustive approach, he indeed lays bare the foundation for right knowledge that creates a requisite humility before the face of God. Rather than look further into the specific content of the preface, the essential aspects of his approach are sufficiently revealed to turn to his treatment of the actual selected commands.

Key Commands of the Decalogue: True Knowledge

The three commandments that receive attention under this heading are best suited to the purpose of revealing Andrewes' own conscience. The rationale for choosing them is straightforward. He reserves his lengthiest treatment for the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and in it, he finds the very essence of a life of faith. For Andrewes, all the commandments flow from this one: it stands at the head of the moral law, summing up humanity's duty to know God and to live according to that

⁸ Thomas Stapleton is a Roman Catholic scholastic who, with Bellarmine, offers arguments that Andrewes refutes. Among other things, he advocates "infused righteousness," a position vehemently rejected by Protestants (Reidy 133).

revelation, for faith alone does not stand alone: it manifests itself in right worship and right living. The fifth commandment, “Thou shalt honor your father and mother,” shifts from duties to God to duties to our fellow humans. It underlies Andrewes’ convictions regarding not only family obligations, but those that deal directly with submission to established authority in the various spheres of life: duties to neighbors, duties to spiritual authority, and duties to those in command, be they military, political, judicial, or social. His exegesis reveals his understanding of how obedience to God requires a commensurate regard for the authorities put over us by God himself. We discover, then, the organic quality of his approach that godly living is plainly evident in the Christian’s life. The third commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor,” focuses yet more attention not only on the duties to neighbors but also to one’s self, for it moves to a yet more interior understanding of truth. It displays the integrity of Andrewes as he articulates the quality of honest dealings with others. In short, while these commandments are but a small portion of those treated by him, these three mark critical dimensions of the multifaceted and engaging approach that Andrewes uses to develop saving knowledge and humility in his hearers.

The First Commandment

The importance of examining the first commandment rests in the epistemology of the period; that is, while univocal knowledge of God is not possible due to the effects of the fall, analogous knowledge enables one to attain a partial yet true understanding of God’s essential being. To hark back to Andrewes’ preface, in the eighth point regarding Christianity as the true religion, he claims: “The Trinity, creation, and incarnation, the true metaphysics are only in this, and only to be conceived and understood by this

religion” (STC 6035 96). Since knowledge must come through the mind and transform the heart, the duties of the mind are paramount for Andrewes. He opens his exposition with typical profundity and verve:

Concerning God, for the *Unitie* of his *Essence*, and the *Trinite* in *Persons*; and so what he is to us, we are bound to *know*. And that is set downe, *Exod. 29.46. Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them out of the Land of Egypt, that I might dwell among them; I am the Lord their God.* The Scripture doth not onely set downe what he is in himselfe, but what he is in relation to us. (Wing A3140 165)⁹

By selecting these grounds to explicate the text, Andrewes states the dimensions of the first commandment:

[I]t is divided as the soul is. Now the soul has two parts. 1) The mind or the understanding, whose duty is to know God [...]. 2) The will and affection, whose duty is to regard God, and love him. So God must first be knowne, then loved, and love breeds obedience. (STC 6035 114-115)

Extending in quarto form over 120 pages, Andrewes’ material has a Christocentric quality that imbues all his work with a concrete and tangible emphasis on the incarnation. The proclamation clearly anticipates the gospel element of “Emmanuel—God with us”; it furthers his argument that the Christian faith is one that incarnates, as it were, the spirit of Christ within the believer, or, put differently, God in us. In fact, the next line corroborates this emphasis, for he goes on to say that the first commandment reveals “[b]esides what he hath done for *us*, what we are to do for him; namely, the *knowledge* of his *will*, both in regard of the *generall*, what all are to do, and in regard to the *particular* calling, which every one hath, what *we* are to doe” (Wing A3140 165). Such an emphatic declaration of the experiential dimension of the Christian faith testifies to the veracity of Andrewes’ own faith, further underlining to whom his conscience is ultimately captive.

⁹ This ought to be paginated as 133.

Having thus laid down what the precept calls for, he then turns to discuss the means to discern this will through the engaging of the mind. The right means draw from Scripture, the patristic writings—both in the Eastern and Western traditions—the first four councils, and the scholastics (Reidy 32). Quoting a “heathen” to emphasize his point, Andrewes states, “*Ponenti fidem, ponenda media*; he that would attend unto the *end* must use the *meanes*” (Wing A3140 165). He then states the means by which the Christian may know and do God’s will.

First in his focus is the need to remove “impediments”—those within and those without—that hinder heeding of the call to know God, the chief impediment being the influence of evil counsel from those who have no inclination to pursue saving knowledge. Again quoting Scripture (Pro. 19: 27), he admonishes his hearers as a father: “My son (if thou wilt remove the *impediment*), heare no more the instruction that causeth thee to erre from the words of knowledge.” The one who would then seek true knowledge must lay aside associations with those who love evil, for such company inevitably will corrupt the best of intentions (Wing A3140 166). Yet here again, the actual dealing with the “necessary means” has been delayed: other impediments must be removed, and it is another five paragraphs before he actually arrives at his point.

When he arrives at the means themselves, he starts with a favorite pursuit of his own: prayer. It is the *sine qua non*, the without which nothing else occurs: “First, there is required prayer; wisdom and knowledge [...] must be asked of God,” and second, “wee should bring it into the heart, which is past the braine.” The latter is accomplished by ordinary means, that is, via catechizing—“hearing and repeating” (167). One must talk to others (the importance of communion with believers is alluded to here), write these

commands out, and read the precepts regularly in order to “bind” them before the eyes. Not, as he points out, in the literal sense, but through meditation (Wing A3140 168).¹⁰ He lays out how true knowledge is internalized so that hypocrisy may be avoided, for inward reality manifests itself in outward manners; to truly achieve wisdom and knowledge necessitates an abandoning of mere worldly knowledge.

Andrewes draws a sharp dichotomy here between natural and spiritual realms, and this tradition echoes the Old and New Testaments on through the patristic writers and councils and into the seventeenth century Reformation and Counter-reformation literature. For Andrewes, it continues as a critical dimension of the spiritual life. This consonance places Andrewes well within the boundaries of historic orthodoxy, further illuminating his objections to mere intellectual assent, or what has sometimes been termed—ironically enough—dead orthodoxy.

Continuing his points regarding various obstacles to attaining true knowledge and the means of attaining wisdom, Andrewes enumerates four distinct signs of true knowledge. Signs are profoundly important measurements of the inner realities he teaches, and he dwells on them pointedly. While the first, humility, is couched within its antecedents of fear, love, and obedience, the critical element is humility. Referencing Augustine, he insists: “*Vera scienta non facit hominem exultantem, sed lamentatem*, True knowledge begets not pride, but tears. [...] He that hath a conceit of himselfe, can never

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that the liturgical tradition which Andrewes avidly supported, that of the Book of Common Prayer, does exactly these things via the scheduled daily and weekly Scripture readings, confessional prayers, intercession, and thanksgiving.

come to knowledge” (Wing A3140 168).¹¹ The axiom seems counterintuitive from the modern American perspective, but as both a student and a teacher, Andrewes invariably learned its truth from his own experiences. His own reputation regarding this quality was, by all accounts, impressive.¹²

The second sign is that of “order”:

[H]e is a wise man that can order his doings, to preferre eternall things, before temporall. [...] But we doe contrarie; it is a common order, to put private profit against common profit; and to prefer temporall things before eternall. Therefore this is a signe that we have no knowledge. (168)

Again, Andrewes’ ordering of his own life with his many public and private duties was exemplary. His self-discipline was extraordinary by all accounts, and the esteem of his colleagues, fellow clergy, and the court testifies to his character.

Continuing with his emphasis on the signs of true knowledge, Andrewes places constancy of faith as the third requisite. Drawing from 1 Cor. 14. 26, he briefly sums up that “we must not be like those, that be children in knowledge, that be carried away with every wind of vaine doctrine; and as *Joel* saith, They are empty cloudes, carried with wind, and like the waves carried with the tyde” (168). Such a straightforward sign needs no further elaboration from Andrewes, and so he moves to consider the fourth signifier of true knowledge. For his penultimate point, he uses the pithiest expression thus far: “[I]f

¹¹ Calvin’s first paragraph of *The Institutes* emphasizes precisely the same point; yet, while Andrewes was certainly familiar with this momentous work, he prefers the authority of one of the leading church fathers, and in doing so, he distances himself from fellow Cambridge men who, in his estimation, tended to follow too closely the Genevan model.

¹² One instance of his humble acceptance of what many viewed as an oversight on the part of James I occurred, when, after Archbishop Whitgift died, the position of primate appeared perfectly suited for Andrewes. The honor went instead to George Abbot. Contemporaries report that Andrewes never expressed any word of complaint, disappointment, or contrary opinion on the matter.

we knew our God, our actions would witness it” (Wing A3140 189¹³). Yet again, he insists actions must be commensurate with a saving confession. Lastly, an exhortation follows hard on the heels of uniting knowledge to deeds, fleshing out what actions he expects to see: we must not “hinder knowledge in others,” but instead, we must provoke them “to seek after knowledge and increase it in others, as much as we can” (189). True knowledge is part of the evangel—the good news—thus, three uses of knowledge come into play here that demonstrate the nature of Andrewes’ godly wisdom: one, knowledge is used to teach the ignorant; two, it is used “to resolve them that are in doubt” and strengthen those who waver; and three, knowledge comforts those in distress and those afflicted by their conscience (189). The outward focus of knowledge, then, creates its own community wherein the life of faith and obedience is expressed. True knowledge does not exalt its recipient, for humility accompanies it and enables the possessor to aid others in seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness. It hardly bears repeating that his contemporary biographers consistently attest to both his constancy of faith and his conformity to his profession. One example should suffice as evidence: on an entirely voluntary basis, while he was Dean of St Peter’s Collegiate Church at Westminster Abbey, he would take “a brace of this young fry” from Westminster School along with him on his customary walks so that he could instruct them on the way (Owen 23).

The first dimension of godly knowledge having been explicated as the command to seek God with the mind and heart, the second duty of the mind under the rubric of the first commandment is summed up as “belief.” For the sake of brevity, I touch on the most salient points under this heading of belief, for Andrewes invariably must not only

¹³ Mistakenly numbered—the pagination ought to read 169.

address the kind of belief required—spiritual, in this case—but he also develops at length the natural kinds of belief that rely on the senses and “discourse” with others, or reason (Wing A3140 189¹⁴). And while he recognizes these as legitimate means of belief, he emphasizes a belief that embraces the specific revelation of God found in the Bible. He thus asserts that, while in science assent follows inquiry, “in faith there is the assent first, and then the conceiving of what we have consented to” (170). Moreover, the nature of the Christian religion contradicts philosophy, for the way of philosophy is not to believe, while the way of divinity is to believe. Andrewes continues to explain the difference by using numerous analogies, Scripture texts, and the church fathers, but in the final analysis, he brings his hearers back to the soundness and reliability of the received text of the Bible. Here, too, his proofs for its veracity abound, yet the ineluctable truth is simple: belief is a duty that is commanded (170-176).

Andrewes is, however, not yet finished with the nature of faith, for divinity has three sorts of faith: a general faith—the acceptance that there is a god and he rewards those who seek him; a legal faith—that the laws given by God are to prescribe and proscribe our thoughts and actions and that he will reward and punish us appropriately for transgressions; and an evangelical (justifying) faith. It is not enough simply to have the first and second sorts, for these two will not work out the humility that the commandment requires (177): the justifying kind of faith no longer looks to the law as a means of acceptance before God as does the legal kind of faith. Instead, faith looks to the work and person of Christ presented in the gospel. It abandons self-righteousness as humility takes hold (191).

¹⁴ Cf. footnote 7.

Taking a step back from Andrewes' treatment of the law, several things stand out in relief thus far. One of the more obvious things is his determination to "digge deep" into the text. Thus far, only what the commandment requires has been considered, and even that is incomplete. No analysis regarding what the precept forbids has been considered, but readily apparent is his very thorough and conscientious approach to the serious nature of the task and the text before him. Another obvious aspect is the inward quality of the commandment as Andrewes presents it. He moves immediately to considering what God is in himself and in relation to us. Literal idolatry is not refuted once he takes up the theme of spiritual knowledge; rather, he seeks to remove idols of the mind and the heart and extol the superiority of the revelation found in Christ, indicating the Christocentric quality of his approach. A third element found here that illuminates Andrewes' character beyond that of the careful, erudite scholar is his emphatic insistence on the practical aspect of the commandment. He relentlessly underlines that true faith and true knowledge result in observable signs: a reverential fear that informs worship, a consistent obedience, an enduring love, hope that strengthens, humility that results in service to others through teaching and encouraging others, almsgiving, prayer, an ordered life, and constancy. Given such a sweeping—and yet still only partial—scope of duties, the central thrust of his theology dwells on rightly understanding God and his will, and then, living humbly before him, "incarnating" that revealed will in the world and among his people.

To continue in such a vein might well result in charges of hagiography akin to that of his early biographers, yet no claim exists that Andrewes was blameless. The fact remains that while no mortal could live up to the standards that Andrewes sets forth in

this command, that very impossibility is part of his point. He sets out from the beginning insisting that the law is a tutor to lead us to Christ, and in his exposition of the first commandment, he lays bare the foundations of true knowledge and its effects upon believers. Thus, having briefly considered the god-ward duties laid out by Andrewes, the duties towards neighbors need attention.

*The Fifth Commandment:
The First Commandment of the Second Table*

Historically speaking, the Protestant tradition has generally accepted that the fifth commandment begins the second table of the law in that it shifts the focus from the cultic dimension of worship to that of civic concerns. Andrewes works from this perspective, stating: “[t]he summe of the first Table was, love the Lord thy with all thy heart, etc. The summe of the second Table, Love thy neighbor as thyselfe. And they are well joynd together, and this latter dependeth well on the former” (STC 6035 258). This closely bound relationship of the two tables controls his interpretation and application of the fifth commandment. Furthermore, it reveals his approach to the important matter of obligations to honor properly those whom God has placed in authority. Another aspect that stands out in the exposition is the clarity with which he explains the obligations of both the superior and the inferior. One might easily be forgiven for thinking that Andrewes, as one working so closely with the king, would take a much more authoritarian approach in deference to the “divine right” concept often associated with the Stuart monarchy, demanding more of the subjects than the monarch; such, however, is not the case, for the obligations are clearly mutual.

Beginning with his introduction to the second table of the law, Andrewes lays the foundation of the command firmly upon love for one's neighbor. Couching this love for others as an expression of love for God, he notes three qualities about love for one's neighbor: first, it "derogates nothing from the love of God, but rather increaseth it"; second, "if we do not love him whom we see, how shall we love God whom we never see?"; and third, "if we love man which oftentimes doth hurt us, how shall we choose but to love God who always is doing us good?" (STC 6035 258). Breaking it down into its simplest form, he observes that the command is love, the object of love is our neighbor, and the manner is to love that neighbor as oneself (258). Moreover, this love is not benevolence, but *delectio*, "which is with consideration and without error." Six points quickly follow: We must rejoice at his welfare and not envy it, for to do so is to follow the pattern of the devil. Next, we must do no harm to our neighbor, and if harm is done to us, we must "recompense" the evil with good. We are also obliged to "succor" the poor and needy with our worldly goods. The next duty is to pray for them. And finally, we must perform the duties of our own calling in a faithful fashion. For example, if we teach, we must teach diligently. If one is a lawyer, that lawyer must offer wise good counsel (260). Having thus laid down the general interpretive principle for the second table of the law, he brings up a thorny issue.

He considers what is a perennial question: who is our neighbor? He cuts this Gordian knot by sweeping all humanity—family, friends, the poor, the needy, even enemies—into his magnanimous, neighborly net. We are all, after all, "one blood" (261-262). He immediately then makes some practical points regarding degrees of this love and distinguishes them by proximity; namely, he observes that to neglect one's duties to

parents is worse than omitting them to a stranger: the right ordering of our love is first to God, then to our souls, next, to our neighbors' soul, then our bodies, and finally, our neighbors' body. Even here, though, he lays out an order among those who have need: first is the "household of faith," then "our countrymen" (STC 6035 263-264). Finally, he is nearly ready to interpret the fifth commandment, for he concludes by observing that all this love as summed up in the second table of the law must be conveyed justly, in truth, and as ordained (265). This methodical approach to the text that Andrewes takes here actually reflects his second sign of true understanding: order.¹⁵ The nature of order extends to more than the ordering of affections and eternal and spiritual concerns; it also extends to God's ordering of rank, station, gifts, talents, and the order of importance and priority. Andrewes' orderly movement through each of his points carries a weight of its own that demonstrates his serious-minded temperament and his commitment to live out his understanding of God's law.

The Exposition of the Fifth Commandment

Rather than walk through his treatment step by step, the most pertinent aspects will serve to illustrate the tenor of his approach. He first breaks the commandment down into two parts: that of the precept itself, and then the reason appended to the law. The command itself suggests the approach: "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy daies may bee prolonged upon the land the Lord thy God giveth thee." While the reasons are important for his purpose of encouraging obedience, it is his exposition of the precept that is germane to this argument. To summarize his opening, after a brief reference to Chrysostome's wisdom—"they must first be fathers, before they be honoured as

¹⁵ Cf. page 65.

fathers”—the term “father” and “honor” are defined in a comprehensive fashion. More precisely, “father” carries more than the weight of a progenitor of a family; rather, it encompasses those “by whom others are in any better estate” (STC 6035 265). This approach takes into account husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, masters, teachers, clergy, magistrates, nobility, and the monarch. To put it more succinctly, it includes any figure who exercises some kind of authority over others (265). Rather than cover all that Andrewes himself does, this study narrows the focus to some general observations and then moves to consider his reflections on the specific concerns of obedience to a wicked ruler, some salient points regarding teachers and ministers, and finally, the obligations of rulers and subjects.

General Observations

In the tradition of classical rhetoric that defines its key terms, Andrewes examines “honor,” derived from the Hebrew “kavod.” It means heavy, weighty, or having gravitas, and those who hold the office of a father must be treated accordingly: “Seeing they beare the person of God, they must not be set light by (267).¹⁶ The immediate import of his definition is apparent. God himself has set these persons in place, and to treat their offices or them lightly is to impugn the prerogatives of God. There is more to consider, though, for Andrewes, mindful of the abuse of power, carefully notes that duty does not only flow from the inferior to the superior; the superior has duties to the inferior inherent in the position: “There are some duties which are *officia reprocosa*, mutual duties between the inferiour and the superiour, due by either of them to the other of them.” In short, both owe each other love and prayer (269). Here lies one of the more crucial

¹⁶ Paginated incorrectly: it omits 266.

aspects of Andrewes' understanding in terms of mutual obligations. In his understanding, the structure of society is one that has dignity for all its members, and while he is certainly aware that order must be maintained and that some members are given greater gifts and more influence by virtue of their position, his vision for a godly community recognizes a parity of worth in the eyes of God. It is a parity built into the commandments by God himself, and Andrewes stresses this balance so that none will favor one group over another.

As he moves to his next point, he notes that the command entails an inward and outward type of honoring. The inward honoring requires an *honesta opinio* of the inferior towards the superior. The one should have a good opinion and reputation of the other and should labor to maintain it. The outward honor the inferior shows is evident through the customs of each person's own specific country. For instance, in England, the customs include rising up "when that person of excellency is in presence, which either by nature, or by analogie or proportion, is our father"; to uncover the head out of reverence; to "bend the knee"; to stand, "as our servants stand before us": "to be silent when our betters speak, and to give care unto them"; and "when we are by necessary occasion to speak, to use words of submission" The outward signs, like the signs spoken of in the first commandment regarding true knowledge and faith, speak of the inward reality requisite to loving obedience to God. Servants are to serve their earthly masters as they would their heavenly one (STC 6035 269-271).

"Fear" then follows honor, for it "properly belongs to the superiour, in regard to his power." He qualifies it as "an awe or reverent feare" and cites Scripture: "Ye shall fear every man his father and mother" (Lev. 19.3), and Ephesians 6.5: "We must with

fear and trembling serve our masters according to the flesh.” This fear is especially appropriate to kings, for “their anger is as the messengers of death” (272). The application of such Scriptures to this duty may strike us as extreme, more akin to a subservient, cringing, and obsequious stance, but the historical picture of the period provides ample instances of those who gave allegiance to God over earthly masters and sovereigns, requiring personal suffering and loss.¹⁷

Continuing the examination of the duties packed into the fifth commandment, Andrewes touches on what would seem an obvious point: obedience. Yet obedience must come under further scrutiny to be properly rendered. It consists of three qualities: 1) simplicity and singleness of heart, with a good conscience, 2) with cheerfulness, and 3) it must be continual, “at all times, and in all cases lawfull, not contrarie to Gods Commandments” (STC 6035 273). In this third point, Andrewes offers a loophole within the qualifier, “in all cases lawfull, not contrarie to Gods Commandments.” What might come under the heading of lawful and not contrary depends a great deal on who is interpreting. Nevertheless, while it is safe to say that he leaves room for expressions of passive disobedience when commanded to violate a commandment, he is not leaving much room, as will soon become clear.

Particular Observations

The discourse then turns to the consideration of the duties of superiors, and in this section he clarifies that with being honored and obeyed come responsibilities. Andrewes argues that by virtue of the fact that superiors are the recipients of honor, “a burden and a

¹⁷ Foxe’s “Book of Martyrs,” though still popular reading at the time, is not the only source of record, for it does not mention the founders of Plymouth Colony, for example.

charge” is laid upon them that they should be worthy of the honor accorded by performing their tasks well. They are to consider themselves “God’s ministers,” “his vicereagents,” and they are to recognize that their judgments are to be “his and not their owne” (STC 6035 275-276). In the case of parents, this role means that God, having made them responsible to instruct, nurture, guide, and teach their offspring, requires them not to treat children as equals or exalt them above their parents (277). The same goes for those who are superiors by position, for God requires that they maintain good order, making sure that those under them work well, and if they “break order,” it must be dealt with and punished appropriately. On the other hand, those that work well are to be commended and encouraged (279). These rather generic instructions about the nature of the superior’s position are readily enough adaptable to the gamut of social, economic, ecclesiastic, and political realms, but again, Andrewes cannot rest until he has taken them a step further and spoken of the manner of discharging these duties.

To properly instruct the superior requires Andrewes to focus on cultivating an inner attitude. He begins by quoting a Davidic Psalm that speaks of the king’s “walking uprightly himself,” and then recalls Gregory’s principle that the right use of power is to use it to subdue the “rebellious affections in [the ruler’s] nature, that [...] he may [...] bring himselfe to goodness” (279). His second admonition moves from the inward duty of personal conformity to godliness to the outward conduct toward his inferiors. Several key qualities are listed: dealing harshly is forbidden and moderation required, a proud manner is unacceptable, along with “contumelious words” and “tyrannous deeds,” for the Christian should eschew such: “especially those in high place must be farre from anger, bitternesse, and crying out, and railing, and such like” (280). In this context enumerating

behavior that the Christian ruler is to avoid, he turns to a lengthy treatment regarding honoring superiors “that are evill and wicked.” Ought the Christian obey such? His answer does not equivocate at all: “Yes. [...] for the wickednesse of man cannot take away the force of Gods Commandment, nor make void Gods ordinance” (STC 6035 280). Such a direct admonition warrants seven more octavo pages to develop, and it is in this fulsome development that we find why Andrewes may strike many as one of the king’s indefatigable supporters. As such, it merits close examination.

His argument is based primarily on the Scriptures, and he draws heavily upon them, quoting or alluding to twenty-three different passages. To begin, we discover that both old and new testament narrative is applied as support for his position. The first examples are Old Testament selections:

Though they be froward, we must submit ourselves, 1 Pet. 2. 18. As when Sarah dealt roughly with Hagar, yet the Angell willeth her to returne backe to her Mistres, and to submit herselfe to her. And as in the family, so in the Common-wealth. Wee know that Saul dealt very roughly with David, and yet still he acknowledged subjection unto him, so that he would do him no violence, when opportunitie was offered him in the cave. (281)

Andrewes chooses two instances of narrative here, and they effectively represent a domestic, social obligation in that of Sarah and Hagar, and a significant political and civic relationship between Saul and David. In both examples, he commends the submissive response of those being abused. Andrewes’ use of these examples shows his hermeneutic method and its application of the ethos of a foreign patriarchy and theocracy to his own culture. It is practically seamless. He is able to do so because the approach was the norm of the day and would meet with a receptive audience: narrative passages were readily used to support precepts and propositional thinking. The effects of secular political theory based on rationalism were still in the future in the late sixteenth and early

seventeenth century, and thus, when supporting his claims, the final arbiter was God's word.

Returning to his theme of the "froward" superior, he states, "though they be wicked, yet obedience and honour is to be done unto them: For it is God who hath set them up, though it were in his wrath" (STC 6035 281). Referring then to the rulers Nebuchadnezzar and Asshur (of Babylon and Assyria, respectively), he insists that God set them up as rods of his wrath (282). Even though these two rulers stand as enduring symbols of the oppressors of God's people, honor was their due. Apparently, such a stark truth requires additional incentive to obey under such difficult circumstances, so Andrewes returns to his doctrine of theocentric obedience: "[L]ooke what honour we give them, wee doe it not to them, but to God himselfe, in reverence to his Ordinance. Not to the person, but to the visard that God hath put on him" (282). The visard, then, bearing the representation of an evil magistrate, conceals who is truly in control and is worthy of honor, and being mindful of this disguise, obedience is the only acceptable course. Andrewes' consistency and timeliness on this point are notable, for when he delivered this lecture, papal bulls had come forth from Rome asserting that obedience was not due to heretics, a status applied by the Pope to Elizabeth. The relevance would not have been lost on his audience.

Thus far, we can discern the theological grounds upon which Andrewes bases his own principles of conduct regarding his obligations to those under him and those above him. We can also see that his approach is not unique to his times. As more of his teaching on this commandment continues, however, a return to the questions regarding honoring the wicked ruler takes shape: "Must we obey an evil man in an evil thing? [...]"

[Do] we owe (as we call it) absolute obedience to evill Magistrates?" (283). With the same verve he answered the former question positively, he now flatly answers in the negative:

No, we doe not: For absolute obedience is due to God onely, and kings are to be obeyed so farre as their commandements are not repugnant to Gods Commandements: For if God command one thing, and they another, *Deo potius quam hominibus*, better obey God then men, Acts 4.19. No man can serve two Masters, Matthew 6.24. When God and they command all one thing, they are but *unum agens*, and so but one Master; and there are not two masters till man breake order, and become a master himselfe against order. (STC 6035 284)

Here is yet another example of the supremacy of God in Andrewes' theology and his use of both testaments. The simple fashion by which he reasserts the spiritual nature of obedience leaves no doubt where one's loyalty must lie. Nevertheless, the nuanced dimension appears in the conditional clause "till man break order." It is not until man as magistrate becomes a master over against the command of God that the break occurs and obedience to the now false master ceases. Thus, Andrewes infers that personal or private sins do not abrogate the authority of the ruler. Only when rulers require others within their purview to perform evil is their rule in that particular matter abrogated. As Andrewes points out in the subsequent paragraph, "[o]ur Saviours rule is, Luke 14. 26. He that commeth to mee must hate father and mother and all; which he expoundeth, Matth.10. 37. He that loveth father or mother more then mee, is not worthy of mee" (284). His examples that follow further illustrate the plain principle:

God the Superiour [over] all, the great Superiour, took order [the Jews] should not falle downe, nor bow to any image; Nebuchadnezzar a prince, a lesser superiour, he commands the contrary, he was disobeyed, and the disobedience was no disobedience: for [...] he had gone out of order first, Dan. 3.18. Darius went out of order, Dan. 7.9. When he forbad prayer to God, which God had first commanded; Daniel contrary to the Kings

decree prayeth: Daniel kept his order; the King was out of order, the fault was the Kings. (284-285)

Illustrating from such narratives how the principle works itself out, the clarity of his exposition speaks for itself. Human rulers will err in judgment, but that is not unusual. However, when a magistrate commands what God has forbidden, obey God.

In spite of this clear delineation between two masters, Andrewes still exhorts his hearers that “this honour must be *propter Deum* [on account of God], and that is [...] *in Deo* [as unto God]. Nor is even that sufficiently thorough, for he adds another caveat: “and yet not withstanding all this, it shall be good and expedient, [...] not to carpe at every little thing, but rather obey, if it be in our power” (STC 6035 286-287). Continuing to clarify, he permits obedience even in things that are “doubtful,” such as Joab’s taking of a census for David, though one had been taken recently (2 Sam. 24.4). Even “an unjust commandement,” if it is not “directly contrary to Gods will, there may be just obedience unto it” (STC 6035 287). A narrative from the life of Christ is employed: “Matt. 17.17. [I]t was more than *Cesar* could require of Christ to pay tribute, because hee was a stranger, yet rather than hee would break quietnesse, he gave it” (287). Andrewes readily acknowledges that there will inevitably be difficult choices to make regarding honor and obedience—the sinful condition sees to that—but through a careful examination of scriptural narrative and commands, he presents a compelling argument that challenges the tendency to disobey under scruples of the conscience. This balanced and rigorous treatment lies behind his conduct in the royal court and witnesses to the man’s integrity.

Turning now to his specific treatment regarding the duties of a prince and his subjects (311-321), I must overlook other aspects that delve into the relationships of

social, economic, pedagogical, and spiritual nature. Neglecting the instructions for husbands and wives (STC 6035 287-292), fathers and sons (292-293), masters and servants (294-297), teachers and hearers (297-299), ministers—a very detailed treatment (299-311)—various gifts of the mind and facility in the arts (321-328), the duties of benefactors and nobility, the right use of wealth, and other additional instructions may seem irresponsible, but for present purposes, the keenly important exposition of the civic dimension demands attention.

Andrewes neatly wraps up the section pertaining to ministers (“the fatherhood of the Church”) by saying that order requires that “nursing fathers and mothers in Gods Church, and in the Common-wealth” receive attention (311). The “nursing fathers and mothers” are none other than the magistrates who function as the fathers of the country. Couching the role in terms consistent with the commandment he explicates, Andrewes again emphasizes the comprehensive nature of magisterial rule. Moreover, his phrasing immediately apprises his readers of the role he sees for these nursing fathers and mothers; specifically, it is both spiritual and temporal. As such, a firm bond is kept between the church and the state inasmuch as these magistrates serve as protectors, providers, and in certain instances, enforcers within both contexts.

In an intriguing opening statement, Andrewes alludes to Augustine’s influential work, *The City of God*, as he states that the world would have had no need for civic authorities, the ecclesiastical powers being “sufficient,” had not Cain built a city, requiring the godly to defend themselves. Thus, a power was needed “to bridle” the ungodly (311-312). The reason, then, that power should be given to one in “particular” was that one “wolfe” was preferable to many. Such a theory bespeaks a clear conviction

of the post-lapsarian condition, necessitating the use of the sword by the state since the time of the flood. Drawing upon the Scriptures again, Andrewes uses Melchizedek, as the king of Salem who intervenes to assist “Gods people from Nimrod,” as evidence of the role a godly magistrate takes (STC 6035 312). Additionally, the magistrate is styled after a shepherd who must insure that the “fat sheepe” not trample the grass and prevent the lean ones from eating. Extending the analogy further, Andrewes seems to delight in the picture of the magistrate as a defender of the weak: “[N]or [should the fat ones] trouble the water that [the lean] cannot drinke; neither strike at them with their horns, but that they may feed quietly without disturbance.” The magistrate’s task is to regard first “the flocke within,” and “to keepe and preserve them from foraigne invasions” (313).

Naturally, Andrewes recognizes that magistrates are of two orders: they are either “under-officers” or kings, for kings cannot of themselves “beare all.” Yet, regardless of the status, all should manifest certain qualities appropriate to godliness. The standards are derived from Deuteronomy 17.16—“He must not be affected to Egypt, which is the nursery of Idolatry; not affected to false religion”; from Proverbs 31.3.4—“He must not be uxorious, voluptuously given to pleasure, for “wine and women are not for Kings and Princes”; and again from Deuteronomy 17.17—“He must not gather gold and silver, that is, hee must not be covetous. [...] It was Solomons fault” (315). These qualifications form the ideal magistrate, of course, and later, Andrewes acknowledges that the frailty of the human condition requires subjects to bear with the weaknesses that afflict magistrates and subjects alike.

Having dealt with character, Andrewes then addresses duties. The first duty distantly echoes the quality of humility found in the requirements of the first

commandment, for the magistrate must acknowledge that he is in his position, not by his own power, but by that of God's: "*Per me reges regnant*, saith God."¹⁸ As such, the magistrates' authority is not arbitrary, but delegated (STC 6035 315). Gratitude and dependence lie at the core of this duty, and in consequence, their duty is to "to rule as God himselfe would rule." An obvious dilemma appears in this formula, though, for in order for the magistrate to do so, a thoroughgoing knowledge of God's rule is needed. The resolution, therefore, is that magistrates are obligated to have a close working relationship with both the Scriptures and the church. Andrewes implicitly draws a Venn diagram that sees an overlap of duties and interdependence between the state and the church. In doing so, he continues to strengthen the spiritual dimensions of proper rule.

Andrewes then carefully adds a second duty that proscribes the duty of the king and his deputies:

He must not require him by breaking into that which is Gods peculiar; for wee see our Saviour maketh a division; [...] some things to Cesar, some to God; as namely the Court of Conscience; the Lord onely keepeth his Court there; and therefore the King must [...] command nothing to any man against his conscience. (317)

This move on Andrewes' part is rather extraordinary, for he plainly intends that the court of conscience is to stand inviolate from intrusions from magistrates. By virtue of the conscience being the realm of God's judgments in the individual subjects, and God alone is allowed there, an inherent tension is created. Part of the tension disappears when we note that he has already created certain parameters that permit disobeying commands that conflict with God's law, so this position, in effect, simply extends that principle. The contrast here, however, is that what was implied is now explicit as he sets off the

¹⁸ "By me kings reign." Andrewes also uses this text in a Gunpowder Plot sermon, treated in chapter six.

conscience as the locus for this sacred repository. In essence, his position foregrounds the sovereignty of the individual's conscience in distinction from society's accepted mores. It also suggests Luther's principled stand on Scripture and his conscience over against the Diet of Worms and its papal representatives. At the very least, it adumbrates the struggles that would ensue from policies that the Stuart monarchs imposed, especially in the Laudian period.

Why would Andrewes introduce such a potentially radical concept except that at the very core of his principles he recognizes the limits of temporal authority. Absolute obedience is owed exclusively to God, and in matters of faith and practice, the king must not coerce his subjects. Perhaps Andrewes is here reflecting on Queen Mary's grim five-year reign that so fractured the nation. Elizabeth's own policies could also figure in at this point, for she was typically reluctant to intrude upon her subjects' personal beliefs if those convictions imposed no threat. The ambiguity he introduces still remains, for more must be said about the king's duties that further complicate the matter.

Regardless of the historical exigencies, while he sets the conscience off limits from the king and his deputies, he then seemingly turns to give the magistrates an obligation that potentially intrudes upon it: "Yet those whose consciences are not well instructed, they must labor to rectifie them; and if they bee obstinate, and will not yield to religion, they must compel them" (STC 6035 317). What, then, is Andrewes requiring here? Certainly he advocates a role for the church (religion) in instructing and teaching as a means to rectify or straighten up those stooped down with ignorance, but in the event that such efforts are met with stubborn resistance, the prince must "compell them" to conform. The immediate context supplies some clarity as to what Andrewes proposes,

for he adds, “therefore let Papists come and heare, that they may be caught” (STC 6035 317a).¹⁹ When these lectures were delivered, it was a requirement that all attend religious services within the respective parishes of the realm. Fines were levied in the absence of compliance, and in all likelihood, Andrewes sees this kind of compelling as beneficial (as opposed to harmful coercion) in that it required Roman Catholics to hear the exposition of the true faith. As they hear, they then may well be “caught” in the net of truth. Be that as it may, the double entendre present in the expression does contain an ominous note, for Francis Walsingham and his deputies had hunted Jesuits and their supporters diligently.

Continuing with Andrewes’ line of thought in regard to the second duty of the prince, we learn that it is his responsibility to “feed the people” both in spirit and in body. In respect to the former, “he must provide for their soules, that Preachers bee sent into all places,” and in respect to the latter,

[f]or their bodies [...], hee must lay up corne against a dearth, and see there be plenty, 2 Chron. 9.21, send ships abroad, for outward and foraigne commodities: and for inward right to all men at home, to provide judges [...], and to avoyd wrongs from abroad, provide souldiers, 2Chron. 17.2. (STC 6035 317b)

Thus, magistrates work closely with the ecclesiastical powers to care for their subjects’ eternal and temporal needs.

As can readily be seen, the king and his aides are under a substantial burden in order to rule in a godly fashion, but Andrewes still has two more duties to unfold from his text, for catechizing entails the sweeping of many different texts under the one. It is a prototype of systematic theology, geared to summarize key doctrines: the third duty requires the king to establish his throne in justice, making sure that the cases that are tried

¹⁹ Error in numbering: the publisher uses 317 for the verso and recto pages.

in the land remain free from bias and bribery. In doing so, the righteous will flourish and the wicked will flee, for his eyes are not to spare capital crimes (STC 6035 318-319). As Andrewes comes to the fourth duty of the king, he now makes clear that an attribute of true knowledge must manifest itself in the king. The king must conduct himself in:

humility, and meeknesse in ruling, to use his power meekly and mildely, not as *Pilate John 19.10, I have power to crucifie thee and I have power to loose thee*: but every Magistrate should doe well to say with *Paul, 2 Cor. 10.8. I have no power to hurt, but to doe good*, to edification, and not to destruction. (319)

In these two juxtaposed duties, an apparent contradiction appears that is readily addressed: in the former duty, Andrewes expects the righteous king to wield the sword of justice so efficaciously that the wicked will be terrified by the king's judgments (319), yet in the latter, meekness and mildness operate to edify and not to destroy. The resolution lies in how these qualities are directed towards the king's subjects. If the subjects are numbered among the godly, then the king should conduct himself with humility and meekness. If, on other hand, his subjects are wicked and evil, he is obliged to deal severely and firmly.

Again, Andrewes creates a conundrum of sorts for the conscience. The struggle appears when sincere and devout citizens committed to knowing God's will and living a life of devout obedience do not agree on the nature of God's will. A lack of consensus on theological points could easily upset the balance he endeavors to discover. For Andrewes, many of the disputatious Puritans and Presbyterians, not to mention the Brownists and other more extreme interpreters, failed to emphasize adequately the vast common ground that they stood upon. His own irenic nature allowed for more latitude than many of his contemporaries, and few were either temperamentally capable or willing

to emulate him when it came to his own leading by example as opposed to requiring outward conformity in all matters. What does become plain from examining his treatment of the fifth commandment, however, is his emphasis on the spiritual nature of honor and obedience. Outward conformity is not ultimately the goal, for the mere appearance of righteousness, while it may pass muster in human courts, does not meet the exacting standards laid out in God's law.

We discover, then, how his conscience is further informed and shaped which leads naturally to a better understanding of his relationship to his own superiors, particularly to the crown and the primate of the church. While his interpretive approach to the first command displays an insistence upon loyalty to God, this command enables us to see how that loyalty translates to his relationship to the court and his preaching obligations there. The Gunpowder plot sermons suggest that his conviction regarding humility and thanksgiving before God, and the attendant humility and obedience to temporal authority undergird his ordering of his texts and the focus of his attention. His understanding of conscience, dictated by principles derived from the Scriptures, help determine the nature of the messages he delivers before James I. The sermons, then, given in the context of a state-mandated occasion, are not primarily produced by the state as Thomas Nowak asserts, but rather, the primacy of the understanding of the individual's conscience, Andrewes' in particular, controls the themes, the rhetoric, and the purpose to which the sermon is employed. For Andrewes, the prescribed duty of preaching on any given occasion appears to be yet another opportunity to serve God. If the crown and the court are edified by such, so much the better, but in the final analysis, premised upon a conscientious proclamation of God's will remains paramount.

The Ninth Commandment

As we examine the relatively short explication of this commandment—“Thou shalt not answer a false witness upon thy neighbor, or touching thy neighbor”—an interesting assortment of passages from both the old and new testaments opens Andrewes comments:

The exposition of this commandment is, Levit.19.11 *Thou shalt not lye to thy brother:* and in the sixteenth verse, *Thou shalt carry no tales:* and Zach 8.16,17. *Speake every man the truth to his neighbor, and love no false oath:* and Ephes.4.25. *Cast off lying, and speake every man truth to his neighbor:* and vers 15. *Let us follow the truth in love.* (STC 6035 453)

By pulling these verses into one bundle, he telegraphs his comprehensive approach to the command. The thread of truthfulness runs back and forth across the Scriptures and shows the unified nature of Andrewes’ approach. His interpretation and application of it opens in a similar vein to the fifth: he carefully begins by defining the Hebrew words “answering,” “witness” (454), and “false” (457). He asserts that “answering” must be understood as a Hebrew idiom similar to that used by the evangelists in the gospels when they state, “and he answered and said,” yet none either spoke or demanded anything of Christ. For Andrewes, the expression requires us not only to “speak the truth when we are demanded, but even when we speak of ourselves, without any demand of any other, we should speake truly” (454). By using his linguistic skills, he broadens the thrust of the command from a strictly literalist approach that would tend to limit the command to a particular forensic accusation, for example, to one that encompasses any kind of speaking whatsoever. It is a simple but brilliant move that opens the scope of the commandment considerably.

Next, he notes that “witnesses” consists of four sorts, and he lays the types out by order of importance. The first witness is God himself, and the Trinity bears witness to all truth (STC 6035 454-455). God’s attributes of omniscience and omnipresence, though not cited here by Andrewes, have previously been employed to reinforce his supremacy in all matters relating to mankind’s duty, and the duty to speak truthfully is part of that. The second sort of witness in Andrewes’ list is that of which St. Paul “speaketh of Rom. 2.15. [t]heir conscience bearing witness” (455). Yet the conscience is not so reliable, for God is greater than it, and though we may think ourselves entirely right, when before the great test in God’s presence, we may discover ourselves wrong (455-456). These two sorts of witnesses, though, are not adequate since “God will not speake from heaven, and mens consciences may be seared, so as they will deny the truth; therefore the third witness is, that of one man to another” (456). It is precisely this witness that the commandment speaks to, for, as Andrewes states: “[T]he end of it is to establish the truth by witnesses: *By the mouth of two or three witnesses every matter must be confirmed, Matth. 18.16*” (456). Since Andrewes has pinpointed the precise sort of witness spoken of in the command, it is surprising that he goes on and mentions the fourth sort of witness: that of “dumbe creatures, as of “stone,” “*the beames of timber,*” and “*the rust of your gold and silver shall bee a witness against you*” (456). His reason for doing so is that “man is unfaithfull in his testimonies,” and therefore, recourse to other “creatures” to testify against him is needed (456-457). It seems that Andrewes is compelled to treat of every dimension exhaustively. Such a compulsion, if indeed it exists in him, is the

outworking of his own conscience to “rightly divide the word,” for he must fulfill his calling as a faithful minister.²⁰

His next obligation is to mark out the three types of falsehood signified in the commandment. The first is “*Falsum*, to speake that which is not so: When our words and the matter doe not agree.” The second is to speak mendaciously, which he defines as speaking one thing while thinking another. And the third type of speech forbidden is “*Vanitas*.” This empty kind of speech is prohibited because speech is ordained to build others up in respect to God, and to convey charity to “our brethren.” It serves no useful purpose. Thus, “all vain and frivolous idle talke is here forbidden” (STC 6035 457). As if such exacting standards of speech were not enough, at this juncture, Andrewes poses another of those perennial questions that haunts the human condition; it turns on the word “for” as opposed to “against”: can we lie for the purpose of aiding our neighbor, to help save either his life or goods? Are we permitted to lie *for* his benefit? Again, Andrewes will not equivocate: “It is altogether unlawfull; and indeed the words of the Commandement will not beare it; for the word is *barad* which is best translated, *Super Proximum, tuum*, which may be either for or against him” (458). Such searching definitions and strict applications condemn all of us, and it is helpful to remember that the law is, according to Andrewes, meant to lead us to Christ in whom we find relief from our burdens. Andrewes insists that the law be preached before the gospel so that we will be ready for that deliverance that Christ brings.

Andrewes continues his explication as he considers the scope and purpose of God in giving this command: “as he is truth in itselfe, so he wold have the truth preferred

²⁰ It is also helpful to remember that these lectures were delivered over a year that used two to three hours each Saturday and Sunday.

among men: which truth, and Joh 8.37. Christ saith of himselfe, so we may all say, we are borne and came into the world to this purpose, to beare witness to the truth” (459).

Once again the implied presence of the *Imago Dei* is felt when Andrewes makes his bold claim of parity of purpose with Christ. The claim, however, is unattainable since the fall, for the offence of false testimonies and slanders come from the heart (459-460). He keenly cuts to the heart’s motives when he observes that, due to the inclinations of our nature:

[i]f we thinke we can keepe down the credit and estimation of another, we ourselves shall be the better thought of: and so, either from an aspiring desire of our owne good, or an envious & malicious minde to our neighbors hurt, or from some such like corrupt inclination, we are moved to sin. (STC 6035 460)

This assessment is bleak from the perspective of the secular humanist, but Andrewes is in a different tradition. The tradition premises that the Bible’s teaching is binding upon all; in fact, from Andrewes’ perspective, it is not as bleak as it might appear, for he balances the picture by setting forth the ideal pattern that informs us of the goal for which we must strive. The key point with which he began the lecture series still stands for the struggling Christian: the law is the guide to godliness, not the means to it.

Andrewes continues to expose the sins of speech that flow from the fallen condition and mentions other sins forbidden in the ninth commandment. They include gossip that destroys another’s good name, revealing of private sins, listening to malicious reports, surmising guilt when the whole matter has not been revealed, having “itching ears,” meddling in other affairs—“to take care of another mans Diocesse”— which ends as being busybodies (461-463). In contrast, “if we look well to our owne, we shall have no leasure to deale with other mens” (463-464). The essence of the command addresses

sins spoken, when words depart from the truth of “the thinges we speake of, or from our minds and meaning” (464). Andrewes was, no doubt, aware of the kind of casuistry that permitted one, even in a court of law, to speak deceptively.

One famous instance of this casuistry occurred in Elizabeth’s reign when a Jesuit, James Campion, was asked if he were a priest. He responded by saying “no” but completed the answer in his mind by adding, “I am not a priest of Apollo.” The judge inquired further by asking if he had ever sailed overseas, the plain implication being that he had been to Rome, for the court had proof that he had. Again, he responded in the negative but added to himself that he had never sailed on the Indian Ocean. While such equivocation may strike us as clever and amusing from our safe distance, mendacity like this exactly what Andrewes was rebuking. His concern covers two dimensions:

[F]alse speech either concerns ourselves, or our brethren: For if it be hurtful to our selves, or our neighbors, it is condemned, because it is against charity: But if it doe no hurt, yet it be false, it is evil, because it is against the truth of God. (STC 6035 464)

He continues to unfold further instances of miscarriages of truth in both the realm of jurisprudence and in personal relationships, but for present purposes we may conclude with several pertinent observations relating to Andrewes’ own conscience.

In that his approach to these commandments is so relentlessly searching, it is difficult to imagine that a man who teaches in this manner is also prone to ignore his own conscience’s voice. The specific ways that he exposes the things required and forbidden, examining in close details the motives and intentions of sinful human behavior, is a witness in itself that Andrewes searched his own heart, as it were, and found there a lack of conformity. In spite of this evidence, however, his own personal conduct as reported by those who best knew him reveals no glaring deficiencies or pattern of inconsistency.

We may safely and reasonably conclude that what he taught to others he also practiced in public and in private. This early work, aptly entitled *A Patterne of Catechistcall Doctrine*, is a useful pattern to measure his expectations of himself and others. The Decalogue serves to inform his inward and outward expressions of faithful obedience to his sovereigns, both the Lord of heaven and earth, and his temporal and earthly ones. The public pattern having been laid out, albeit in a very abbreviated form compared to his entire treatment, his private prayer life reveals yet another facet of this man.

CHAPTER FIVE

Preces Privatae: The Conscience at Work

The smiling conscience in a sleeping breast
Has only peace, has only rest;
The music and the mirth of kings
Are all but very discords, when she sings;
Then close thine eyes and rest secure;
No sleep so sweet as thine, no rest so sure.

—Francis Quarles “A Good-Night”

How Andrewes approaches and practices prayer reveals a great deal about his conscience. By studying the structure, themes, and language he employs in his private devotions, a portrait that delineates his inmost concerns comes into focus. The correlation between private prayer and public scruples, while potentially an obscure topic from today’s perspective, nevertheless offers a large window into the operation of the conscience, for James I’s own ethical behavior (or lack thereof) impinges upon Andrewes’ convictions. In fact, as the actual date of the Plot recedes, his “political” sermons take on a different tone than one would expect if he were a trumpeter of the blessed state of England and James I’s divine right to rule. Conversely, the later sermons especially seem forged as weapons against the excesses of the court without unduly (and unwisely) laying the blame at the feet of the king. Should the king be listening well, however, a commensurate sense of responsibility on the king’s part for at least allowing such an atmosphere is very likely to occur. What requires Andrewes to speak out against such excesses, however, is discovered in the nature of his personal outpourings in the context of what would have been called his “prayer closet,” a time-honored spiritual exercise derived from Christ’s teaching in the Sermon on the Mount.

The question of reliability regarding the text itself is less problematic compared to that of his lectures on the Decalogue. According to Trevor Owen's research,¹ the work exists in three surviving manuscripts: the Laudian Manuscript, discovered in 1833, the Pembroke College Manuscript in Samuel Wright's hand, one of Andrewes' secretaries, and the Harleian Manuscript 6614, held by the British Library. Andrewes' amanuensis, Henry Issacson, published a partial English translation as early as 1630, and Richard Drake, frustrated by what he deemed an altogether inadequate translation published in 1647 by Humphrey Mosely, published his own more complete and careful work in 1648 (Owen 51). He dedicated it to the Prince of Wales, and while F.E. Brightman's 1903 translation and edition receives high praise for its qualities, Drake's octavo version reflects a contemporary's presentation of it.²

As to whether the *Preces Privatae* gives an accurate impression of Andrewes' private devotional life, opinion is unanimous that it not only accurately reflects the exceptional personal piety of the man himself, but its spiritual quality has also benefited the church at large: since it was first published in 1647, it is the only work of Andrewes that has never been out of print, a fact that readily testifies to its continual usefulness. Moreover, its contents display the eclectic nature of Andrewes' sources of inspiration, for as Drake notes: "[Y]ou may see [...] The Matter, Form, and Phrase of His devotions all borrow'd from the Sacred Scriptures, the Holie Fathers, and Primitive Liturgies" (Wing

¹ *Lancelot Andrewes* (pp. 50-59)

² Drake's reference to having actually worked with the original is interesting: "Had you seen the Original Manuscript, happie in the glorious deformitie thereof, being slubbered with his pious hands, and water'd with his penitential tears, you would have been forced to confess, that book belonged to no other than primitive devotion" (Wing A3135 Preface: To the Chr. Reader).

A3135 12). A more fulsome description of Andrewes' far-ranging sources comes from Thomas Kepler in another edition published in 1953. He gives a "roll call of the writers" employed in *Preces Privatae*:

[The] *Church Fathers*—Irenaeus, Tertullian, Saint Cyprian, Dion Chrysostom, Saint Jerome, Saint Augustine, the Gregories; *Medieval Writers*—Alcuin, Saint Anselm, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter Lombard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Thomas Bradwardine, Gerson; *Sixteenth-Century Writers*—Erasmus, Saint John Fisher; *Classical Writers of Greece and Rome*—Euripides, Aristophanes, Horace, Seneca: *Liturgies and Prayers* from Saint James, Saint Basil, the *Western Hours, Missal and Manual*, several of the *Primers, Book of Common Prayer*, John Knox's *Book of Common Order*, the Apostle's and Nicene Creeds. (Kepler, Introduction xx)

This "roll call"—not exhaustive, incidentally³—certainly demonstrates the broad sweep of his learning, but even more significantly, it displays how Andrewes employed that learning to a private, spiritual end. False knowledge, according to his treatment of the first commandment, produces pride, while true knowledge leads to humility. If Andrewes' great learning were meant only to dazzle his hearers—and it did—that learning would not appear in his private life, for without his audience what motive remains to display it? This vast learning, however, is prominent in his prayers, and the overall effect it conveys is humility. He primarily builds his prayers from Scripture, but in keeping with his deep sense of communion with the Church universal, he does not stop there—even Knox's order of worship aids him in his impassioned efforts. Yet in spite of his indebtedness to others, his prayers are original and energetic, for he weaves together the different sources into a fabric of his own making. It is not enough to pull these sources into one place; he actually changes the text to make them speak for himself, as

³ Trevor Owen notes additional sources in his brief treatment of the *Preces* (*Lancelot Andrewes* 52).

will be seen. Further, it is obvious that his vast learning was not simply focused on his private devotional life: Brightman observes that one of the profound aspects of the private prayers is the close relationship they bear with Andrewes' sermons:

The devotions are in fact an abstract of the sermons, the sermons a development and expansion of the devotions. The things which he delivers to the Church are the things in which he habitually "exercises himself day and night"; they have been proved and tested in his own heart; and the essence of his public teaching is distilled into suggestion for his own devotion. (Brightman, Intro. to *Private Devotions* 59)

Brightman's analysis suggests that there is a rhythmic breathing quality, an inhaling and exhaling of thoughts and themes that exist between Andrewes' prayers and sermons. It comes as no surprise, then, when sermons become vessels for the themes of his prayers, and his prayers contract the essence of his sermons. In fact, his sermons often include prayers as part of his message, not unlike some of Paul's letters. This symbiotic relationship between his prayers and sermons suggests at the very least a consistency between his public and private life. Thus, characteristics of *Preces Privatae* serve as markers of his conscience hard at work, and as a supplement to his teaching on the Decalogue, the multifarious devotional themes found here effectively provide an opening into the man's mind and heart.

The Structure

While structural details in themselves can be lethal to alertness, benefit comes from understanding that that structure manifests the thoughts and habits of a person's life. To this end, some general observations help clarify that his liturgical practice serves as a framework to order his thoughts and emotions. It is not, as some modern assessments surmise, a rigid form that cramps spontaneity, creating a rote and perfunctory

performance. Rather, the structure enables greater freedom and range of expression by virtue of its balanced and comprehensive ordering of the multifaceted nature of life. For Andrewes, proper order simply reflects God's order in the universe. In fact, the framework he uses is that found in Genesis as God frames the world in six days and then rests. God's own order of work then serves to guide the theme of prayer for that day, as will be seen shortly in the two selections chosen as examples. Additionally, the seven creation prayers follow divisions derived from liturgical tradition. Trevor Owen perceives these divisions in the following manner:

The morning prayers for a week are effectively structured. The typical pattern, after brief introductory rubrics from the Psalms, consists of a ten-fold division: Commemoration, Deprecation, Comprecation, Faith, Hope, Intercession, Blessing, Commendation, and Praise. (53)

Apparently, he is including the introductory rubrics as among the ten divisions. His "ten-fold division" is not always clearly delineated in the text, however, and a more general approach is proposed by Thomas S. Kepler, noting six guiding partitions for worship: "(1) meditation and adoration (introduction), (2) confession of sin, (3) prayer for grace, (4) confession of faith (profession), (5) intercession, (6) thanksgiving and praise" (Intro. *The Private Devotions* xxi). I employ both of these suggested patterns to examine the structure, content, and language of Andrewes' prayers based on the first and sixth days of creation.

The simplest means to display the organization is first to lay out the content and then observe the patterns of spiritual discipline that the form denotes. Andrewes gave his devotions and meditations to William Laud in two volumes: the first volume was "in Greek and well planned, the second volume in Latin with less careful organization" (Kepler *xix-xx*). Since for the purpose of this study only the first volume will be used, the

second volume's orderliness is not a concern. Nevertheless, Drake's table of contents reveals well the first volume's organization compared to that of the second:

The Times of Praier. p. 2
The Places of Praier p. 4
The Gestures of the Bodie denoting the Affections of the Soul p. 6
Praisers Preparatorie to all our Devotions p. 8
At our En'trance into the Church p. 9
Morning Praier p. 15
Sundaie p. 36
Mundaei p. 90
Tuesdaie p. 115
Wensdaie p. 132
Thursdaie p. 165
Freidaie p. 187
Saturdaie p. 214 (Wing A3135 p.17)

The contents of the second volume are as follows:

A form of Praier for all the World, and particularly for our special Relations. p. 237
A Recommendation of our selves and ours to Gods blessing p. 240
Praisers Preparatorie to all our Thanksgivings p. 242
A Form of Thanksgiving for Temporal and Spiritual Blessings p. 243
A Letanie to be used upon special occasions of Public or Private Humiliations p. 243
Hosanna in the Highest. Or, a Supplication for Spiritual Blessings p. 267
Hosanna upon Earth. Or, a supplication for Temporal Blessings p. 274
Evening Praier p. 281
A Praier for all Estates p. 300
Praisers for Holy Communion p. 302
Special Duties recommended to Christian People p. 318. (p.17)

Drake's version of the *Praes* shows no division between the volumes, but a cursory glance reveals that the latter prayers are topical in nature and are not ordered by biblical texts in nearly the same fashion as the first. The quality of the prayers offered in the second volume are equally shot through with scriptural references, patristic writings, and liturgical influences, sharing in the same passionate pursuit of holiness, but the structural tautness derived from Genesis is not evident.

On the other hand, immediately apparent in the first volume's structure is the importance of preparation. By foregrounding the times, places, and even the appropriate bodily gestures that reflect the "affections of the soul," the serious nature of prayer comes into sharp relief. Prayer is seen as an entrance into the presence of God, and none should presume to do so lightly; thus, preparation of the heart is needed and appropriate incentives are supplied. For example, the times of prayer are all encompassing, for there is no inappropriate time, and supporting Scriptures are provided: "Alwaies" pray. Luke 18.1; pray unceasingly. 1 Thes. 5.17; "At all seasons pray. Ephes. 6.18" (2). The places, too, are comprehensive: "in all places, wheresoever I record My Name, I will com unto thee, and I will bless thee. Exod. 20.24." More places follow in quick succession: within the congregation, the closet, to pray in secret, on the "hous-top," in "the Temple," "in the Garden," and in "Wilderness," all of which are supported by biblical instances of prayers offered in such places (Wing A3135 4, 5). The suppliant's body should reflect the affections of the soul—the heart's deepest feelings—and respond accordingly. There ought to be: "Bowling of the knees, falling on the knees, and on the face," for the Psalmist declares, "My soul is brought low even unto the dust; my bellie cleaveth unto the ground. Ps 44.25" (6). These actions speak of "humility and dejection of the soul," while "bowing of the head" and "smiting of the brest" display "shamefastness" and "indignation," respectively. Trembling, sighing, wringing of the hands, uplifted eyes and hands, and even "chastising and keeping the bodie under" all signify various states of the affections appropriate to prayer (6, 7). Prayer, construed in this fashion, is not a passive thing; it demands a single-mindedness and focus of the mind, soul, and body. To spend five hours a day in prayer and meditation—Andrewes' consistent personal practice—

requires discipline of a high order; if the body is not involved and doing its part in prayer, if it succumbs to comfort or inactivity, sleep will come.

Andrewes' spiritual intensity is barely warming to his purpose, though, for the contents indicate that a preparatory prayer is needed. That prayer declares the essential attitudes spoken of in his exposition of the first commandment: faith and humility:

O Thou that hearest praier, unto Thee shall all flesh come;
Even my flesh shal come:
My misdeeds prevail against me;
O be Thou merciful unto my sins. (Wing A3135 8)

Clearly evident in his own approach to prayer, Andrewes evinces in the first two lines the kind of faith he exhorts his hearers to in his preface to the Decalogue. Coming before God means believing that he hears his people and that there will be an accounting. The next two lines acknowledge the fallen condition of the suppliant and the need for mercy. His humility in light of his "misdeeds" prompts this confession.

Returning to the structural aspect of the work, a prayer is offered upon entrance into the church—the spiritual company of saints and angels—that is at once remarkable for its use of the first person singular. Only three times in the course of this particular prayer does he use the first person plural pronouns "we" or "us." Contrasted with the thirty-four times that he refers to himself in this context, a strongly personal dimension is immediately apparent (9-14). Primary among these self-references are an overwhelming number of penitential expressions. Several examples ensue: "[H]ear the voice of my humble petitions, when I crie unto Thee; when I hold up my hands toward the Mercie-seat of Thy Holie Temple" (9); "Wo is me, I have sinned against Thee, O Lord, I have sinned against Thee. How evilly have I don? And yet Thou hast not requited me, according to my sins" (12); and, "I have sinned, I have don perversely, I have committed

wickedness; Lord, I know the plague of my own heart, and, behold, I return unto Thee with all my heart, and with all my might” (Wing A3135 12, 13). Two dimensions of his contrition are evident in this series of confessions; the first is the general sense of his sinful condition, and the second reveals that his condition results in particular sinful deeds. In short, the “plague” of his own heart erupts into sinful actions.⁴ These two dimensions combine to create a movement toward restoration and forgiveness, found at “the mercie-seat.”

How does one come to such a seemingly grim self-concept? Here, the use of the moral law is demonstrated in prayer. The well-informed conscience—with the law as the “schoolman”—cannot but recognize the poverty of one’s soul: the human condition. In turn, this recognition, as Andrewes emphasizes in his teaching in the Decalogue, moves the afflicted soul to seek refuge in Christ. Modern sensibilities easily find such breast-beating unbalanced and unhealthy, but in terms of its historical context, it was the expected normative response of the devout.⁵ Thorough self-examination guided by the Law was part of a traditional practice in both the Eastern and Western Church. What we

⁴ Nicholas Lossky notes that the most recent twentieth-century biographer of Andrewes, Paul A. Welsby, (*Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626*, London 1958) believes that such expressions were autobiographical. Welsby, using the Essex affair as a gloss on Andrewes’ psychological angst, finds such penitential and intense language caused by his guilt over this compromise. Lossky observes that a simple leafing through a “Byzantine *Horologion* or the *Canon* of St. Andrew of Crete” reveals similar examples of spiritual expressions (*note* 1, 7).

⁵ An example of such a treatment by John Owen, *Temptation and Sin*, is even more demanding in its relentless examination of the corruptions of the heart, well over 600 pages in the quarto version. An outstanding seventeenth-century Congregationalist scholar in his own right, Owen assisted with the writing of *The Westminster Confession* (1647)—he also served Cromwell as a chaplain for a time (*Works* vol. 6).

find expressed in these deprecations are best understood as sincere and devout cries of the heart seeking rest, relief, and power to overcome the weakness inherent in the flesh.

Having aptly prepared his soul, Andrewes begins his devotions with a morning prayer filled with both praise and petitions. He praises God for “sleep,” “for the refreshing of my weakness, and for the eas of my labors of this flesh subject to weariness” (Wing A3135 15). He asks:

[t]hat this daie and every daei may come on perfect, holie, peaceable, healthful, and without sin [...] that an Angel of peace, a faithfull guide, a Guardian of our souls and bodies, may pitch a tent about us, and ever suggest what is needful for my salvation” (15-16).

Other such requests continue, all of which underline a profound sense of dependence upon God’s providential care over him and fellow Christians. Incorporating prayers from Chrysostom and exhortations from Philippians 4:8, he asks that God will grant a “Christian end of our life, without sin, without shame, and, if Thou think good, without Pain, and a good Apologie at the dreadful and terrible Tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ” (17-18). The opening “morning prayer” extends for another eighteen pages, warming Andrewes (and subsequent readers) to the work of praise, confession, repentance, thanksgiving, and supplication. After his prayer upon awakening, Andrewes then follows the Genesis pattern of creation. His prayers reflect the Creator’s work in six days, and two examples will sufficiently demonstrate how his prayers are inspired by the created elements of the respective days. After considering these in detail, some general observations applicable to the workings of his conscience follow.

“Sundaie”

In that Sunday is first day of the week in the Christian tradition, and on that day God called forth light, Andrewes opens his prayer with the theme of light in mind:

Glorie be to Thee,
O Lord,
Glorie be to Thee, who createdst the Light, to enlighten the world.
The Visible Light:
The Beam of the Sun;
The Flame of the Fire;
The Daie and Night;
The Evening and Morning. (Wing A3135 36-37)

He revels in the many sources of physical light, and their arrangement invites a contemplation of the distinct qualities they display. He continues, then, considering another kind of light entirely, the light derived from Scripture:

The Intelligible Light:
That which is Known of God;
Written in the Law.
The Oracles of the Prophets;
The Melodie of the Psalms:
The Instruction of the Proverbs;
The Knowledge of Histories. (38)

Each of these spiritual sources of light reflects one of the five different categories of Scripture, witnessing to the central role that God’s revelation has in Andrewes’ theology. This theme recurs throughout his prayers in other iterations and in the multiple numbers of biblical verses that he employs.

Yet there is another kind of light for which God must receive praise, for he then turns to consider “[t]he Eternal Light, without anei Evening” (38). Here, his thoughts turn to “an Holi-daei” established in eternity that connotes a place of eternal refuge, symbolized by our “crowding up even to the horns of the Altar.” The Old Testament allusion refers not only to one who is spared judgment by “taking hold of the horns of the

altar,” a provision of the Mosaic law found in Deuteronomy, but it is also alludes to the sacrificial work entailed at an altar and thus serves to move his thoughts to the resurrection of Christ, the Lamb who was slain, yet lives. Christ manifests this eternal light: “By Thy Resurrection raise us unto newness of life, affording unto us the means of Repentance” (Wing A3135 38). Having been the recipient of this light, the only appropriate response is to repent, and repentance then follows in a very full fashion. He opens this section of confession with another request that will provide the steadfastness he needs to remain faithful: “O Thou, who, upon *This* Daie, didst send down Thy most Holie Spirit upon Thy Disciples, withdraw not the same again from us, but renew it daily in us” (39). After supplicating God for the presence of God’s Spirit, yet another source of light, the confession begins in earnest:

Merciful and gracious Lord, long suffering and of great pitie, I have sinned, Lord, I have sinned against Thee. O wretched man that I am! I have sinned against Thee, O Lord, I have greatly and grievously sinned; and that by giving heed to vanitie and lies. (49)

No enumeration of specific sins of speech is needed, for Andrewes is intimately acquainted with the exacting standards laid out in the ninth commandment. In the light of this knowledge, he readily acknowledges his complicity with vanity and lies: he has, no doubt, heard flattery, half-truths, and mendacious comments aplenty within the courts of both the church and the king. His conscience labors under this burden and finds expression in such a prayer.

He continues in this vein, alternating between confessing his sinfulness and his sins, pleading for God’s grace and mercy:

I am moved with indignation,
I take vengeance on myself,
I am displeased with myself,

I abhor and chasten myself,
that I do it no better,
that I do it no fuller.
I repent, Lord; Lord, I repent: [...]
Cleanse Thou me from my secret faults;
Keep Thy servant also from presumptuous sins.
Make Thy mercies to be admired over me, who am an high and notorious
sinner. (Wing A3135 48-49)

It is important to remember that he says such things in the framework of the theme of light. The light of the Word that shines on his darkness and the eternal light of Christ the Light of the world move him to this energetic and impassioned recognition of his dire state. He continues in this fervent state for another forty pages. One would think he would run short of material, but he does not. The light from the scriptural categories that open his prayer—namely the prophets, the law, the wisdom literature, the histories, and the Psalms—serve as courts of judgment that scrutinize his conscience and provoke further confession and petitions.

An example from the category of the “Knowledge of Histories” appears midstream in his prayer: the histories include, of course, the Gospels themselves, and it is in their light that Andrewes finds confidence to bring himself with all of his faults into the light of God’s presence. In a lengthy litany, he not only speaks of the historic record, but he also includes in his prayer the effects that Christ’s life and work procure:

Supplie the defects of my weak faith.
Grant me also to love the Father, for His tender love.
To adore the Almighty for His Power.
To commit the keeping of my soul to him, in wel-doing, as unto a faithful
Creator. Grant me to enjoie
From Jesus Christ the only begotten Son, salvation, anointing,
Adoption.
To serve the Lord for his Conception, in faith,
For His Nativitie in Humilitie,
For His Sufferings, in Patience and Antipathie to Sin.
For His Cross, in Crucifying all the occasions of Sin.

For His Death, in Mortifying the Flesh.
 For his Burial, in Burying my bad purposes by good works.
 For His Descent, in Meditation upon Hell.
 For His Resurrection, in Newness of Life.
 For His Ascension, in Setting my affection on things above.
 For His Session, in Seeking those better things at His Right hand.
 For His Return, in Aw of His Second coming.
 For His Judgment, in Judging myself, before I am com to be judged.
 From the Spirit, to receive the Breath of saving Grace.
 To be partaker
 In the Church, of Vocation;
 In the Holie Church, of Sanctification;
 In the Catholic Church, of Distribution and Communication,
 Of the Holie Mysteries, Praiers, Fastings, Groans, Watchings, Tears and
 suffering of afflictions.
 To a firm persuasion of the Remission of my sins.
 To a confident Hope
 Of Resurrection and Translation to Life Eternal. (Wing A3135 62-65)

This creed-like Trinitarian recitation begins in eternity in adoration of the Father and culminates at the judgment seat at the end of time. Its dominant focus, though, is that of the Nicene Creed: Christ. Included in its fast-paced summation of Christ's work are benefits that work brings to believers, but that corporate dimension is not central to his purpose. Instead, he asks that *he* might personally experience these benefits as he serves this Lord. In fact, the line that speaks eloquently to Andrewes' present enjoyment is that through Christ's Spirit, he has already judged himself. By virtue of judging himself by the light supplied by God, Andrewes is bold in his prayers, confident that he accurately understands himself and God in that all-searching light. The only reasonable conclusion to which he can come is that he is a sinner, invited to commune with a holy God through the intercessory work of Christ.

To conclude this examination of his Sunday prayer requires a synopsis of his movement to his closing requests. The entire prayer is profoundly Trinitarian in nature, addressing each member of the Trinity with petitions appropriate to their theologically

distinct economic roles but ever aware of the ontological unity of essence unique to orthodox Christianity. This aspect of his prayer expands the requests laid out before God, and every dimension of life is treated as needing the aid of this benevolent and righteous heavenly Father. After Andrewes has presented his personal contrition, praise, and requests, he remembers the needs of others (Wing A3135 67). Included in these are “all thy creatures,” “all mankind,” “the helpless,” “all in anie necessitie, and stand in need of Thy help,” the “sick of Heresie and Sin,” “Thy Congregation, whom Thou hast purchased,” “all Governments,” and “this Island and Countrie” (67-73).

Having mentioned several of the realms wherein authority operates, his thoughts turn logically to the authorities who rule. Demonstrating a consistent application of a principle from the fifth commandment regarding rulers—magistrates as nursing fathers and mothers—Andrewes, in his address to “the Lord of Lords,” is ever mindful of the derivative nature of earthly authority; the prayer is quite general up to the point that he reaches England’s sovereign. As is readily apparent below, Andrewes’ attention suddenly shifts to a central concern marked by the small prepositional phrase, “above all”; here, his prayer for James I takes a more focused turn:

O Thou, who art the Lord of Lords, and Prince of Princes,
Be mindful of all Princes, to whom Thou hast given Right to rule upon
earth.

But, above all, be mindful of our most Gracious King, preserved by Thee;
Work mightily with Him, and prosper Him in all things;
Speak good unto His soul, for Thy Churches, and for Thy Peoples sake;
Grant unto Him a settled peace, which maie not be taken away;
That in His prosperitie we maie lead a quiet and peaceable life in all
godliness and honestie. (73-74 *italics added*)

“But,” that marvelous contrasting conjunction, sets up the shift to the intensified petition. The prayer itself on behalf of James I derives in large part from St. Paul’s instructions to

Timothy: “I exhort therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for Kings, and for all that are in authority, *that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness, and honesty*” (1 Tim. 2: 1, 2 *italics added*). Andrewes’ prayer and St. Paul’s exhortation underline the close correlation between the welfare of authority with that of the “Churches” and God’s people. In view of this correlation, petitions on behalf of those in authority are not only wise, they are imperative.

For those who argue that Andrewes at least borders on sycophancy towards the king, if not falls completely into it, prayers such as this might seem to provide support.⁶ Utilizing expressions of like nature from his sermons and his expositions elsewhere, those unfamiliar with this traditional precedent can readily impute a character flaw to Andrewes. After all, that a bishop would ask God to prosper the king “in all things” appears excessive. In the context of the prayer, however, given that Andrewes plainly eschews vanity, vices, and worldliness, the “all” pertains entirely to the things that are godly. Moreover, when St. Paul wrote to Timothy, Nero reigned, an emperor notorious even by Roman standards for his unprincipled conduct and for his persecution of Christians. The principle is evident: regardless of the moral state of the king, prayers on his behalf are incumbent upon believers. Additionally, the contrast between King James I’s professed support of Christianity and that of Nero’s brutal opposition warrants Andrewes’ sense of gratitude for his sovereign’s professed allegiance to Christ. Considering such, the seemingly unstinting support of Andrewes for a Christian king is grounded, not in the king’s divinely-endowed right to rule, nor his personal conduct, but

⁶ Several scholars have taken such a position: Maurice Reidy, Peter Welsby, Adam Nicholson, and Thomas Nowak.

in his position to bring good to the cause of Christ. The text plainly requires such a reading, especially in that the intercession continues with the request that God “speak good unto [the king’s] soul” (Wing A3135 74).

Continuing with Andrewes’ Sunday prayer in the context of James I, it pleads for the king’s deputies:

O Thou, by whom all Powers are ordained, and ordered,
Grant to all that be in eminencie at Court, that they may be eminent in
virtue, and in the Fear of Thee.
The [Privy] Council, Thy holie wisdom.
All that are in power and authoritie over us, that they maie have no power
to do anie thing against the Truth.
The Judges, Thy judgments, that they maie judg all Persons in all Causes,
without prejudices and partialitie. (75)

The text above is yet another instance of Andrewes’ consistent application of his understanding to a duty required under the fifth commandment: pray for those in and under authority. His conscientious discharging of his obligations continues as he moves to those who are under these authorities: “Grant to all the People of this Kingdom, to be subject to their Prince, not only for Wrath, but also for *Conscience* sake” (76). These include “Husbandmen and Dealers in Cattell,” “The Navie and Fishermen,” “Tradesmen,” “Artificers and Workmen, even to the poorest Beggars,” and “all the youth among us, that they maie grow up in wisdom, and stature, and favor with God and men” (77). Moving then to his own “kindred,” those of his “house” and “familie,” “all whom I have received anie benefit from” and “mine enemies” (78-80), he then collects before God’s presence “The Infants, Children, Lads, Youth, Men, Aged. All in Extreme Age and Weakness. The Hungry, Thirstie, Naked, Sick, Prisoners, Strangers, Harborless, Unburied. Such as are possessed by the Divel, and tempted to make themselves away”

(Wing A3135 82-83). The list goes on (83-86), but the point is clear: no one in the realm is neglected, and all stand in need of God's merciful attention.

His conclusion is a stirring doxology that gives thanks for God's attributes.

Echoing *The Book of Common Worship*, he prays:

[I]t is very meet, right, and our bounden dutie, that we should in all, and for all Things, at all Times, in all Places, by all Means, ever, everie where, everie waie, Make mention of Thee, Confess to thee, Bless Thee, Worship Thee, Praise Thee, Sing laud to Thee. Give Thanks to Thee, Creator, Nourisher, Preserver, Governor, Physitian, Benefactor, Perfecter, Lord and Father, King and God. (86-87)

The sheer weight and compression of his descriptors lend speed and substance to his theme, and the doxology races on to consider how the angels, the heavens, the heaven of heavens, and all the celestial powers lend their voices in ceaseless praise of God's communicable and incommunicable attributes (88-89). Sunday's prayer, to put it in understated terms, sheds ample light on Andrewes' convictions, giving full voice to his perception of himself, God, and the world.

"Freidaie"

The second prayer to consider is that of Friday, the sixth day, for Andrewes dwells at length on the creation of mankind as the crowning accomplishment of God's work as recounted in Genesis. While each prayer in this week has its unique theme that springs from the Creator's work of that specific day, this prayer unveils Andrewes' understanding of the image of God and its implications, a dimension important to the discussion of his conscience. At fifty-four octavo pages, it is nearly exactly half the length of the Sunday prayer. The structure here is the same as that of his first prayer: before moving to confession, he first considers the work God performed on that day:

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who didst bring forth of the earth Beasts, Catel,
Creeping things. For Nourishment, Clothing, Help. And did'st make Man
after Thy Image, to have Dominion over the earth; and did'st bless him.
(Wing A3135 187-188)

While the brief summation follows the Genesis 1:24-28 account very closely, Andrewes enlarges on the teleological purpose these other creatures *presently* serve, anticipating a dominion that changes in nature after the fall. In the prelapsarian condition, Adam and Eve are naked and are given “every herb bearing seed, which is upon all the earth, and every tree, wherein is the fruit of a tree bearing seed: that shall be to you for meat” (Gen. 1: 29). In Andrewes’ construction, the animals not only provide clothing and help, but nourishment. Furthermore, while one could assert that fig leaves work as clothing, the point that is uppermost in the biblical text is that these were inadequate, for the postlapsarian picture depicts God providing Adam and Eve with the skins of animals (Gen. 3:21). This move by Andrewes to treat of God’s provision in the postlapsarian world seems best explained by his ever-present acknowledgment of humanity’s sinful condition. In turn, this awareness heightens the sense of mercy and compassion that God pours out on his creatures. Andrewes then considers “the Consultation” that shapes the creation of man:⁷

The Work of His hands.⁸
The Breath of Life.⁹
The Image of God.¹⁰
The Setting him over the Works.¹¹ (Wing A3135 188)

⁷ Richard Drake inserts into a brief explanation of this “Consultation,” adding “[of the blessed Trinitie about him] (Wing A3135 188).

⁸ Cf. Ps. 138: 8

⁹ Cf. Gen. 2: 7

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 1: 26

¹¹ *Ibid.* 1: 28; Ps. 8: 6

The progression of his thought begins with the forming of Adam from the earth, then the imparting of life vis-à-vis the gift of God's "ruach"—the Hebrew word for breath, wind, or spirit. With this impartation, this animated being becomes the creature that reflects God's image. Possessing it, Adam is then equipped to superintend the other works of God. Andrewes sets up the dignity bequeathed upon mankind and obliquely infers the height from which "Man" has fallen. Such an exalted position as a vice-regent has attendant attributes that equip him for his calling, for, along with "The Charge" which God gives "to the Angels concerning him" (Wing A3135 189), man receives:

Paradise.
Heart, Reins,
Eies, Ears,
Tongue, Feet.
Life,
Sense, Reason,
Spirit, Freewill.
Memorie, Conscience. (189)

The balanced and paired arrangement of the words convey the symmetry involved in man's creation, while the solitary word in the midst of the pairs—"Life"—functions as a fulcrum that balances the material aspects of man with the immaterial, for on each side of "life" stand three paired descriptors. The last two mentioned are especially important to Andrewes, and his continual use of his own memory and conscience serve as examples to others. Given these physical and spiritual qualities, humanity is now distinguished from the rest of creation.

Even with these distinctive attributes, however, the fall so affected mankind that God cannot be known apart from special revelation. Andrewes immediately returns to the categories laid out in his first prayer: "That which is Known of God; Written in the

Law; The Oracles of the Prophets, The Melodie of the Psalms, The Instruction of the Proverbs; The Knowledge of Histories,” and here, an additional category appears: “The Service of Sacrifices” (Wing A3135 189-190). Sacrifices imply worship and propitiation, and the greatest service of sacrifice rendered was by Christ on Good Friday on behalf of the human race. The phrase—“The Service of Sacrifices”—is a pivotal point for Andrewes as he turns to remember Good Friday, referenced in his prayer as “This Daie”:

Blessed art thou, O Lord, for thy great and precious Promise, on This Daie, concerning That Life-giving seed; and for fulfilling therof in the fullness of time upon This Daie. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for Thy Holie Passions on This Daie. O, by Thy saving Passions on This Daie, save us, O Lord. (190-191)

Besides the many scriptural allusions here, there is found in this shift to the passion of Christ a crucial expression of Andrewes’ theology; specifically, it is the centrality of Christ’s work. Without it, all of Andrewes’ “breast-beating” and cries of anguish, his “filthiness, and superfluitie of naughtiness” (172) would sink him into despair. Instead, the traversing back and forth from his miserable state of darkness into the light of the only begotten Son are movements from humiliation to exaltation. As he comfortingly reminds himself, “I have an Advocate, with Thee, to Thee, Thine only begotten Son the Righteous. Let Him be the propitiation for my sins, who is for the sins of the whole world” (171).¹² His conscience has no other source of relief, nor does it ever seek any.

Having introduced the passion of Christ, Andrewes now returns to the theme of confession, for he accepts that his sins produced Christ’s suffering: “I have stood out against Thee, O Lord, but I return unto Thee; I am weakened by mine iniquities; But I

¹² While these two references actually come from the Thursday prayer, the theme resonates throughout the *Preces Privatae*.

take with me words, and turn to Thee, saying, Forgive my sin, and receive my praier” (Wing A3135 191). And later, with yet more vigorous and vivid terms, he presents himself to the Lord’s view:

Behold me O Lord, clothed with filthie garments;
Behold Satan standing at my right hand.
And by the blood of Thy Covenant, O Lord, in that fountain opened for
the purging of all uncleanness,
Take away mine iniquities, and cleanse my sins.
Save me, as a brand pluck’d out of the fire. (195-196)

In Andrewes’ framework, the sixth day when God created man corresponds to Good Friday, now foremost in Andrewes’ thoughts: he pleads for cleansing “in that fountain opened for the purging of all uncleanness” (195). Moreover, while “the blood of Thy Covenant” looks back to the institution of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday, the actual shedding of that blood was on Friday. The next lines place him underneath the cross itself, applying to his own condition the words of Christ, the prayer of one of the thieves crucified with Christ, and Stephen’s prayer:

Father, forgive me; for I know not, in truth I know not, what I have don, in
sinning against Thee.¹³
Lord remember me, when Thou comest into Thy Kingdom.¹⁴
Lord, repaie not mine enemies their sins.¹⁵ (196)

The plea that the Lord not repay Andrewes for his sins rests squarely on the work of Christ leading up to and including Good Friday. By adapting Scripture to reflect his personal involvement in the event, Andrewes creates a profound sense of identification with the past. He displaces himself from seventeenth-century England and journeys to

¹³ Cf. Luke 23:34 “Then said Jesus, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.”

¹⁴ *Ibid* 23:42

¹⁵ Cf. Acts 7:60

Calvary. Thus, his next development recalls the passion entailed in that journey to the cross and contemplates the suffering inflicted on the Lord by his sin. The justification for God not repaying Andrewes is found in Christ's payment:

By Thy Sweat, and great drops of Blood;
By The Agonie of Thy Soul;
By Thy Head, crown'd with Thorns, set on with staves;
By Thy Weeping Eies;
By Thy Ears, fill'd with revilings;
By Thy Mouth, given vinegar and gall to drink;
By Thy Face, shamefully defil'd by spitting;
By Thy Neck, loaded with the burthen of the Cross;
By Thy Back, furrow'd with stripes and wounds;
By Thy Hands and Feet digg'd;
By Thy Strong Crie, Eli, Eli;
By Thy Heart, pierc'd with the spear;
By Thy Water and Blood running out;
By Thy Bodie broken;
By Thy Blood shed. (Wing A3135 196-198)

The images are drawn directly from descriptions of Christ's passion beginning in the Garden of Gethsemane and climaxing at his death on the cross. The rhetoric lends power to the picture as phrases progressively expand and contract from "thy sweat and great drops of blood" to the decrescendo of the four, hushed, monosyllabic words: "by thy blood shed." Andrewes' meditation takes a spiritual journey from the creation of man to his fall, and to his redemption, but this journey must first recount Christ's suffering before relief can come. The repetition of the causative expression, "by thy," could appropriately translate as "by the means of" and speaks of the efficacious nature of Christ's suffering to remove the penalty of sin. His life's oblation, his passive obedience supplies Andrewes' deficiencies.

Additionally, by naming the various parts of Christ's suffering body—his head, eyes, heart, hands, feet, ears, mouth, neck and back—Andrewes reflects on two important

things. The first is the full humanity of Christ, represented by the graphic details such as the thorn-crowned head set on with staves, the face covered with spit, the neck burdened by the cross, the heart pierced with the spear, the back furrowed with stripes and wounds, and the hands and feet “digged.” While such a description might cause some to turn away, Andrewes looks directly at the spectacle of degradation, contemplating the price of his failings. He also looks back to the creation account when man, bearing the *Imago Dei*, failed to remain “set over the works” of God’s hands, failing to control his own life, sense, reason, spirit, free will, memory, and conscience. These are the things that Christ successfully controlled, even under the cruel treatment he endured.

Even then, the pattern of repentance, confession, absolution, and renewal must continue, for spiritual declension and renewal are represented in the human experience throughout the Scriptures. The Psalms especially portray this struggle, and Andrewes makes full use of them, but with a different focus, similar to his appropriating of the passion narrative. For example, Psalm 85 is actually a corporate prayer in the original Hebrew and the Septuagint versions, and it is translated in the past perfect tense in the third person plural voice: verses 2-3), “Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, and covered all their sins. Thou hast withdrawn all thine anger, and hast turned back from the fierceness of thy wrath” (1599 Genevan version). The Psalm starts off asserting God’s favor (vv. 1-3) but subsequently shifts to a less assured tone (vv. 4-7). Andrewes adapts these passages in the following manner: “Lord, forgive the offense of Thy servant; and cover all his sins. Take away all Thy displeasure; and turn Thy self from Thy wrathful indignation” (Wing A3135 199). His adaptation makes the Psalm apply to his personal, present need for God’s favor. And though one could cavil that the third person singular

that he uses might refer to another and not himself, the next petition he borrows from Psalm 85: 4 changes from “Turn us, O God of our salvation,” to “Turn me, O God of our salvation” (Wing A3135 199). Clearly, he is making the psalm applicable to his own condition.

There is still another way that the psalm is transformed, for Andrewes’ personalized rendition of it is a *request* for three verses, as opposed to an assertion. He then moves to an assurance not evident in the original: “O God, Thou *wilt* turn again, and quicken us; and Thy people *shall* rejoice in Thee” (199-200 *italics added*). In the more literal Genevan version, a close translation from Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, the same passage poses a question: “Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, that thy people may rejoice in thee?” (Ps. 85: 6). The difference between the two approaches is palpable.

What does Andrewes’ different approach signify? To discern this, the effect must be considered. He is decidedly more positive, initially asking God to “turn back” to His people, and then displaying confidence in the future fulfillment. That of the Genevan translation shifts from a past-completed action of forgiveness to one of a tenuous quality that lacks the assurance of Andrewes’ adaptation. Given that Andrewes writes from the New Testament perspective, and having himself experienced many turnings from sorrow to joy, from sin to forgiveness, from groans to praise, his adaptation of the Psalm to his personal spiritual state is perfectly sound. The warrant for the greater optimism is the greater amount of light that breaks forth from the New Testament.

Further evidence for this reading comes from the startling shift that now appears in the Friday prayer. Andrewes leaves Psalm 85, having utilized only six of its thirteen verses. Instead, apparently as proof of God’s turning his people and granting them

salvation, he turns to lists that contrast the works of the flesh with the fruit of the Spirit.

Taken from St. Paul's letter to the Galatians and arranged as they are, they become

echoes of epic catalogues of vices and virtues:

The Works of the Flesh.
Adulterie,
Fornication,
Uncleaness,
Lasciviousness.
Idolatrie.
Witchcraft.
Hatred,
Variance,
Emulations,
Wrath,
Strife,
Sedition,
Heresies,
Envyings,
Murthers,
Drunkeness,
Revellings, and such like.¹⁶ (Wing A3135 200)

In contrast, “the fruit of the Spirit” consists of:

Love,
Joie,
Peace,
Long-suffering,
Gentleness,
Goodness,
Faith,
Meekness,
Temperance.¹⁷ (201)

How such lists convey a confident sense of God's turning to his people—a metaphor of restoration—requires something more than mere lists can provide. It is helpful, perhaps, to recognize that the first heading manifests a heart that is dead, “unquickened,” and the

¹⁶ Cf. Gal. 5: 19-21.

¹⁷ Cf. Gal. 5: 22-23.

second supplies the effects of the Spirit who turns and tunes the heart. Greater clarity comes, however, in the next scriptural reference. Andrewes uses Isaiah 11: 2—“And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and strength, the Spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord”—a passage long identified as a prophecy about Christ, and compresses this Messianic text into a shorthand of sorts: “The Spirit of Wisdom, Understanding, Council, Might, Knowledge, Godliness, The Fear of the Lord” (Wing A3135 201-202). What does this compression serve, though? Andrewes uses one of those attributes God bestowed upon man (memory, to be specific) to underline Pentecost—Whitsunday in *The Book of Common Prayer*—when Christ sent his Spirit upon the disciples. To the biblically and liturgically-alert reader, this densely-packed allusion would trigger the remembrance of Christ’s gift of the promised Spirit—the Comforter spoken of in John 14. The event marks the fulfillment of the promise to turn their hearts back from sin and the works of the flesh. It is the restoration of the shattered image of God, for God imparts to the Church, through the mediation of Christ, his own Spirit. As if to reinforce this conclusion, the Spirit’s gifts to the newborn Church follow immediately:

The Word of Wisdom;
The Word of Knowledge;
Faith;
The Working of Miracles;
Prophecie;
Discerning of Spirits;
Divers Kinds and Interpretation of Tongues.¹⁸ (202)

These signs testify to the presence of God through the work of the apostles and the establishing of the Church. The promised restoration has occurred, for those who are in

¹⁸ Cf. 1 Cor. 12:8-10

Christ are new creatures, created for good works and renewed in the true image of God. Thus, once again Andrewes returns to the theme with which he began, that of God's creation of mankind:

Lord, I believe,
That Thou didst Create me,
Despise not the work of Thine own hands.
That according to Thy Image and Likeness,
Suffer not Thy Likeness to be blotted out.
That Thou didst Redeem me with Thy Blood,
Suffer not the price of Thy Redemption to be lost. (Wing A3135 203)

Andrewes believes that God created him because his heart is turned to seek after God, to enjoy the fruit of the Spirit, and to rest in the redemption of Christ. He ends this profession by revealing his renewed desire and his fortified hope: "My soul fainteth with longing for Thy salvation; and I have a good Hope because of Thy Word" (205). This declaration of hope enables Andrewes to rest in Christ and turn his attention to intercede for others; it marks the opening of petitions befitting the restoration of God's image in humanity in Christ.

His intercessory prayers for the sixth day smoothly shift from the first person singular to the hortatory plural, "Let us praie," "our Holie Fathers," and "For all that hate us and love us," for he is not the sole beneficiary of Christ's ministry of grace and truth, but only one among many (205). He numbers himself among those who have received the Spirit, and together they breathe out the prayers for the saints, their endeavors, and even the fruit of the earth:

Let us praie
For the prosperitie and strengthening of all Christian Armies against the
enemies of our most Holie Faith.
For our Holie Fathers, and all our Brethren in Christ:
For all that hate us and love us;
For all that have mercie upon us, and minister to us;

For all whom we are desired to remember in our prayers:
For the Redemption of the Captives:
For all our Fathers and Brethren who are absent:
For all Sea-faring persons;
For all who are [...] upon the bed of sickness;
For plenty of the fruits of the earth;
For the souls of all Orthodox Christians. (Wing A3135 205-206)

While there is a vague generality present here in this exhortation to prayer, the range and diversity supplies the Christian with ample subjects to pray for in more specific terms, thus enriching the life of prayer.

Having supplied a host of suggestions for intercessory prayer, he then remembers that the law to love one another requires a further exercising of the memory:

Let us commemorate
Our Godlie Kings,
Our Orthodox Prelates,
The Founders of *This* Holie Habitation,
Our Parents, and all our Fore-fathers and Brethren who are gon before
us. (207)

By thus remembering that he does not stand alone, he has discharged his calling to pray for himself and others. The thoroughness with which he sets out the obligations inherent in a godly life exemplify his own spiritual discipline and effectively testify to the integrity of his private practice. In that Andrewes is following a liturgically prescribed order of prayer that has ten different dimensions, he cannot simply leave off the final three elements, though, and thus he continues with the blessing, commendation, and praise. Thus, the blessing commences:

Let Thy mightie hand, O Lord, be my defence;
Thy mercie in Christ, my salvation;
Thy all-true Word, my instruction;
The Grace of Thy quickening Spirit, my consolation, unto the end, and in
the end.
Let the
Soul of Christ sanctifie me;

Bodie of Christ strengthen me;
Blood of Christ redeem me;
Water of Christ cleanse me;
Stripes of Christ heal me;
Sweat of Christ refresh me;
Wounds of Christ hide me.
The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep my heart
and mind, in the knowledg and love of God. (Wing A3135 207-209)

The centrality of Christ stands out prominently in this blessing and underscores yet again the tenor of Andrewes' faith. Every aspect of Christ's suffering supplies an attendant benefit, even the unusual application of Christ's sweat. Concluding as it does with Andrewes' personal appropriation of St. Paul's blessing from Philippians 4:7, no doubt remains that God's peace comes mediated through Christ.¹⁹

The commendation that follows on the heels of the blessing is a fulsome reflection on the Lord's kindness in relation to his people and returns to the Friday theme of mankind's creation, subsequent fall, and redemption:

O Lord, who didst not despise, nor forsake man, transgressing Thy
Commandment, and falling;
But, as a tender-bowel'd Father, didst visit him sundrie waies;
Giving him that Thy great and precious Promise, concerning the *Blessed*
quickenning *Seed*;
Opening unto him a dore of Faith and Repentance unto Life;
And in the fullness of time, sending the same Thy Christ, to take the seed
of Abraham;
And, by the *Oblation* of His *Life*, to fulfill the *Obedience* of the Law;
And, by the *Sacrifice* of His *Death*, to take away the *Curse* thereof;
By His *Death*, to *redeem* the World;
And by His *resurrection* to *quicken* the same;
Who didst all things to this end, to bring back Mankind to Thee, that he
might be partaker of the divine Nature, and of Eternal Glorie:
Who didst attest the *Truth* of Thy Gospel,
By manie and manifold *Miracles*;
By the ever memorable *Conversations* of Thy *Saints*;
By their supernatural *Patience* under Torments;

¹⁹ St. Paul's benediction encompasses the readers of his letter: "The peace of God [...] shall preserve *your* hearts and minds" (1599 Genevan version).

By the most wonderful *Conversion* of the whole world, unto the
Obedience of Faith without Strength, Rhetoric, or Force;
Blessed, praised, celebrated, magnified, highly exalted, glorified, and
hallowed be
Thy Name; the mention and memorie, and all the monuments thereof, both
now and for ever. (Wing A3135 209-212)

Andrewes' commendation is essentially a hymn to God the Father for sending Christ. It is a compendium of the themes Andrewes has previously addressed. It moves from Genesis to Acts and beyond, gathering together a record of God's promises to his people, performed through Christ and by his Spirit. By virtue of its force, Andrewes is now primed to give his attention to appropriately exalt the "second Adam" who successfully opened the "dore of Faith and Repentance."

To close in praise, he borrows directly from the book of Revelation:

Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the seals thereof;
For Thou was slain, and hast redeemed us to God, by Thy Blood, out of
everie Kindred, and tongue, and people, and Nation.
Worthie is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and
Strength, and Honor, and Glorie, and Blessing.
To Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, Blessings, and
Honor, and Glorie, and Power, for ever and ever.
Salvation to our God, who sitteth upon the Throne; and to the Lamb.²⁰
Amen:
Blessing, and Glorie, and Wisdom, and Thanksgiving, and Honor, and
Power, and Might, be unto our God, for ever and ever.²¹ (212-213)

By conjoining five different verses from two of Revelation's adoration scenes, the weight of Andrewes' doxology increases with each repetition of honor, glory, wisdom, might, power, and blessings, for ever and ever. The gathering sense of majesty due to God and the Lamb invites worship and reverential fear, leading the faithful to the only right response for those whose hearts are turned.

²⁰ Cf. Rev. 5: 9, 12, 13

²¹ *Ibid.* 7:10, 12

Some General Observations

Since *A Manual of the Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes* has enjoyed nearly 400 years of being in print, its reputation among the finest of devotional literature is well established. It is more than simply a collection of pious thoughts, for, as demonstrated, Andrewes employs structural and rhetorical elements to great effect, harnessing his skill to serve his master. In what seems a very natural fashion, he creatively adapts his many sources through use of compression and expansion, allusion and voice shifts, conflation and deletion, and juxtaposition and isolation. His language is vivid and concrete, and his diction stirs the imagination to the point of feeling and seeing what he sees and feels. His profundity provokes contemplation and meditation on things never considered. As an example of discipline in the habit of prayer, the church is both enriched and humbled by it. As Alexander Whyte, a Scottish editor of an 1896 edition opines: “for its peculiar purpose and its special use, Andrewes’ *Private Devotions* stands out at the head of them all.”²² There is nothing in the whole range of devotional literature to be set aside [his] incomparable *Devotions*” (31). This kind of enduring reputation could hardly withstand the close scrutiny of so many generations of Christians if it were an insincere work. It is precisely its genuine quality of devotion that makes it valuable as another means to measure Andrewes’ conscience at work.

In the context of the two examples of Andrewes’ creation prayers, strong connections are readily apparent between the Decalogue and the content of his prayers. Andrewes clearly teaches that the Law is meant to reveal God’s perfections and humanity’s imperfections. The attendant effect of seeing his nature in the brilliant light

²² The “all” that he mentions includes Augustine’s *Confessions*, St. Anselm’s *Prayers and Soliloquies*, and Jeremy Taylor’s *The Golden Grove*.

of God's moral beauty moves him to seek mercy through Christ. Even more than in his sermons, Andrewes' prayers show a cyclical movement from heights to depths and back again. In fact, this movement recurs in each of the prayers built on the Genesis pattern. Perhaps the image of breathing, though previously applied to the relationship of his prayers to his sermons, is at least equally apt for the framework found in the well-organized first volume. He exhales his sin and sorrow and inhales grace and mercy, all through the mediation of Christ. From this exchange, he derives his strength to persevere in faith, to pray for himself and others, and to praise the Triune God.

Notable, too, is Andrewes' use of structure to supply breadth and depth to his devotions. Originality of material is not a desirable attribute. Instead, he takes the traditional material and shapes it to his own end, that end being a renewed spirit and a right heart. As he proceeds through his spiritual exercise, a transformation occurs: his anguished cries of deprecation change to sighs of longing for comfort and assurance. In turn, these comforts come through the means of contemplating Christ, hoping in God, and rejoicing in the Spirit's presence. He then calls out to God to aid others. The previous tension created by his own sin ultimately resolves itself into praise and adoration as he meditates on Christ's person and work.

All these observations are true enough in themselves, but what insight into his conscience can be gained from them? To return to an earlier point, I take it as a reliable axiom that what a person is in private is the true measure of that person's character. In his personal pursuit of God, Andrewes is continually reordering his affections, repenting of his wanderings, and seeking grace and mercy to walk humbly and uprightly. The list could extend much longer, but the point would remain the same: his private prayers

match his pulpit proclamations. Andrewes consistently demonstrates that it is Scripture that primarily informs his conscience, and it is this same Scripture that provides relief through its revelation of Christ. He moves to those passages that speak to his condition, whether weary, downtrodden, full of self-deprecation and contrition, or confidently approaching the throne of grace as an eager and assured suppliant. He does not dwell on several easy and comfortable texts. Part of the power of his *Private Devotions* derives from the variety of his selections, and he consciously and conscientiously brings to bear upon his own experience the rich heritage of the church at prayer.

Given these general observations, one may reasonably conclude that the *Preces Privatae* accurately reflects that Lancelot Andrewes' conscience is indeed God's deputy, ruling on His behalf. Even more importantly, Andrewes devoutly seeks to submit to its rule. Thus, when considering how he selects and applies texts for his political sermons, his calling as a preacher, first and foremost, determines his message to the court.

CHAPTER SIX

The Gunpowder Plot Sermons: Encomium and Opprobrium

First and foremost, these sermons are, by their very nature, predominantly epideictic. Both forensic and deliberative elements are certainly present, but they function as either ancillary to or consequent from the qualities of the day under consideration. These displays, or proclamations of virtue and vice, need to be seen as much more than simply state-sponsored expressions, for they reveal what Andrewes values. As articulations of what he believes “the day” represents, the sermons stand as witnesses to his convictions. What Andrewes praises and blames shows the shift in emphasis that occurs over the years, and his conscience’s influence is evident. In a very real sense, Andrewes is required to hold up “this day” to a full examination of its importance for the English to properly respond to God’s favor. How he shapes his message to fit the exigencies of the day demonstrates that his primary interest is spiritually determined, not politically.

Parliament’s proclamation to perpetually commemorate the Fifth of November is perfectly understandable: those who had so narrowly escaped from death ought to mark the occasion. Proclaimed as a day of thanksgiving, the implicit expectation was that the ensuing thanks would invariably be directed toward God, but that in itself leaves a great deal of room for the aggrandizement of the nation. James’ additional decree that required sermons to be preached throughout the land simply gave more focus to the means of marking the day. Framing the event in this manner required clergy across the nation to think creatively about the event. They had, of course, another historical deliverance close

to hand that was similarly seen as providential, and it, too, was lauded in pulpits as a sign of God's blessing upon the nation; however, the destruction of the Spanish Armada in 1588, while followed with great rejoicing, was never promoted in the same official fashion. God was officially praised and given thanks from both the pulpits and the throne, but no Parliamentary proclamation and royal decree "eternalized" it. Andrewes was thirty-three in 1588, and without a doubt rejoiced with the rest of England over that particular victory. Yet as far as precedents in English history go, nothing was available to warrant the exaltation of November 5, 1605, over other deliverances; nothing, that is, except that a new monarch was on the English throne who had just recently escaped a previous attempt on his life.

The Gowrie Plot (August 5, 1601), an event in Scottish history little known today, and not without skeptics of authenticity in its day, did establish that precedent, and James, loving sermons as he did, called for sermons to be preached on that day. However, since that attempt on James' life occurred in Scotland two years before he came to England's throne and was decidedly less dramatic on the national level, the Gunpowder plot serves better as a sign of mercy upon an entire nation. Parliament's and King James I's marking of the date meant the occasion was peculiarly politico-religious. In this vein, Peter McCullough observes:

[I]n the kingdom at large, [...] the Gunpowder and Gowrie sermons were important annual articulations of providential nationalism—the logical outgrowth of the Foxeian myth of England's divine deliverances from the clutches of popery. (*Sermons* 122)

In the context of this providential nationalism, virtues are extolled and vices condemned: right and wrong thoughts, words, and actions are compared and contrasted; the greatness of the deliverance, the mercies of God in Christ, the beauty of holiness, the duties of

righteousness, the dangers of ignorance, sedition, and pride, the wiles of the serpent, the deceitfulness of sin, and worst of all, the cruelty of enemies that would send the King and his subjects flying through the air—all are considered in the light of their qualities of either praise or blame. Praise invariably entails an emphasis on God's goodness in delivering the nation from the igniting of thirty barrels of gunpowder underneath the most important members of England.¹ The blame largely features the heinous nature of the attempted crime and its perpetrators; however, later sermons contain blame directed toward the court's lack of decorum for the occasion and toward absence of works that should manifest thankfulness. By examining the two different epideictic dimensions of several representative sermons spanning the twelve years Andrewes preached them, this movement towards an increased condemnation of the court becomes obvious.

Andrewes' efforts to set forth these contrasting elements make for some gripping reading, but more than that, his efforts also reveal a personal dimension of him in his role of preacher. While T. S. Eliot and Trevor A. Owen effectively argue that Andrewes displays very little of himself in his sermon style compared to John Donne,² it does not follow that self-revelation is absent from these proclamations of God's mercy and the condemnation of schemers' crimes. The means to find them, though, lie in his choice of texts, how he employs them, his subsequent applications of them, his references to the Law and to himself, and the rebukes he delivers. For instance, to analyze the Gunpowder sermons for the presence of Andrewes within the message, informal stock is taken of the

¹ This is Andrewes' figure for the barrel count (1617 sermon). According to Mark Nicholl's sources, it was thirty-six barrels (*Investigating the Gunpowder Plot* 9). Who is to quibble, though? The damage would have been horrific.

² Trevor Owen, pp. 72-73.

frequency with which “I” appears. It was informal in that only the first person pronoun was counted. A more formal approach would also account for possessive pronouns, second person, and third person. Furthermore, the context in which the pronouns appear is important. For example, is the use emphatic so that it distinguishes the speaker from the auditors? What if it is merely an inconsequential self-referent that could serve merely to segue to another point? These kinds of distinctions, while valid, are not distinguished for the purposes of this study. Yet, even a cursory count reveals potential signs of Andrewes’ increased sense of concern. In the course of the ten sermons, he uses “I” approximately 236 times, give or take two or three. Given that these occur over a span of nearly 110 quarto pages, Andrewes uses it sparingly, especially by modern standards. Nevertheless, when viewed individually, a pattern is revealed that suggests something significant. For instance, in his first sermon, preached November 5, 1606, when the memory is still fresh and the inaugural aspect is paramount, it appears twenty-seven times. In the next two sermons, it diminishes to fifteen and thirteen, respectively (1607, 1609), nearly half the number. In his penultimate sermon (1617), one in which he is particularly pointed in his rebuke of the English, “I” appears forty-four times. Such a contrast suggests that sermons containing more self-references display his conscience more fully. Rather than use the occasion to uphold the state's rights and virtues or the king's divine right to rule, or a diatribe against the Society of Jesus and the plotters, he makes the day something more significant and more enduring. The opprobrium is present, but not as an end in itself or even to bolster the political foundations of the nation. Given his recurring themes, his thrust is spiritual: hearers must be moved to gratitude, humility, praise, and service to God.

Besides often being an epideictic form of speech, as a form of literature, sermons have many parallels to drama. They are primarily intended for hearing, so much in the way of delivery and emphasis is lost when merely read. This dimension may account for Andrewes' apparent reticence to put this form of his work into print. Part of my reason for selecting a text published in 1632, is that the punctuation and italics, according to the two men who worked from the manuscripts, changed very little from the way it appeared as Andrewes' preached it.³ Nevertheless, while something is lost between the actual event of preaching and the reading of the same text, the printed version still stands as a reliable record of the preacher's thoughts, doctrine, and practice. A sound understanding of these depends on knowing the historical context in which they were first given. For instance, as an age coming from the "social contract" as the prevailing model for conducting politics, his articulation of the need to unswervingly honor the king seems excessive, even though it is invariably embedded as the Christian's duty. Historical antecedents help explain the role of preachers and preaching. Andrewes himself, when explaining the difference between the time of Elijah and their own times shows a greater sensitivity to time, purpose, and place than many readers.⁴ Sermons, then, are not only revelatory of the preacher, but the times; therefore, some brief historical context will be provided for them.

³ *XCVI Sermons by the Right Honorable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late Lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by His Majesties Special Command. The Second Edition.* Printed by Richard Badger. 1632. The dedication to King Charles from "Gvil. London." and "Io. Eliens." asserts several times that "the lines are the same" as the sermons preached by Andrewes.

⁴ 1609 Sermon.

Contextual Popularity: Andrewes' Privileged Position at Court

It has already been mentioned that Andrewes preached to James I and his court on this occasion more than any other preacher in the realm, and this is entirely due to King James' preference for his style and content. Several reasons for this esteem suggest themselves: Andrewes' learning impressed James enormously. The king styled himself a theologian of sorts, and he certainly was more learned and articulate than many contemporary European rulers. Thus, the learned and closely reasoned style that Andrewes brought to the pulpit appealed to the king. In terms of his style—T. S. Eliot has nominated him the “master of the short sentence”⁵—much has been written, but an observation by Deborah Shuger prods scholars to reconsider what a fresh analysis could bring to this area of seventeenth-century study:

The sacred rhetorics [...] open the possibility of a new history of English Renaissance prose that recognizes a distinctive Christian aesthetic as the basis for meditation, treatise, and sermon [...] that endeavors to make language traverse the ancient dilemma by lifting the emotions and imagination to the supersensible, to express and evoke the reality of divine presence through a communal and passionate inwardness, and to create a style proportioned to both the magnitude and affectivity of spiritual life. The most characteristic features of Renaissance sacred prose (with the exception of an ineradicable taste for sound-play) derive from this endeavor: Andrewes' brevity and drama, Donne's expressivity, the use of vivid detail and paradox of Browne, [...] and] the prevalence of propsopoeia, apostrophe, dramatization, metaphor, interrogatio, and hypotyposis throughout these works. (*Sacred Rhetoric* 253)

This brevity and drama, the obvious enjoyment of word-play, and the intensely keen sense of the divine presence are evident within all Andrewes' sermons. Together, they convey the immediate and palpable sense of God's providential involvement in the affairs

⁵ Owen p. 75.

of men that has power to move hearers (and readers) to “the supersensible,” thus enriching the participant’s spiritual life. Andrewes’ repeated presentations in graphic detail of the effects of the non-existent blast—an example of experiencing the supersensible—attempt to stir thankfulness and promote praise, prayers, and service. If nothing else, these qualities engage a close listener: the king’s contemporaries noted his attentiveness to such sermons, and while he may have slept during some plays, he was not prone to do so during sermons.

Another possible contributing factor for his court presence was Andrewes’ irenic nature, and his more measured approach to the ongoing problem of relations with Catholic Spain had something to commend it. Moreover, Andrewes had been an active figure on the scene of James’ appearance in England. That initial respect and regard on the part of the King only strengthened as the years of his reign continued. The fact that Andrewes served on the Privy Council at James’ request further confirms such. Was that respect and regard mutual? In certain matters, it is highly likely that Andrewes genuinely appreciated aspects of James’ person and policies, especially regarding the church, but Andrewes always seemed mindful of a respectful distance that protected him in his day from accusations of favoritism.⁶

Most significantly, however, Andrewes’ firm commitment to the close connection between God and the king was unshakeable. Of course, Andrewes’ position on this matter would have been the same even if Nero were the king, but his position bolstered the conception that James had articulated in his work *Basilikon Doron*. Due to these

⁶ One instance of this regard occurred when Andrewes entertained the king and his courtiers at his home for three days. His recorded expenditures are listed at £3,500. This lavish amount represents only a small amount of Andrewes’ total estate. Records also show that his almsgiving far exceeded this amount.

aforementioned factors, the perception that Andrewes was frequently compromised in his conscience is understandable. The evidence for this is slim, though, and continuing examination of the historical context of the relationship between the two men indicates otherwise.⁷ Indeed, when Andrewes' Gunpowder sermons are seen in the light of his treatment of the Decalogue and his private prayers, the picture comes into better focus. McCullough notes that some have seen these "political" sermons as "slavish fawning at the king's feet" (*Sermons* 120). He also points out, though, that others of late have examined them in a theological and political light, revealing a more nuanced understanding of Andrewes' Gunpowder sermons.⁸

The Sermons

The development in Andrewes' thought and the subsequent shifts in emphases are revealed in the sermons' texts and his handling of them. He tightly and logically organizes his sermons and clearly articulates each of his points; thus, the uppermost concern is each sermon's primary epideictic theme. Foremost, of course, is "this day"—the Fifth of November—and Andrewes continually treats it as the here-and-now, appropriating the classical *carpe diem* theme and turning it to religious ends. Every sermon emphasizes its present quality, much as the Church holds up Christ's birth, death, resurrection, ascension, and Pentecost. He examines it from multiple perspectives, bringing home its import in ever-vivid detail. As the years progress, he expands on ideas lightly touched in previous sermons and fleshes out with consummate skill how the signs

⁷ On this point, I am particularly indebted to Peter McCullough's work on Andrewes (*Sermons* 148).

⁸ *Sermons at Court*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. 1998. Footnote 75, p. 120.

of God's mercy are evident. Andrewes' treatment of time in relation to this historical deliverance is yet another fascinating dimension of his thought, and Lossky comments:

In fact, it can be discerned in [the political sermons], perhaps even more than in the sermons preached at the time of the traditional feasts of the Church, that Lancelot Andrewes was not content with passive fidelity to the spirit of liturgical prayer, where time and eternity meet. He interiorizes this spirit to such a point that he interprets these two political events in these sermons as manifestations of the divine mercy. (Lossky 29)

This compression of the event into an existential moment aids in Andrewes' continual effort to stir a deeper sense of God's goodness in his auditors; it also gives a coherence and organic quality to his preaching on these days.

The progressively developed ideas within the Gunpowder sermons need attention to enhance our understanding of Andrewes' service under James I. If they are only treated as individual proclamations, much is missed. Seeing them as an organic outgrowth of Andrewes' convictions enables an easily overlooked pattern to emerge: a dynamic flow adapts to the present exigencies as Andrewes assesses the growing presumption among members of the court. Time fades the initial sense of elation and obligation, and Andrewes speaks directly to the signs of presumption. Since Andrewes invariably seeks to evoke a response commensurate with the favor shown, his applications from the text come under consideration. What are these attitudes and actions that ought to follow? Is the tone encouraging and hopeful, or is it otherwise? From answering such questions, signs of Andrewes' conscience at work become clear. This shift in rhetoric becomes apparent when looking at sermons chronologically, and the texts and years are given below, together with a brief summation of their use.

The Years Preached and the Texts Used

The first two sermons utilize texts that serve as the source of Andrewes' most developed and positive rhetoric that sets England squarely under the blessing of God:

1606: Psalm 118: 23, 24 "This was the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made: let us rejoice and be glad in it."

1607: Psalm 126: 1-4 "When the Lord brought again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dreamed. Then was our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with joy. The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we rejoice. O Lord, bring again our captivity, as the rivers in the south."

As Andrewes explicates these passages, the flavor of nationalism noted by Thomas Nowak, McCullough, and others is at its height. In fact, while there are some initial comparisons made between that of Judah coming out of captivity and the Gunpowder plot, both of these sermons emphasize the superior delivery that God worked for the English. Andrewes returns to this approach several times throughout the course of his preaching, but these two stand out for the sheer, unstinting sense of joy and thankfulness they exude. They do, however, also lay the groundwork for a yet more persistent motif: the obligation that such a deliverance entails.

The text for the third of Andrewes' Gunpowder sermons (1609) is unique in that it is taken from a gospel narrative:

And when his disciples, James and John saw it, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command, that fire come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elijah did? 55) But Jesus turned about, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not of what spirit ye are. 56) For the son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. *Then they went to another town.*⁹ (Luke 9: 54-56)

⁹ The words in italics are not used by Andrewes.

Andrewes did not preach the previous year (1608), perhaps in part due to the incessant labor required of him by the king to write a response to Cardinal Bellarmine.¹⁰ When he returns to the pulpit, he does so in the wake of John King, a popular preacher who used the occasion to call for yet more vigorous treatment against the Roman Catholics. The tone, while he specifically addresses the Society of Jesus and its involvement with the plot, is remarkable for its balance and reserve. Andrewes stresses the importance of self-knowledge so that the Spirit of Jesus might be discerned from that of another spirit. In essence, it moderates an extreme anti-Catholic spirit that was in the air.

In the year 1612, Andrewes selection of this text is unusual, coming as it does from Lamentations 3: 22: “It is the Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.” It is so unusual, in fact, that he takes time to explain his reason for using it. Yet again, he contrasts the mercies that Jeremiah witnessed with those enjoyed by England. His theme is ultimately that the mercy God showed to England in their deliverance supersedes that for the Israelites, and in it, he carefully notes that mercy should then follow from those who have received mercy. Weighted so heavily on the side of mercy, especially in the textual embedding of the mercy in terms of imminent suffering, the sermon’s emphasis requires hearers to renegotiate their understanding of God’s intervention on their behalf. It marks the beginning of a shift toward addressing the important point of obligations in a more deliberate fashion. Due to this shift, it is grouped among the latter sermons. Prince Henry’s mortal illness prevented the king from

¹⁰ His response, *Tortura Torti*, was printed in 1609.

attending, and it was the only Gunpowder sermon of Andrewes James ever missed.¹¹

There was a profound sense of disappointment within both the main Protestant ecclesiastical community and the court at the death of the Prince of Wales.

For the years 1613 and 1614, respectively, the texts selected emphasize the close relationship between God's rule and that of the king. More specifically, in 1613, Andrewes selects Proverbs 8: 15: "By me kings reign, *and princes decree justice.*" He then returns to his theme in 1614, drawing upon Proverbs 24: 21-23:

My son, fear the Lord, and the King, and meddle not with them that are seditious. For their destruction shall rise suddenly, and who knoweth the ruin of them both? Also these things pertain to the wise, *It is not good to have respect of person in any judgment.*

As one can readily discern from the texts, the sermons predictably address a key interpretation of providence regarding rulers and the fifth commandment. In terms of the historical context, Alan Stewart records that the Prince of Wales, Henry, had had a significant following in James' court. As he observes, "[p]erhaps because he spent time with adults and because of his serious mien, Henry was quickly seen as a serious threat to James' control of state business" (184). The reassertion of James' pre-eminence and the explicit warnings against grumbling against the king and his conducting of state affairs make sense in light of this. More ominous yet, Stewart asserts that, "[t]hose who lost patience with the King now started to look towards Henry—as the future" (185). In the wake of the removal of Henry from the scene, it seems very likely that a discernible discontent was in the air—an air of impatience in anticipation of another to come to replace James. Coming as they do in what is the fulcrum of the ten-sermon cycle of Andrewes' preaching (the last of the first five and the first of the last five), their

¹¹ Henry died the following day, November 6, 1612.

purpose—while definitely supporting the rights of the king and underlining the duties of subjects—goes farther in that they proclaim the obligations of the king and his subjects to follow Christ. They serve to close, respectively, the predominant note of praise and to sound the note of admonition. The proper fear of the Lord determines the right fear of the king, and the derivative nature of the king’s role is clearly delineated, as is that of his subjects in relation to those who are seditious. Nothing here deviates from Andrewes’ treatise on the fifth commandment nor his private prayers when it comes to the king’s person and office.

When Andrewes returns the following year (1615) to preach, the sermon marks the tenth anniversary of the deliverance, and the theme is mercy throughout: accordingly he selects Psalm 145: 9: “The Lord is good to all, and his mercies are over all his works.” Whereas he has brought this theme to the fore previously, here it is developed exhaustively. In exalted terms that wring every drop of mercy out of the passage, Andrewes saturates the court with images and comparisons that redound to God’s goodness. The message, however, is not all about encomium; it also raises the level of exhortation to respond accordingly with their own mercy toward the needy.

In 1615, an unusual passage is used: “The children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring them forth,” Isaiah 37: 3. The text from Isaiah picks up on a theme that Andrewes mentions in his first sermon: the plotters’ failure to deliver the conceived evil. The parallel to giving birth is ingeniously presented, amply demonstrating Andrewes’ metaphysical flare. It also serves as an excellent example of his conscious development of one allusion in a previous message.

Andrewes, preaching yet again in 1617, employs Luke 1: 74, 75, to exhort his hearers to a greater devotion and obedience in light of the favor bestowed upon the English in order that: “[God] would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hands of the enemies, should serve him without fear, all the days of our life, in holiness and righteousness before him.” Drawn from the final portion of *Magnificat*, or “Mary’s Song,” this text serves Andrewes well as he first points out that, ultimately, this is about our final deliverance in Christ. As he continues to treat of it, though, he transforms it to fit “this day.” Thus, typologically speaking, the thwarted plot adumbrates Christ’s final deliverance. The second verse, however, supplies him with yet stronger grounds for a close application of proper service; predictably, the dimensions of exhortation and censure intensify. Distinguishing between holiness and righteousness, Andrewes applies the first table of the law to define the nature of holiness and the second table to describe right conduct toward neighbors. His strongest rebukes against the court’s cavalier conduct occur here, and, not surprisingly, this sermon features the most use of the first person singular pronoun.

The final Gunpowder sermon preached by Andrewes (though not his last sermon before the court) was delivered in 1618. He selects Esther 9:31: “To confirm these days of Purim according to their seasons, as Mordecai the Jew and Esther the Queen had appointed them, and as they had promised for themselves and for their seed with fasting and prayer.” It continues comparing and contrasting the Jewish nation’s deliverance with the English, and yet again, God’s mercies to the English surpass those to the Jews. He also presents another convincing biblical justification for setting “this day” aside but

seamlessly shifts to the emphasis to rightly apply these mercies so abundantly showered upon them.

By presenting this overview of the texts and themes of the sermons, one readily sees the elements of the epideictic speech manifested: praise and blame. Throughout all the sermons, he ascribes the deliverance to the work of God. On the other hand, the nature of the blame is more obviously two-fold: it moves outward and inward. Criticism moves outward against the multilevel participants in the crime, but it also turns inward to critique the mounting presumption of James' court, as the deliverance becomes yet another opportunity to enjoy the Epicurean code of pleasure. These perspectives derived from the texts guide the following examination of Andrewes' Gunpowder sermons.

Examining the Elements of Encomium

The first sermon preached by Andrewes on the Gunpowder Plot day rests on a famous passage: "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the Day which the Lord hath made; let us rejoice and be glad in it" (Ps. 118: 23, 24). Andrewes knows that this Psalm forms part of the Jewish Hallel, the three psalms of rejoicing that immediately precede the celebration of Yom Kippur. He also knows that "all the Fathers applie this verse" to the resurrection (*XCVI Sermons* 891); yet after he has read the text, he immediately wrests it into obedience to exalt the present deliverance:

To entitle this time to this Text, or to shew it pertinent to the present occasion, will aske no long processe. This Day of ours, This *fift* of *November*, a day of Gods *making*; that which was done upon it, was the Lords doing. CHRIST'S own application (which is the best) may well be applied here: *This day, is Scripture fulfilled in our eares*. For if ever there were a *Deed* done, or a *Day* made by *God*, in our dayes; this *Day*, and the *Deed* of this *Day* was it [...]. (889)

Is it possible to be more emphatic in such a short span about “This Day” and “the Deed” done on this day? The effect must have struck his hearers as startling, for the accepted approach to this well-known passage could never have anticipated such an application. Prophetic as it was of Christ’s resurrection, how could one of the most respected and reverend scholars, an extraordinary linguist and careful exegete such as Bishop Andrewes responsibly apply this text to a seventeenth-century event? The key words that spring the passage loose from its historic application, moving it to serve the present occasion, are “a day of Gods making,” and “a Deed done [...] by God.” Andrewes simply moves beyond the literal-historic approach and notes the analogous dimensions to their own deliverance. Moreover, behind this move lies his confidence in the controlling nature of providence that superintends all things in heaven and earth. He reinforces this immanent quality of God’s involvement in their world by aligning salvific terms to the occasion:

If ever He gave cause of *marvelling* (as, in the first;) of *rejoicing* (as in the *second* verse) to any Land; to us this day, He gave both: If ever *saved, prospered, blessed* any; *this day*, He *saved, prospered*, and (as we say) *fairely blessed* us.

The *day* (we all know) was meant to be the day of all our *deaths*; [...] There was a thing *doing* on it, if it had been done, we had all been undone. And, the very same day (we all know) the day, wherein that appointment was disappointed by *God*, and we all saved, that we might *not die but live, and declare the praise of the Lord*; the Lord, of whose *doing*, that *marvelous Deede* was; of whose *making*, this *joyfull Day* is, that we celebrate. (*XCVI Sermons* 889-890).

While employing word-play with “doing,” “done,” “undone,” “appointment” and “disappointed,” and the repetition of “day,” Andrewes effectively introduces his *telos*; namely, that this saving, prospering work of God was done in order that the saved would give him praise. By repeating “day” twelve times within such a relatively short span, the theme is sufficiently apparent, and no question remains as what the focus of the praise

shall be. In fact, Andrewes lays out the divisions of his sermon under the headings of “the *Deed* or *doing*,” “the *Day*,” and “the *Dutie*.” To clarify the logical relationship between them, he adds: “The other two reduced to the *Day*, which is the center of both. The *Doing* is the Cause; The *Dutie* is the consequent: from the *Day* groweth the *dutie*” (*XCVI Sermons* 890). He consistently develops this theme throughout the ten sermons, for it functions as the sure foundation upon which an enduring memorial to the deed can stand. The day almost invariably receives the most attention, but he inevitably calls attention to the duty resident within mercy: temporal mercies of this magnitude warrant perpetual praise. The beneficiaries of “that marvelous deed” were to “declare the praise of the Lord,” and “celebrate.” For them to do so properly, the supra-biblical nature of “this day’s” blessing must be set forth. In order to do so, not only the nature of the deliverance comes under scrutiny, but also the nature of those delivered.

He derives another lesson from this God-wrought deliverance that is closely tied to his understanding of the King’s person and role. Having previously established that Andrewes’ conviction on this point flows from his exegesis of the fifth commandment, this additional lesson should come as no surprise. He articulates it in a very emphatic manner, especially in his penultimate point:

[B]ecause both these, the one and the other; our future *salvation* [...] and our present *prosperitie* (like two walls) meet upon *the Head Stone of the corner*; depend both, first *upon the name of the Lord*, and next upon him, that *in His name*, and with *His name*, is *come* unto us (that is) the King [...] neither of them sure, unless hee be safe. [...] The building will be as Mount Sion, so the corner be fast; so the two walls, that meet, never fall asunder. If otherwise: but, I will not so much as put the case, but as we pray, so trust, it shall never be removed but shall stand forever. (899)

The one to be praised for this two-fold deliverance is God, and as long as England, represented in both the king and the people, trust in him, the future salvation—the first

wall—shall be secure. The “present prosperitie,”—the second wall— however, is dependent upon the welfare of the king: the king must remain safe in order for England to prosper. The two walls meet in the person of the monarch. Andrewes, in a bold move, is likening the office of king to that of a cornerstone. The italics emphasize the close relationship that Andrewes sees between the king and God. While the king is certainly not God, the king, coming in His name, must rule as one devoted to the welfare of the state. First and foremost, the king is himself to be thoroughly submitted to God. As God’s image bearer (like the rest of us but not the same), he represents the highest in the order of magistrates that God has ordained. Second, those who are his subjects must recognize this king as God’s appointed means of sustaining their prosperity. This delicate balance would be severely tested in the reign of Charles I, but for Andrewes, the concept of rebelling against an earthly king was tantamount to rebelling against God himself. Thus, having touched on this topic in his first sermon, he returns to develop it in two more sermons (1613 and 1614).

More examples from the first sermon adequately demonstrate Andrewes’ method of controlling the subsequent sermons’ themes and content. To begin where he does, he plans to treat of “[w]herein: That this of Davids [day] was,” and after doing so, he will show “ours is no lesse, rather more” (*XCVI Sermons* 890). The pattern he uses is straightforward: the biblical example is examined, and while God’s mercy exhibited in it is not diminished or demeaned, the benefits enjoyed by the English on November 5, 1605, are greater. For example, Andrewes underlines the Psalm’s portrayal of David’s plight:

He was in great distresse. Three several times, with great passion, he repeats it, that *his Enemies came about him; compassed him round;*

compassed and kept him on every side: were, no swarme of bees so thicke: That they gave a terrible lift or thrust at him, to overthrow him; and very neere it they were. And at last, as if he were newly crept out of his grave, out of the very jawes of death and despaire, he breakes forth and saith, I was very neere my death; neere it I was, but non moriar, die I will not now, for this time, but live a little longer to declare the workes of the LORD. This, was his danger: and, a shrewd one (it seemeth) it was. From this danger, he was delivered. (XCVI Sermons 892)

The description, with its vivid verbs and adjectives, its balanced, brisk phrases and clauses, conveys the distress and the attendant relief of David's harrowing delivery.

Andrewes' rhetorical abilities effectively display David's straits. The praise of David's magnificent rescue continues: this deliverance was "[n]ot [by] any *arme of flesh*, but GODS alone, *His might*, not of any merit of [David's], but of His own *meere mercie*, that brought it to pass" (892). The frank acknowledgment of God's work on David's behalf is clear. High praise is assigned to God and the act. Juxtaposed to this, though, is the severity of the dangers the Gunpowder plot posed:

Will these [elements of deliverance] be found in ours, and then our [day of God's making] bee so too? They will, all of them certainly; and that, in a higher degree, in a greater measure; match *Dauids day*, and overmatch it in all. [...] Boldly I dare say, from a greater than *Dauids*. Thus I shew it, and goe no further than the *Psalme* it selfe. (893)

While it may appear that Andrewes has lavished high praise on David's delivery, in comparison to England's, its luster diminishes. Seven times Andrewes demonstrates that their day of mercy exceeds the psalmist's. First, "*David* called upon GOD in his danger; he knew of it, therefore. We did not: we imagined no such thing [...] and we might have gone to the *Parliament*, as secure as ever. The danger never dreamt of, that is the danger." Second, his enemies were visible to him, they were "above ground," and though he may well have been "hemmed in" by them, "ours was by undermining, digging deep *under ground*; that none could discern." Third, since David was "beset" by his enemies,

he had hope of “breaking through” their ranks, but for the English, there was “no way, no means, no possibilitie of escaping.” Fourth, David’s “swarme of bees” made noise! They buzzed, and thus he could hear them, whereas, “ours, a brood of *vipers, mordentes in silencio; still*, not so much as a *hisse*, till the deadly blow had beene given.” Fifth, David’s danger was only to himself, for the Psalm clearly declares he is alone. England’s three estates *and* a David with his Queen and sons and advisors and nobles were all present: “It is out of the question it had exceeded this of *David*s here.” Sixth, “[h]is *danger* (he confesseth) was from *man*: He goeth no further. [...] This of ours was not: meerly mans, I denie it; it was the *Devill* himselfe” (*XCVI Sermons* 893). Thus far, every superlative point has come from the Psalm itself, but having introduced the idea that the devil is the chief perpetrator behind the plot, Andrewes deviates from his rapid enumerating of the superior qualities of the English circumstances to consider more closely the nature of the men who plotted such a deed. In that it and the seventh point are better suited to the next section, I forego presently discussing them in order to continue with more examples of Andrewes’ praise.

While the “day” and its unique nature are central to his attention, the *factum est*, the doing of the deed also receives praise; in effect, he examines who is really responsible for performing the deed that delivered them. Out of the three candidates up for the honor—God, man, or the devil—the only reasonable choice is God:

By whom, whose doing? Truly, not mans doing this; it was the Lords. [...] It was the *Devils doing*, or *devising* (the plot). [...] This was *Gods doing* (the deliverance.) The blow was the *Devils*; The ward was *Gods*. Not *man*, but the *Devill*, devised it: not *man*, but God defeated it. (895)

Having asserted that God alone is worthy of the honor, he then builds toward his goal of exalting the primary agent of their deliverance:

He that *sate in heaven* all this while, and from thence looked down and saw all this doing of the *Devill* and his *limmes*, in that mercie of His, which is *over all his workes*, to save the effusion of so much bloud, to preserve the soules of so many innocents, to keep this Land from so foule a confusion, to shew still some token, *some sensible token upon us for good, that they which hate us may see it, and be ashamed*; but especially, that that, was so lately united, might not so soon be dissolved; He tooke the matter into his owne hand. And, if ever *God* shewed, that he had *a hooke in the Leviathans nose*; that the *Devill* can goe no further than his *chaine*; if ever, that there is in *Him* more power to *helpe*, than in *Sathan* to *hurt*; in this, He did it. (*XCVI Sermons* 895)

The sudden shift in syntax signals Andrewes' accelerating pace of praise: gone are the simple sentences and the repetition of the earlier lines. Here, the rich layering of God's deeds laid out in long, sweeping, balanced phrases deepens the sense of wonder over the mercy poured upon the "land," especially when all these lengthy lines end so abruptly with, "in this, He did it." While Andrewes' rhetorical training is very evident in such examples, the primary thing to remember is that these skills are harnessed to his goal of exalting God and edifying his hearers.

At such a point as this in his sermon, Andrewes is perfectly situated to lavish praise on England for its fidelity to the true faith or some other merits that win God's favor. Does England garner credit for receiving these mercies? No, Andrewes makes it very clear that mercy is not related to works, but to misery. In fact, the line above—"in that mercie of His, which is *over all his workes*"—derives from Psalm 145: 9, a Psalm that he specifically chooses to preach from on the tenth anniversary of the plot: "The Lord is good to all, and his mercies are over all his works,"¹² and no grounds for boasting in England's strength, wisdom, righteousness, nor any virtue is ever given. In that sermon, it is God's mercy that receives primary attention as opposed to "the Day," but

¹² A sermon preached before the King's majesty at Whitehall, 1615.

the tenor of the praise continues at the same level of intensity, and we see an example of how he returns to further develop ideas from his first sermon. Thus, the conscience of Andrewes remains actively operating to bring every thought to bear on exalting God first, the king second, and the nation a remote third.

Before leaving the text quoted above, however, an important allusion to the king appears embedded in the middle of the rolling lines: “but especially, that that, was so lately united, might not so soon be dissolved” (*XCVI Sermons* 895). The antecedent to which “especially” refers is God’s mercy to the English, and “lately united” references the James I’s united crowns of Scotland and England. This allusion could read like a prelude to fawning, but Andrewes is out to prove that “this doing” is God’s doing; God uses means, and two of his next points highlight God’s use of means. First, Andrewes notes how the plot was “bewrayed” by one of the traitors through writing a letter, but “Hee [God] made them the bewrayers of themselves.” Since God is able to direct like a watercourse even the king’s heart, it is a small matter to direct the heart of a treacherous plotter. In spite of the oaths to secrecy taken, “it shall come out by themselves. Was not this Gods doing?” (895). It was, of course, the same letter that fell into the King’s hand, and at this juncture, Andrewes presents James I as a tool in God’s hand:

This which was written, was so written, as divers of profound wisdome, knew not what to make of it. But then commeth *God* againe (*God* most certainly) and (as in *Pro. 16. 10*)¹³ puts a very *divination*, a very *oracle in the Kings lippes*, and his mouth missed not the matter; made him, as *Joseph* the revealer of Secrets, to read the riddle: giving him wisdom to make both explication, what they would doe; and application, where it was they would doe it. This was GOD certainly. This, *Pharواه* would say, none could, unlesse he were *filled with the Spirit of the holy GOD*. (896)

¹³ “A divine sentence shall be in the lips of the king: his mouth shall not transgress in judgment.”

Andrewes underscores the intervention of God in both these instances to make this day one of rejoicing, yet he also introduces the importance of the king's role in discovering the plot. The ascribing of James as one "filled with the holy Spirit of God" is indeed high praise, and it suggests a more profoundly spiritual connection between God and the king than is necessarily warranted. This implicit idea that the king is crucial to right rule is revisited at the end of this sermon,¹⁴ and it proves so significant to Andrewes that it needs two complete sermons to develop adequately.¹⁵ Tying the fortunes of England to the maintenance of the throne in the manner he does is not indicative of political indebtedness, though. Basing it as he does upon his explication of the Decalogue, it grows naturally to this application. Nevertheless, in the final analysis, it is God who is glorified, for it was He who revealed these things to the king.

The first sermon provides another example that further reveals Andrewes' thought development over the years. Made in 1606, the passing reference to Purim occurs within Andrewes' preparatory remarks:

[i]n remembrance of the disappointing of *Hamans bloudie lotts*, they likewise appointed the daies of *Purim*, *yearely to be kept*. [...] *Haman and his Fellowes had set the dice on us, and wee by this time had beene all in pieces: It is our Purim day.* (*XCVI Sermons* 890)

While simply a brief remark in the context, when Andrewes returns to the pulpit in 1618, he is armed with the text from Esther 9: 31: "To confirm these days of Purim according to their seasons, as Mordecai the Jew, and Esther the Queen had appointed them, and as they had promised for themselves, and for their seed, with fasting and prayer." Twelve years had passed since Andrewes first made the comparison, yet it seems that he found it

¹⁴ Cf. pp. 144-145 for a discussion of this kingly reference.

¹⁵ Andrewes returned to the theme in 1613 and 1614.

a sufficiently redolent idea to permit a full sermon to it. By now, the human celebratory aspects were in the ascendancy, and the religious dimensions of the occasion that Andrewes had labored hard to keep prominent had receded. The sermon still exalts the work of God in making the day one of historic national and spiritual significance, but the scale tilts in the direction of more blame than praise. Nevertheless, those aspects of the day that he exalts are worth visiting.

Andrewes looks closely at the text from Esther, filling in the background and applying it to their day of deliverance by using the scriptural analogy of the Jews in captivity in Babylon:

Here we have the making of a new *Holy-day* (over and above those of GODS in the Law). And the making it, by *Royall authoritie*, and the *peoples* assent; and so, of the nature of the *Act* or *Statute*: a good precedent for us, that have made the like. (*XCVI Sermons* 997)

There is a gentle reminder in this opening: the scriptural warrant for setting November 5 aside as a special day is found in its functioning as a “*new Holy-day*,” and that it was consensual in its formation—the King and Parliament agreed. Having again given biblical warrant for marking special days, Andrewes moves to sum up the context of the passage and show the parallels with their situation. Haman and his motives tacitly represent the same principles as the Society of Jesus and their plans: Haman’s grudge against Mordecai was not simply against the man. Andrewes puts it rather wryly: “*a feud* it was, the strangest *feud* that hath beene heard of: not with all his *kinne*, or all of the *name*; but, with all of the *nation*, all the *Jewes*, because Mordochai (forsooth) was a *Jew*” (998). Haman’s high favor with the king enabled him to put a law in place assigning a day where all Persians could legally kill their Jewish neighbors and thereby claim the goods left in the aftermath. To determine the exact day, Haman cast lots, and the Hebrew

word “purim” means “lots.” Andrews appropriates this casting of lots throughout his sermon as the signifier of their own day of danger and deliverance:

This comes somewhat to our case. For, as they were in danger then, by a lot; So were we, this day, by a plot, in as great danger as they, and as strangely delivered. [...] A plot, and a lot, though they sound alike, yet (with us) they differ much. A lot seemes casuall; a plot is laid with great circumspection: but with GOD, they are in effect all one. (*XCVI Sermons* 998)

When Andrewes then comes to contrasting the two events, the superior quality of the deliverance of the English becomes apparent. Fourteen lines later, he states, “in all of these [similarities], I make no doubt, this of ours will more than match that of theirs: the *lot* of our *danger more fearefull*, the *lot* of our *deliverance more wonderfull*” (998-999). The encomium pattern here is identical with that of the first sermon, for, after pointing to the similarities, he dwells on differences point by point: the Jews were to die by the sword, whereas they by “fire and powder, to be blown up. Of the twain, this is worse.” Some Jews may hope to escape from the sword, but not so with fire, for “fire cannot relent, that spares none.” Moreover, Haman’s plot did not include the King, though it might well have touched Queen Esther, while Andrewes notes that “our Hamans” plot included the King and all the rest with him. Additionally, the Jews “had notice of their day”: the English did not (999). With each new discovery of the unique peril that the English faced on that day, Andrewes drives home the “marvellous” nature of their deliverance. Even the manner of their going to their deaths serves to illuminate the profound mercy:

When men goe to their death they would goe *mourning*, all in blacke, as the manner is; But, when they are going in all *pompe and magnificence*, then to be *shot* off, and *flie* away in all pieces! no man would draw that *lott* if he could escape it. Yet, that was our *lot*, and at that very time.

For a King to be made away, is a thing not unheard of; but, in this manner, a *King* to be made away, in his *robes royall*, the *imperial crowne on his head*, the *Scepter* in his hand, sitting on the *throne* of his *Kingdome*, in the midst of all his *States*, then, and there, and in that manner; that passes all: that, the *lot*, that never yet hath beene heard of. (*XCVI Sermons* 1000)

Andrewes has clearly organized his material with the weightiest evidence reserved for the last.

One of the last pictures he depicts before turning to application is indeed descript:

I conclude all, with the very sight, if this lot of theirs had fallen to our lot. It had been a heavie sight (as in the *massacre* of *Paris*) to have seene men rumbling in their owne bloud here and there in the streets; Nothing to this, to see men torne in sunder, heads from shoulders, armes from legges, both from the body; quarters and halfe quarters flying about; the braines fly one way, the bowels another; bloud spilt, like water in the river, in the fields, in every corner of the streets, never like the sight, and so never a *lot* to this. (1000)

The picture brings the reality of that day into sharp relief, and Andrewes seems intent to make it sharp enough to move the King and his court to go even further than the Jews did in marking out the day of deliverance. The crescendo supports his message time and again, strengthening the impression of God's kindness. In the context of this sermon, Andrewes calls for an appropriate response that will insure the day is marked properly, not by feasting and playing, but by fasting and prayer. Consonant then with his own marking the day, he urges his hearers to reclaim the spiritual nature of the day by a renewal of the heart.

Andrewes' opening sermon serves as the pattern and the nursery for his subsequent sermons. The close initial working with the text followed by enumerating the various aspects of the foiled plot illuminate the glorious nature of God's work on their behalf. Additional material, specifically from the 1618 sermon, demonstrates the

sustained effort that Andrewes uses to refresh the event's singular quality. And though one can read these comparisons and contrasts as aggrandizing efforts of the realm of England and her sovereign, Andrewes' conscience—to speak of it as the controlling influence—seems set on making “this day” a holy day, one that serves to elevate the sense of thanksgiving and service in the King and his court. In the light of this technique, the other texts that he uses and his ensuing development of them appear readily suited to his task.

Examining the Elements of Opprobrium

In this section, I use three sermons to look at how Andrewes levels criticism towards the enemies of the state—the outward dimension—and his censuring of those who are the recipients of God's mercy on that day: the sermon preached in 1606 for blame towards those outside the English church; the 1609 (the third) sermon for internal and external blame; and the 1617 (the ninth) sermon on predominantly spiritual concerns within the court.

In the first sermon, Andrewes, in that there is a fitting solemnity and decorum present, has nothing to upbraid in the conduct of the court; therefore, all his opprobrious attention is focused on those who conceived the plot and nearly carried it to its horrifying conclusion. His description of England's enemies merits a lengthy quote, for it not only illumines the contrast he makes between David's salvation, but it gives a taste of one kind of opprobrium he directs to the traitors:

The instruments (not as his, a swarme of Bees, but) a swarme of Locusts, out of the infernall pit. Not men; No not Heathen Men: Their stories; nay, their Tragedies can shew none neere it. Their Poets could never feigne any so prodigiously impious. Not men; No, not savage wild men: the Hunnes, the Heruli, the Turcilingi, noted for their inhumanitie, never so

inhumane: Even among those barbarous people this fact would be accounted barbarous. How then? Beasts: There were at Ephesus, beasts in the shape of men; brutishnesse is the worst, Philosophie could imagine of our nature. This is more than brutish; What Tiger, though never so intraged, would have made the like havock? (*XCVI Sermons* 893)

Using anaphora, alliteration, and interrogatio, Andrewes quickly exposes the nature of those who undertook the deed, for the failure to find a corresponding example of impiety in the annals of humanity or the species of animals means the search must move to hell and to the devil:

Then, if the like, neither in the nature of *men*, nor *beasts* to be found (it is so unnatural), we must not look to patterne it upon earth, we must to *hell*; [...] even from the *Devill*. He was a murtherer from the beginning, and will be so to the end. In every sinne of bloud, he hath a *claw*, but all his *clawes*, in such an one as this: wherein so much bloud, as would have had it raine *bloud*; so many baskets of *heads*, so many peeces of rent bodies cast up and down, and scattered all over the face of the earth. Never such a day; all *Joels* signes of a *fearfull day*, *bloud*, and *fire* and the *vapour of smoke*. (893)

The terse, graphic description borders on the sensational but is not gratuitous: it both intensifies the contrast between David's delivery and theirs, and it brings a deeper sense of gratitude to God for their superior mercies. Furthermore, he has done it, as he stated, while staying within his text. These two excerpts exemplify well Andrewes' style and go far in explaining his reputation as the *Stella Praedicatorum* of the age. Additionally, they adumbrate what is to come in his other sermons, for, while his matter may change, his method does not. Particularly interesting is his casting the perpetrators in what can only appear as a de-humanizing light. They are worse than the most barbarous men; they exceed beasts in their behavior; they are ranked as demons and collaborators with the devil. No quarter is given. What, then, has happened to these men as image-bearers? Is

there a warrant for this kind of excoriation from the Scripture? Can such language not be construed as a violation of scriptural principles, and thus, Andrewes' conscience?

Such rhetoric seems very unfit for a man who would lift up his enemies in prayer and urge others to do the same. The spirit seems not in keeping with his exposition of the second table of the Law and jars the sensibilities of the modern reader. What sense can be made of it? Humanly speaking, the description is perfectly understandable when remembering that for Andrewes, this plot would surely have killed him in a manner very similar to that which he describes. His sense of outrage and horror is apt from this perspective. Yet, even accounting for the human element, in terms of the ethos from which he works, it must be kept in mind that this occasion is public, and in earlier evidence gleaned from his lectures on the law, it is obvious that Andrewes distinguishes between the two realms. Public acts of violence, theft, corruption, and sedition entitle the full justice of the law to fall upon such. It is part and parcel of the magistrate's duty to prosecute crimes and criminals. Additionally, discomfiting as some might find it, Andrewes has precedence in abundance from the Psalms and the Gospel; consider, for instance, Psalm 137: 8, 9, a psalm of mourning when the Jews are in exile in Babylon: "O daughter of Babel, worthy to be destroyed, blessed shall he be that rewardeth thee, as thou hast served us. Blessed shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy children against the stones." In the Gospels themselves, Christ speaks to the Pharisees, calling them "whited tombs,"¹⁶ and "serpents, a generation of vipers."¹⁷ Of those who refused to accept his deeds and words as the Messiah, threatening to stone him, he said, "Why do ye not

¹⁶ 1599 Genevan Version. Matt. 23: 27

¹⁷ *Ibid* 23: 33

understand my talk? Because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do” (John 8: 43-44). Passages like these, while confusing to many moderns, provide insight for Andrewes’ appropriation of these extreme expressions. One other mitigating factor that escapes present readers is an acquaintance with like vehemence in contemporary literature of the period. Martin Luther, for example, used especially earthy remarks against his opponents and brutally upbraided them when in the heat of battle. In comparison to many of his peers, Andrewes is quite restrained. Sensibilities then were not attuned to our ostensibly more circumspect approaches.

Considering the above, one more example from the first sermon suffices to demonstrate Andrewes’ censure toward those responsible for the planned atrocity. This attack is directed at the Jesuits, the purported masterminds behind the plot. It is, in fact, his seventh point by way of showing how great the deliverance was. In that the deed was done with the express foreknowledge, approval, and sponsorship of Roman Catholic authorities, Andrewes likens the deed to “the abomination of desolation,” a reference to when a statue of Caesar was set up in the Temple. Since that time it has stood as a type of the height of apostasy:

[T]his *abomination of desolation* tooke up his *standing*, in the *holy place*
1. An *abomination*: so it is; abhorred of all flesh, hated and detested of all that heare it named; yea, and they themselves say, they should have abhorred it, if it had taken effect. It is an *abomination*. 2. Every *abomination* doth not forthwith make *desolate*. This had. If ever a *desolate kingdome* upon earth, such had this been, after that terrible *blow*. Neither *root* nor *branch left*, all swept away: *Strangers* called in; *murtherers* exalted; the very *dissolution* and *desolation* of all ensued. (XCVI Sermons 894)

Thus far, no specific accusations have been made, but it is clear where he is heading, and in his third point, no question remains as to where the fault lies:

But this, that this so *abominable and desolatorie* a plot, stood in the *holy place*; this is the pitch of all. For, there it stood, and thence it came abroad. Undertaken with an *holy oath*; bound with the *holy* Sacrament [...] warranted for a *holy act*, tending to the advancement of a *holy Religion*, and by *holy persons* called by the most *holy name*, the *name of JESUS*. That these *holy religious persons*, even the *chiefe* of all *religious persons* (the Jesuites) gave not onely *absolution*, but *resolution*, that all this was well done; that it was by them *justified* as lawfull, *sanctified* as meritorious, and should have been glorified [...] long yer this, and *canonized*, as very good and holy act, and we had had orations out of the *Conclave* in commendation of it. (*XCVI Sermons* 894)

Andrewes' repetition of "holy" drips with sarcasm, for when hearing it, the alternative word of "wholly" presents an echo of condemnation when applied to "holy Religion" and "holy religious persons." Their actions are completely contrary to the very idea of holiness; so much so that it is appropriate to consider them as merely and entirely religious and that is all. The hypocrisy of the pretenders to holiness is exposed for public ridicule and shame, and the Roman Catholic endorsement of the act is likened to the worst of all desecrations. He conveys a palpable disgust for the whole affair, calling it "ugly and odious."

There is a *telos*—an ultimate purpose for this rhetoric, even as there is for the passages that exalt God. Andrewes subjects the crime and the criminals to public shame that others will feel the disgust for the act. Perhaps, then, others will avoid the snare of the presumption displayed by the Jesuits. As a preacher, Andrewes is obliged to do more than simply lift up that which is praiseworthy. His calling includes rebuke, admonition, exhortation, comfort, and encouragement. The above example shows him administering a skillful rebuke. His rhetoric, however, while pointedly meant to make laughable the

posturing “holy religious persons,” can also be directed toward those in the court and England, as an example from his third sermon makes plain.

The second sermon considered was preached in 1609 and stands out from the rest in that it is taken from Luke’s Gospel account of an exchange between the sons of Zebedee—James and John—and Jesus. It is the one text that is not alluded to within the first sermon, and this in itself makes it distinct. To briefly recap the historical context, the 1608 court Gunpowder sermon was preached by John King, a royal chaplain who preached an aggressively reactionary sermon that called down judgment of Roman Catholics. It proved popular fare, and the King ordered it published. Apparently, Andrewes took the time to read it and sensed that something was amiss. The following year, he issued a call to discern the Spirit of Christ during the present times, and not the spirit of the Sons of Thunder who would like to call down fire from heaven upon the Samaritans who insulted Christ. Two of the most salient instances of Andrewes’ censoring rhetoric that looks outward and then inward are evident in this sermon. That the full effect of these outward and inward censures can be felt, it is necessary to compress some of the prose. In the end, however, Andrewes’ deft handling of the two dimensions remains evident.

To better appreciate what Andrewes does in the sermon, the text is repeated:

And when his disciples James and John saw it, they said: Lord, wilt thou that we command, that fire come downe from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But Jesus turned about and rebuked them, and said: Ye know not of what Spirit ye are: For the Sonne of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them. (*XCVI Sermons* 911; Luke 9: 44-46)

The passage sharply contrasts the Old Testament concept of retribution for offenses and the New Testament ethos of mercy. Since Andrewes invariably works closely with the

text, the direction of his thought is discernible: beginning with the more dominant outward emphasis of blame, the very introduction confronts the Society of Jesus with its culpability:

[W]as this, under the termes of James and John and a Towne of *Samaria*, our very case; this day foure yeare? We were then in danger of destroying; and destroying by the same element, fire; and so neere it we were, it would have beene done as soone, as a *letter burnt*.¹⁸ There were then, that forwarded these *fire-workes*, [...] all they could: and they said, they were *Disciples* of JESUS *societie*. But JESUS shewed himself to be (in heaven) of the same minde, He was, on earth. And as He was then better, to this Towne, than His *Disciples*; so, to us He was better, than the *Fathers* of His *Societie*, and rebuked them too; And blessed be God, as the text ends, so did the matter; in *Non perdere, sed salvare*: none destroyed, all saved. (*XCVI Sermons* 911-912)

Andrewes opens with his recurring theme of “this day,” again drawing attention to its present significance. Following immediately with a salvo against the Society of Jesus, given the reception of King’s previous sermon, it is the kind of message that would please the crowd. The contrast between the attitude of Jesus and his supposed disciples is perfectly clear. His interest, though, transcends crowd-pleasing, as is apparent in his emphasis on salvation and the spirit resident within Jesus. He continues to develop this contrast of the differing spirits of the disciples and Jesus through the course of the sermon, and as he does so, he presents a process of self-examination that will also require his auditors to reflect on their own spirit.

Presenting the text, he asserts that the whole case rests upon a question. That question is put to Christ: Shall we call down fire from heaven upon the town of heretics that has refused you hospitality? For the sake of pursuing his argument, Andrewes divides his text into two parties: Christ and his two apostles. In this division, the

¹⁸ This “letter burnt” refers to the final instructions given to the one who received it.

discerning of the right spirit for those who confess to be Christ's followers is at stake. Underlining the different religion of the Samaritans from the Jews, Andrewes casts the question as one of religious tension. Hospitality was refused, but that in itself is not an adequate reason to destroy the village. The disciples' impulse to fire the town is premised on their own experience with Christ, for they had just come from the Mount of Transfiguration, and that experience, fresh in their minds, gave added impetus to their sense of outrage. However, it is a "blessed error," in the vein of Gregory, "for by it the world was rid of the like error" (*XCVI Sermons* 912). Andrewes states:

What Christ answered in this case, He would have answered in ours [...]; If not a poore towne, not such an Assembly. If not by a *supernatural* and miraculous; not, by an unnatural, and monstrous act. If not, for Himself; not for Saint Peter. (912)

The censure or rebuke is to all those who would presume to call upon the name of Christ and then seek to destroy others; it is antithetical to Christ's explicit mission. Andrewes states emphatically:

We are all much bound to *Saint Luke*, for recording it, or to the *Holy Ghost* rather, for inspiring him, so to doe. For, so long as this *verse* shall stand in the *Gospell*, it will serve for a resolution to this question. Whether upon pretence of religion, CHRIST will allow, the *Jew* should blow up the *Samaritane*? Upon *non receperunt eos* [not receiving us], any of His Disciples ma doe that, which they (here) would have done? This *rebuke* here of these, will reach to all undertakers in the same kinde. This *Non perdere sed salvare*, saves all our Townes, Cities, and States, from *consuming by fire*, from any of CHRIST'S companie. (912)

The tone of this censure, while still stern, is not the same quality of that found in his first sermon. The sarcasm is non-existent, replaced instead by a compelling appeal to the obvious spirit of the Gospel narrative. It is much more like a reasoned, impassioned appeal than a scornful rebuke. The explanation for the change in tone, beyond that of a moderating effect on King's sermon, may well lie in Andrewes' reflecting on how

quickly sweeping judgments can be made by those who have been offended. He notes, in fact, the polarizing of different parties from the account and the history of the Jews and Samaritans:

The beginning of this quarell [...] is dissent in religion, betweene the Samaritan, and the Jew. We see the fruit of it here, and what spirit it maketh men of. On the one side: Be they Jewes, goe they to Jerusalem? Let them have neither meat, drinke, nor lodging: (that is to say) starve them. On the other: Be they Samaritans, Sectaries? Pitie of their lives; put fire to them, burne them, blow them up. Mutual and mortall hatred breaking forth, upon every occasion. [...] forgetting humanities and divinitie, too, on either part. Here is the fruit: this, the spirit it breedeth. [...] Thus it was: and thus it will be: and by this we see, how necessary CHRIST'S *Pax vobis* is; and the Peace-maker, that could make the peace, how blessed he should be! Blessed here, and blessed everlastingly. (*XCVI Sermons* 913)

In these thoughts, Andrewes' irenic nature and regard for the humanity of others breaks through the fractious tendencies of both sides of the religious spectrum. The inward nature of his rebuke becomes more evident when considering that his audience is unlikely to consist of members of the Society of Jesus. Is this plea for more peace-makers meant for only Roman Catholic sympathizers in their midst? The "*pax vobis*" of Christ is, of course, meant for all, and the ensuing blessedness is not restricted to only the English. His call, however sweeping it might seem, is not ecumenical in nature. As opposed to the kind of human effort to bring about peace by emphasizing the things in common and ignoring key differences, Andrewes will only accept the peace that Christ can speak. More remains to be said to the Society members and to those who respond to them in kind. The sermon's tone thus far is indeed more irenic and conciliatory, but he has hardly begun to open the text.

His next concern is to look more closely at the contrast between Jesus' disciples and the Society, and here the difference becomes stark: Andrewes discerns that whereas

the disciples make two wrong assumptions about the Samaritans—namely, that it was right to want to destroy them, and that fire was the fit means—“they only advise with Christ about the meanes, whence they will have their fire, and how. Whence, from heaven; how, *dicimus*” (*XCVI Sermons* 915); on the other hand, the Society does not seek to emulate the disciples by calling down fire from heaven. Their *modus operandi* is to “conjure it up [...] from an infernall place, [...] to rent the earth to bring it up.” Jesus’ disciples do not resort to “pickaxes to digge; nor boats to carry, nor traines [fuses] to kindle it” (915). The tempo of condemnation picks up quickly at this point as more evidence is assembled against the Jesuits. The contrasting approach is used again, this time, with some word-play on Andrewes’ part: the disciples’ vengeance plan has been put to a “motion” for Jesus to consider, “[a]nd with their motion, He was moved; for, it said, *He turned* with it: but, it was, the wrong way” (916). He continues to set up his rebuke by creating an imaginary positive response from Christ, thereby deepening the pit beneath the Jesuits’ feet:

At the *turning*, it may be thought, they looked for some good turne; that CHRIST should have commended them, and said: I con you thankes, I see you have care of my credit; you are even worthy for it, to sit *one on my right hand, the other on my left*, for shewing yourselves my Champions. Your motion is good; forward with it. (916)

With his sarcasm increasing, Andrewes flexes his casuistry muscles upon the Society:

But, it falls out, His *turning* is the wrong way: He turned on the left side, to *rebuke* them. This CHRIST did. Now I will tell you, what He should have done. For, according to the new taken up resolution, of the grave Fathers of the society, He should have taught them first, to take a paire of balances, and weighed, whether the good that would ensue would overweigh the losse of the towne: If it would, up with it and spare it not. That it would certainly. For, it would strike such a feare (the burning of this Towne) into all the Townes about, that CHRIST should never after want *receiving*: and it would salve CHRISTS reputation much, who had bene

thought too much a favourer of the *Samaritans*: and it would be much for His credit, that He had *Disciples* could doe as much as ever could *Elias*.
(*XCVI Sermons* 916)

Andrewes cleverly turns the Jesuits' famed casuistical tradition back upon them. Even the adjective "grave" describing the "Fathers of the society" speaks not only of their deportment, but also where their reasoning leads. The "weighty" reasons to justify the town's destruction expose such advocates as ignorant of Jesus' spirit.

The example above is but one of several that Andrewes applies to bring blame upon such blind and myopic thinking. While the Society of Jesus bears the brunt of the opprobrium, in effect, the blame lies most heavily, though, not upon the persons themselves, but upon the ignorance that permits such thinking. Those who willfully continue in that ignorance, not discerning their spirit—the two disciples' failure—are culpable and deserve censure. The disciples were ignorant of the distinction between the spirit and times of Elisha in contrast to that of Christ's spirit and time. They mistook the mission as one of judgment, and not mercy. Andrewes asserts that "the times sometime require one spirit; sometime another; *Elias time, Elias spirit*" (917). Moreover, ignorance of this sort results in failing to discern sound counsel, for "we may be deceived in any act, if we know not the *spirit* it comes from."

Such admonishments on Andrewes' part begin the movement inward, bringing light to bear upon the spirit of the English response. In the gentlest manner, he issues a caution that seems an inverse echo of Portia's famous plea for mercy:

Shall not Christ be received? Yes: He is most worthy so to be. I adde, they that refuse it, are worthy any punishment: but, that every man is to be dealt with as he is worthy, would prove a hard peece of *Divinitie*: hard for all, and even for themselves, too. If, so Christ suffers indignitie, fire should come downe from heaven [...] we were all in a hard case: *Jewes, Samaritans*, and all: yea, *Disciples*; yea this James, and John, and all. The

Samaritans, they received not Christ; they were gone; burnt all. [...] When He came to Jerusalem, how was He received there? Why, there He was *murthered*; worse used than in Samaria. Then we must call for more *fire*: *Jerusalem* must be burnt, too. Now for the *Disciples*, *James* and *John*, how carried they the matter? It is true: they had *received* Him; but when most need was, thrust Him from them, renounced Him, utterly denied, that ever they knew Him. Then we must trouble heaven once more; call for more fire, for *James* and *John*, too. Nay then, *the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not, nor received Him not*: why then, the world is at an end, [...] all, a heape of ashes, if this doctrine goes forward. [...] For, who receiveth Christ, as he should? Yea, who refuseth not, one time, or other, to receive Him? Who, of the *Disciples*, who at *Jerusalem*? [...] Then, this will follow; if no place for repentance, then no use of Christ. For, whom shall He save, when *James* and *John* have consumed all to ashes? (*XCVI Sermons* 919)

His logic irresistibly brings everyone into the flames of judgment, leaving no one left to repent and be saved. In this construct, mercy never approaches humanity and justice obliterates all. In the end, Andrewes, with a biting humor, suggests that “it will be well to leave Christ somebody to save: not disappoint Christ of His coming, and sende Him backe without His errand” (919). This display of inexorable logic coupled with humor is perfectly suited to help the English reconsider their desire for revenge and retaliation: this ignorant spirit of destruction is alien to the work of Christ.

In bringing his sermon to a conclusion, Andrewes makes a motion of his own as he offers up a prayer:

Master, wilt thou, we speake to these whom thou hast delivered, that seeing thou tookest order, the fire should not ascend to consume them, that they would take order, their prayers may ascend up, and as the odors of the Saints phials, burne before Thee still; and never consume, but be, this day ever, a sweet smell in Thy presence? (921)

It is but a brief petition, framed as a question that suggests a need for grace to flow to the delivered that they might persevere in the right spirit. To better illuminate this right

spirit, Andrewes draws again upon principles expounded in the first table of the law that requires true knowledge of God:

Their *fire*, they came to put under the earth, Christ would not have it burn; another *fire*, He came to put upon earth, and His desire is that it should burn: even that fire, whereon is the incense of our devotion, and the sacrifice of our praise burne before God. We were appointed, to be made a sacrifice: if *Isaac* be saved, shall nothing be offered in his stead? Shall we not thanke God, that He was better to [...] us, better, than those were, that will needs thrust themselves, to be of His societie? (*XCVI Sermons* 921)

In that this sermon was preached a mere four years after the grim attempt on their lives, the tone is conciliatory, urging Christians to examine their own spirit in their times. It is an excellent example of how Andrewes' conscience functions in the face of an opportunity to retaliate and to urge harsher treatment upon Roman Catholics. The very care that he takes, however, to specify the Society of Jesus as those chiefly behind the machinations narrows the scope of the guilty. Tacit non-condemnation of those still within the Roman Church (but not of the Jesuit spirit) could well imply potential reconciliation. Andrewes is also bold enough to take the more difficult path; by implicitly rebuking a retaliatory spirit, the spirit of the age, he risks losing listeners. By going against the popular tide, the ascendant position of his conscience is apparent.

The third sermon to be considered is from November of 1617. The selection of the text suggests his direction: "That we being delivered from the hands of our enemies might serve Him without fear; in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our lives" (Luke 1: 74-75). None could be prepared, however, for the speed with which he moves to the theme of duty. In that he mentions last year's message based on the plotters' failure to deliver their destructive children (their conceived plot, their barrels of powder, their fuses, and their flint) meant England's delivery, the King and his court

could reasonably assume that delivery, deliverance, and its variations would yet again feature prominently. But this sermon is different: Andrewes conveys a sense of urgency when he abruptly thrusts the concept of serving and service before the congregation. He is still faithful to the passage's logical and syntactical connections, but an imperative tone pervades much of his exegesis. This sermon also has the most first person singular pronoun use, and in many instances its force is emphatic. Note, for example, two instances in which "I" is used: "'The children were come to the birth, and there was no strength to deliver them.' There we left last. Their not being delivered was the cause of our being delivered. And now I go on" (*XCVI Sermons* 983). Although brusqueness appears in this introduction, perhaps even curtness, the "I" functions only as a marker of his direction; but, the absence of any further summation alluding to the glory of that deliverance seems out of character. An impatience to get to his theme presses him and the pace continues: "And our being delivered, was to this end, *That, wee being delivered, from the hands of our enemies, might serve Him, etc.* For I demand: delivered wee were (as this day) why was it?" (983). The "I demand" is distinctively imperative, and it is the only instance of an expression this forceful. The interrogative approach might be rhetorical here to awaken the auditors, but Andrewes seems determined that an answer based upon the given text must come from the hearers. He prods their consciences further: "Was it, that wee might stand, and cry out of the foulnesse of the fact? Or stand, and inveigh, against those monsters that were the Actors in it? Was it, that we might blesse ourselves for so faire an escape? Or bestow a peece of an Holy-day on God, for it?" (983). Blatantly mocking the idea that they had the authority to "bless" themselves, as if they were somehow responsible for the escape, Andrewes sounds more like Malachi

(whom he references later in the sermon) upbraiding the Israelites sloppy, half-hearted, and presumptuous approach to God: how presumptuous to “bestow” a mere *piece* of a holy-day upon God, as if he had some need of the bits of a day from their hands. In such expressions as this, Andrewes’ gentle approach is not in sight, but the slipshod attitudes of the English are on display, and the inward turning of Andrewes’ attention to censure excesses in the court dominates this sermon.

In this penultimate Gunpowder sermon, Andrewes builds his case against the court from the *Magnificat* text working in large part from the well-known Vulgate. His point turns upon that small Latin word, “*ut*,” “that,” in English. Andrewes establishes his claim: “When all is said, that can be said: hither we must come, to this *ut* here, and pitch upon it; for, this is indeed, the *ut finalis*; the right, the true, the proper *That: That*, for our *deliverance*, we bethinke ourselves, how to doe Him service” (*XCVI Sermons* 984). This service is due God for his goodness and mercy, and mercy means, “without all merit of ours, we *were not consumed*, but *delivered* from so great a miserie, so neere us.” These mercies require Andrewes to ask questions again that illuminate the prevailing careless attitude: “Why were we so [delivered]? Were we *liberati*, to become libertines, to set us downe, and to eate, and to drink healths, and rise up, and see a play? Was there no *ut* in it? Yes: what was that? *Ut serviamus Illi* [that we might serve Him]” (984). The specific actions he lists—to sit down, to eat, to drink healths—perfectly describe the progression of the practice current in that day. After the obligatory sermon in Whitehall Chapel, a festive meal would be enjoyed, and then a play presented. Andrewes leaves no room for evading the obligations he lays out, and those who avidly sat, ate, drank, rose up, and watched a play were deserving of censure. Further, this service is unacceptable if not

rendered from the heart. He puts it differently on different occasions, but here, it is thus: “*Visited, redeemed, saved, mightily saved*; why all? For no other end, but that being so *visited, redeemed, and saved*, we might wholly addict, and give over ourselves, to the *Service* of Him, who was Author of them all” (*XCVI Sermons* 984).

Considering the excerpts above reveals that Andrewes here uses a more forceful manner to unfold his text. To demonstrate further, I return to his emphatic use of “I”: “now come I to plead,” “I wot well,” “On God’s part, I set forth these [...],” “I reckon these,” “I speak it not to our commendation,” and “I marvel what we can allege.” Such personal utterances appear far fewer times in his other sermons, and it may be safely concluded that Andrewes is more deeply invested in this sermon than the others. Nothing compares to the following, for instance, when he makes another application of the Decalogue, the third commandment, to the auditors:

Holy and reverend is His Name (saith one Psalm), and, *great and fearfull is His Name*, (saith another). Now, how unholily this *holy*, how unreverently, this *reverend Name* is used; upon how small cause this *great*; how without all feare, this *fearfull Name* is taken up in our mouths. I must say it again and again (which Saint Augustine saith): [...] I speak to the ears of all in general, I convent the conscience of everyone in particular that heareth it. (993)

Profanity and unthinking use of God’s name makes Andrewes grieve to realize that misuse of it is so frequent that many are completely insensitive to the sin involved. The above is simply an application of the third commandment to his hearers, and his passion is transparent. Further, he excoriates those who think merely listening to sermons is service enough to God. It is a choice sample of his bold and direct rebuke, especially when remembering that the King and the court heard so many sermons. After speaking

of slack attendance and informal conduct in the sanctuary, part of the casual approach to religion that galls him so, the vice of sermon-sampling comes under scrutiny:

Thou hast magnified thy Name, and in thy Word above all things; saith the Psalme. After invocation then of His Name, let us see how wee serve His Word: that part of his service, which is in this Age (I might say, in the error of this age) carries away all. For, what is it to serve God in holinesse? Why, goe to a Sermon: All our holiday holinesse, yea, and our working-day too, both are come to this, to heare (nay, I dare not say that, I cannot prove it) but, to be at a Sermon. [...] God forbid, we should thinke, that [...] [a]ll our holinesse is in hearing: all our Service, eare-service: that were in effect, as much as to say, all the body were an eare. (XCVI Sermons 992)

Andrewes is the acknowledged foremost preacher of his day, and he seems to be preaching against the hearing of sermons. It is that very problem that he is addressing, though, for he has no assurance that these sermons are being heard: in the minds of some, only to be present when the sermon is preached suffices for holy service. Recognizing his own calling as a preacher, he must call to repentance those who fail to see the relationship between hearing and doing. The mocking, sarcastic tone previously used on the Society of Jesus has now been turned upon James' court, and perhaps some tendencies on James' part, too. What stands out prominently is Andrewes' conviction that such behavior must not go unnoticed and unaddressed. It must be exposed for the sham of religion it is, for this hypocrisy will not pass God's call for righteousness and holiness found in the text. To end on this note would not fairly represent the balance that Andrewes gives this sermon, though. By simply looking at the censures it brings, the continued strain of wonder and praise for God's providential intervention to thwart the Gunpowder plot is unabated. By the time of this sermon, Andrewes appears to have so internalized the day's spiritual significance, that he is appalled, dismayed, grieved, and frustrated that others have not followed suit.

Andrewes' pastoral concerns for those within his sphere of influence now outweigh the need to lay censure upon the plotters, and one means of addressing those concerns is by continuing to extol God's mercy in all its glorious detail, particularly regarding "this day." Yet, as the years progress, this proclamation that trumps all the Jews' historic deliverances proves inadequate to sustain the appropriate response from the English. They grow jaded and distracted: they need to see themselves in the light of the Law, and in this sermon, Andrewes applies the law more sharply and thoroughly than in any other sermon. The close application does not stand alone, however. He still remains mindful of the power of grace to heal the afflicted in conscience, to deliver the righteous, and to show mercy to his people. His closing prayer in his 1618 sermon reflects the same purposes articulated in his public teaching and his personal prayers:

But, *prayer* is the last word here; ends the verse: and with that, let us end. [...] *Let not the rod of the ungodly light on the lot of the righteous.*¹⁹ *Let GOD in whose hand our lots are, ever maintaine this dayes lot to us;*²⁰ [...] And praised be GOD, this day, and all our dayes, that this day shewed, that He taketh pleasure in prosperity of His Servants, and from all *lots* and *plots*, doth ever deliver them. (*XCVI Sermons* 1008)

The prayer follows his exhortations to the court to demonstrate their gratitude through prayerfulness and almsgiving. We know from the record of his teaching on the moral law, his private prayers, his final months of life, and his last will and testament, that Lancelot Andrewes stayed faithful to this code of conduct preached to others. His conscience, God's deputy, informed thoroughly from the Scriptures and the Church's long history of the pursuit of God, enabled him freely to serve his heavenly God and King. This service requires that he dutifully serve his temporal king, not as a god, but as the sovereign appointed by God to reign. Andrewes' convictions regarding the primacy

of God's mercy and majesty thus shape the sermons to serve a holy purpose in the context of a national day of thanksgiving.

¹⁹ Quoted from Psalm 125: 3.

²⁰ From Psalm 30: 25.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion

*The Influence of Conscience:
Lancelot Andrewes' Gunpowder Plot Sermons*

When it comes to seventeenth-century studies, recent historical research has looked more closely at the intersection of politics and religion, and many excellent connections that aid in understanding the period have come to light. Nevertheless, in the best of circumstances, scholarship “looks through a glass darkly” in the attempt to see and interpret the figures, the ideas, the documents, the habits, and the times of others. In the worst of circumstances, the glass through which scholars look becomes essentially opaque due to not only the distance of time and place, but also the biases and presuppositions of scholars. Given the present climate, I suggest that an excessive amount of attention is given to power in its various forms—those in social, political, and religious dimensions—to the neglect of the individual writer’s own convictions informed by the conscience. The conscience during the Reformation-influenced period, a biblically literate age, operated as the arbiter of thought, word, and deed. It was an arbiter, not only of morals, ethics, and actions within religious and political spheres, but it guided an individual’s sense of fitness, appropriateness, and proportion. It informed one on proper speech toward superiors and inferiors, rhetoric appropriate to the occasion, proper attire, and decorum before authority.

Some might argue that the vast majority of these spheres are, in fact, subject to the particular social contexts of the groups to which the individual belongs. As such, the

conscience of the individual, having internalized the social unit's ordering of values, simply reflects mores of the group, or, to use Francis Bacon's expression, the tribe. In truth, there is no escaping the validity of such an observation, but it needs modifying. This perception, while it may appear logically consistent, is nevertheless built upon an understanding of the Hobbesian theory of social contract and does not sufficiently take into account the experience of "the other." To state it differently, the experience of "the other" philosophically appears in the age-old struggle between the tension of the one and the many. Christian theology has recourse through the Trinity to the ultimate resolution of this tension. The freedom that comes from the recognition and enjoyment of the Three-in-One is at the core of the experience of the comprehension and apprehension of God in His essence. Andrewes speaks of it in his treatment on the Moral Law, and it is a true freedom that, as Augustine states, transcends choice. This transcendent freedom, found by incorporation into the body of Christ through saving faith, frees the individual from a slavish commitment to the many (or the one) who might dictate behavior contrary to what the biblically-informed conscience requires. It is this dimension of the individual's spiritual experience that needs more consideration: to overlook how the conscience works on an individual level necessarily entails missing an important shaping influence upon the literature of that period. In other words, the conscience holds a power of its own that transcends the reach of temporal forms of power.

Having looked at three different works of Lancelot Andrewes, it is apparent that Andrewes' unique sacred rhetoric—powerful, vivid, balanced, and emotionally affective—is harnessed to a sacred purpose more than a political one. His early work on the moral law clearly displays the formative dimensions of his conscience as he develops

the key relationship between law and grace. The emphasis is upon a transformative experience of grace that orders the affections of the heart toward God above all else. No discernible shift in this emphasis occurs from the 1580's through the private devotions to the final Gunpowder plot sermon of 1618. Andrewes' wealth of linguistic, theological, and historical knowledge combine with his intense spiritual passion evident in his prayer life to create sermons that grow naturally from his convictions. The sermons, then, are a product of the deep spiritual experience of Andrewes, whose affections, in turn, have been ordered by a sustained pursuit to know God as found in the revelation of Christ in Scripture. Obedience to this revelation of truth is required by his conscience, and thus, though duty to obey the king may appear to bolster the political structure of the monarchy, it is ultimately premised upon a spiritual obligation. Similarly, Andrewes' emphasis on the favor that God shows to England, couched as it is in mercy, is an encomium directed towards God, and not the state.

In our efforts to more comprehensively understand the period in which an author such as Lancelot Andrewes works, we must not neglect the less tangible influences upon the individual that direct the focus of the literary endeavor being examined. That spiritual or theological influences can actually take precedence over temporal civic or political influences should come as no surprise. Not to recognize this dimension diminishes an important element of humanity within the author. It invariably leads to a reductionism that flattens the contours of the human experience. For example, Thomas Nowak claims Andrewes' preaching primarily supports the church-state power base, stating his premise plainly enough in his abstract:

The sermons of the seventeenth-century England, unlike the poetry or plays of the same period, appealed equally to all social classes as well as

to all geographical locations; and, having so often been “officially inspired” by the ruling political parties, they can enable us to see more directly than either of these other genres the power structures of this era. While these various powers constantly made good use of the pulpit to proclaim their will, my dissertation focuses on the public handling of [...] the deliverance of James and the assembled Lords and Commons from the Gunpowder Treason and Plot. (Nowak iii-iv)

Note the expressions that connote the diminished control of an individual over his message: “the ruling political parties” and “power structures of this era”—these “various powers”—made use of the pulpit to “proclaim their will.” This shift away from the control of the preacher comes even more sharply into focus when he asserts:

My primary interest here lies in the way in which the sermons themselves function within the framework of the time and place for which they were written. In descending order of importance, then, these sermons were written by the national government from James down to the Long Parliament, by the English people, and finally by the preachers themselves. The Gunpowder sermons as a whole, simply put, are public documents; personal expressions, if discernible at all, are dwarfed by larger concerns. (Nowak iv-v)

Nowak specifically places “the preachers themselves” as the least important writers. This privileging of the many over the one is problematic on several levels, not the least of which is that it practically precludes sermons from ever serving as a counterpoint or critique of the regnant party. In that era, of course, no sermon—or any other form of print—could legally be published without the permission of the ruling power, yet there are many instances of unauthorized publishing, *Areopagitica* among them. Also, sermons ordered into print by King James himself contain explicit indictments against its auditors, as has been shown from an examination of Andrewes’ 1617 sermon. Another problem with this “descending order of importance” is the overstating of the proprietary quality of the national government. While the sermons are public documents, they are only so in that an individual created them for a public purpose, nor can their creation for

the occasion possibly preclude personal expressions on the part of a preacher, especially in light of the effects that conscience brings to bear on the shaping of the material.

The broad cross-section of Andrewes' convictions that this study considers indicates that Andrewes used the state-sponsored opportunity for his sacred service to God, not as an opportunity to strengthen the power or propagate the will of the state. This approach is contrary to Nowak's understanding that "while Andrewes' means are primarily religious, his ends are consistently political" (Nowak 83, his emphasis). The interpretation more consonant with Andrewes' understanding of the conscience requires the reversal of that formula. By neglecting to consider this aspect of Andrewes' consistently spiritual and theological convictions that predate and coincide with the Gunpowder sermons, the scholarly work that Nowak presents skews the reading of the material. One instance of this tendency is very much in evidence when he assesses the 1609 sermon as "much more strongly anti-Catholic" (86). Instead, it strikes a very moderate tone given the rhetoric that John King, a royal chaplain, used the year previously. This moderation is borne out in the testimony of a contemporary hearer, a servant of the Earl of Rutland, when reporting to the Earl, states that "the generall opinion is here [in London] that a milder course wilbe held with Catholikes." Part of the proof of this milder course was Andrewes' November 5, 1609 sermon (McCullough *Sermons* 123). Additionally, the moderating tone that Andrewes uses in this sermon cannot surface in an approach that construes the message as primarily political and polemical.

Again, the conscience yielded to God—as this study emphasizes is the case with Andrewes—orders and aligns the texts, the contents, the rhetoric, the historical context,

and the occasion to an end that ultimately glorifies God and brings eternal benefit to the souls of his auditors. Using epideixis, Andrewes exalts the glorious and miraculous nature of the deliverance to stir up affections to a specific end. To heighten and deepen that sense of gratitude, he also displays the depths of treachery that the deed entails. The end, however, as is seen very clearly in the 1617 sermon, is to “magnify the Lord” and that those made sensible of that mercy should “serve Him in holiness and righteousness.” If some of those in the congregation hear something other than that and construe it as a political reinforcement of the privileged status of England as the “New Israel,” then their hearing would, by Andrewes at least, be considered impaired.

Such a claim might be presumptuous were it not for his emphatic assertion in his opening exposition of the first commandment. This point is worth repeating in his own words: “Now the soul has two parts. 1) The mind or the understanding, whose duty is to know God [...]. 2) The will and affection, whose duty is to regard God, and love him. So God must first be knowne, then loved, and love breeds obedience” (STC 6035 114-115). The causality is clear: knowledge precedes love, and love precedes obedience. What is paramount to Andrewes in his myriad roles as a preacher in his diocese or in the courts of the king is to convey clearly what can be known of God and how he is best served. Thus, he holds up the law and grace to convict and comfort hearers, he exposes transgressions and ignorance as warnings and admonitions, and he vividly portrays the magnitude of debt owed to God by the English for the November 5th rescue from the hands of their enemies. The salvation that this historical act brings is yet another instance of God’s mercy found in Christ. As such, it can legitimately be interpreted as an adumbration of God’s ultimate deliverance in Christ.

In conclusion, this study helps to clarify the power of the conscience in shaping rhetoric, not only in a sacred context, but also in a quasi-secular one. Andrewes' rhetoric clearly makes use of a temporal, historical, non-biblical event in such a way that it intends spiritually efficacious as a means of grace. His understanding of how conscience dictates obedience is derived from the rich historical tradition of orthodox Christianity, and meant that the languages he employed—English, Latin, Greek and Hebrew—the diction, the syntax, the organization of his material, and his sources, were employed to a spiritual and an affective end. The heart should be moved to love and obedience by the power of the rhetoric. It is when these material things are harnessed to a non-material end that we gain an appreciation for the affective power of words. They enable us to perceive something previously unseen, to comprehend ourselves and our times better, to find something lost, or even to discover something new. Deborah Shuger, in *Sacred Rhetoric*, states:

[f]or almost all sacred rhetorics in the Renaissance, the defining characteristic of the grand style is passion, and passion in turn is created first by the union of vividness and the excellent object and second by expressivity. The connections between emotion and these stylistic features derive from the religious epistemology and concept of selfhood current in the Renaissance. [...] The language of passion with its figures and tropes is also the language of divine disclosure. (11)

Andrewes reveals his religious epistemology and his concept of selfhood through his teaching on the Decalogue, applies it to himself through his passionate, vigorous self-examination and disciplined devotions, and then proclaims this vision of true knowledge and humility in his sermons. The workings of his conscience, manifested through his teaching and life, attest to his passion. In turn, this passion fuels his understanding of what his conscience requires: Andrewes discloses the divine work of God in the person of

Christ, especially in the historic present of the Gunpowder Plot anniversaries. That divine disclosure should then result in a renewal of love and obedience toward this merciful, heavenly, and immanent Triune God. Moreover, if true knowledge prevails, this obedience incidentally but importantly supports the established rulers, magistrates, institutions—the recognized “nursing mothers and fathers”—within the society into which one is born. Perhaps it is when considering this latter emphasis within his work that the politicized dimension of his sermons becomes temptingly prominent. To be fair to the historical record and the literary evidence, though, an account must be taken of his understanding of the centrality of the individual’s conscience and its relationship to God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augustine. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Edited and translated by R.P.H. Green. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Adamson, Sylvia et al, eds. *Renaissance Figures of Speech*. Edited by Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Ames, William. *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum; Norwood, N.J. : W. J. Johnson, 1975.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. *XCVI Sermons by the Right Honorable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late Lord Bishop of Winchester*. Published by His Majesties Special Command. The Second Edition. Printed by Richard Badger, 1632.
- . *The morall law expounded ... that is, the long-expected, and much-desired worke of Bishop Andrewes upon the Ten commandments: being his lectures many yeares since in Pembroch-Hall Chappell, in Cambridge ... : whereunto is annexed nineteene sermons of his, upon prayer in generall, and upon the Lords prayer in particular*. London: Printed for Michael Sparke, Robert Milbourne, Richard Cotes, and Andrew Croke, 1642.
- . *The Private Devotions of the Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes. Late Bishop of Winchester*. London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his shop at the Princes Armes in St. Pauls Church-yard, An. Dom. 1647.
- . *The Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes*. Ed. By Thomas S. Kepler. Cleveland, New York; World Publishing Company, 1956.
- . *A manual of the private devotions and meditations of The Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrews, late Lord Bishop of Winchester translated out of a fair Greek MS. of his amanuensis by R.D., B.D.* London: Printed by W.D. for Humphrey Moseley. 1648.
- . *A Sermon Preached before His Maiestie, at VWhitehall the Fift of Nouember Last, 1617.* by the Bishop of Elie, His Maiesties Almoner. London: Printed by Iohn Bill, M.DC.XVIII. 1618.
- . *A Sermon Preached before the Kings Maiestie at Hampton Court, Concerning the Right and Power of Calling Assemblies on Sunday the 28. of September. Anno 1606.* by the Bishop of Chichester. Imprinted at London: By Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie, 1610.

- . *A Sermon Preached before the Kings Maiestie at White-Hall, on Munday the 25. of December, being Christmas Day, Anno 1609.* by the Bishop of Elie His Maiesties Almoner. Imprinted at London: By Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie, 1610.
- Church of England. *Diocese of Chichester, Bishop. Articles to be Enquired of within the Diocesse of Chichester, in the First Generall Visitation of the Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Bishop of Chichester. Holden in the Yeere of our Lord God 1606.* Ed. Andrewes and Lancelot. Imprinted at London: by R.B., Anno 1606, 1606.
- . *Two Sermons Preached before the Kings Maiestie at Whitehall. of the Birth of Christ the One on Christmas Day Anno 1609. the Other on Christmas Last Anno 1610.* by the Bishop of Elie His Maiesties Almoner. Imprinted at London: By Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie. Anno 1610, 1610.
- Baker, Moira. "'The Dichotomiz'd Carriage of all our Sermons': Satiric Structure in the Sermons of Thomas Adams." *English Renaissance Prose* 3.1 (1989): 1-17.
- Brightman, Brown, Meg Lota. *Donne and the Politics of Conscience in Early Modern England.* Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995.
- Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660.* 2d ed., rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Cefalu, Paul. *Moral Identity in Early Modern English Literature.* Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Chamberlain, John. *The Letters of John Chamberlain.* Vol 1. Ed. Norman Egbert McClure. Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1939.
- Charles I, King of England. *Basiliká the Works of King Charles the Martyr: With a Collection of Declarations, Treaties, and Other Papers Concerning the Differences Betwixt His Said Majesty and His Two Houses of Parliament: With the History of His Life : As also of His Tryal and Martyrdome.* Ed. Fulman and William. London: Printed for Ric. Chiswell, 1687.
- Cogswell, Thomas, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake, ed. *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England.* Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1987.
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624.* Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Collinson, Patrick and John Craig, ed. *The Reformation in English Towns, 1500-1640*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: The Third Anstey Memorial Lectures in the University of Kent at Canterbury, 12-15 may, 1986*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1988.
- . *The Reformation: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2004.
- . *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- The Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisme First Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and Now Appointed by the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland to be a Part of Uniformity in Religion, between the Kirks of Christ in the Three Kingdomes*. [Edinburgh]: Amsterdam, printed by Luice Elsever [i.e. Gideon Lithgow], for Andrew Wilson, and are to be sold at his shop in Edinburgh. 1649.
- Davies, Horton. *Catching the Conscience*. Cambridge, Mass: Cowley, 1984.
- . *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588-1645*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1986.
- Dever, Mark. *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- Doerksen, Daniel W. and Christopher Hodgkins, ed. *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004.
- Donne, John. *John Donne's 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon: A Parallel-Text Edition*. Shami, Jeanne, ed. Pittsburgh, Pa: Duquesne University Press, 1996.
- Ellis, John. *A Defence of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England Written in Latin by J. Ellis ... Now done into English; to which are Added the Lambeth Articles; Together with the Judgment of Bishop Andrews, Dr. overall, and Other Eminent and Learned Men upon them*. Ed. Andrewes and Lancelot. London: Printed for H. Bonwicke, T. Goodwin, M. Wooten, S. Manship, and B. Tooke, 1700.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter Lake, ed. *The English Sermon 1600-1750*. Manchester; New York; New York: Manchester University Press; Distributed in the USA by St. Martin's Press, 2000.

- Fincham, Kenneth, ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1993.
- . *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; Rochester, NY, USA; Heslington, York: Boydell Press; Church of England Record Society, 1994.
- Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. Oxford, England; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Fish, Stanley. *Self-consuming Artifacts; the Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972.
- . *Seventeenth-Century Prose: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Edited by Stanley E. Fish. New York, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Friedman, Donald M. "Thomas Adams and John Donne." *Notes and Queries: For Readers and Writers, Collectors and Librarians* 23 (1976): 229-30.
- Geneva Bible, 1559*. White Hall, WV; Tolle Lege Press, 2006
- George, Charles H. *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Haller, William. *Elizabeth I and the Puritans*. Ithaca, N.Y: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell University Press, 1964.
- . *The Rise of Puritanism; Or, the Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Howell, Wilber S. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. New York, Russell & Russell, 1961 [c1956]
- Johnson, Galen. *Prisoner of Conscience: John Bunyan on Self, Community and Christian Faith*. Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 2003.
- Keller, Katherine Z. and Gerald J. Schiffhorst, ed. *The Witness of Times: Manifestations of Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*. Pittsburgh, Pa: Duquesne University Press, 1993.
- Knott, John Ray. *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694*. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

- Lake, Peter and Michael Questier, ed. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*. Woodbridge, Suffolk; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Leites, Edmund, Ed. *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1988.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Locke, John. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. First published in Latin, with title: *Epistola de tolerantia*. Goudae: Apud J. ab Hoeve, 1689. Translated into English by William Popple. Reproduction of original in Huntington Library. Wing L2748.
- . *An essay concerning human understanding. In four books. Written by John Locke, Gent.* Vol. 1. The fourteenth edition. London, 1753. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. Baylor University. 6 July 2011
- Loyola, Ignatius. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola*. Translated by Father Elder Mullan, S. J. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1914
- Lossky, Nicholas. *Lancelot Andrewes, The Preacher (1555-1626) The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- MacLure, Millar. *The Paul's Cross Sermon: 1534-1642*. Toronto University of Toronto Press, 1958.
- Mattingly, Garrett. *The Armada*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1959.
- Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony. *Renaissance and Revolution: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Toronto, New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Miller, David G. *The Word made Flesh made Word: The Failure and Redemption of Metaphor in Edward Taylor's Christographia*. Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1995.
- Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- . *Seventeenth Century Britain, 1603-1714. Vol. 2*. Folkestone, Eng; Hamden, Conn: Dawson; Archon, 1980.
- McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge; New York. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- . "Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642." *The Historical Journal*, 41, 2 (1998), pp. 401-422. Cambridge University Press.
- . "Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* Ed. H.C. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP 2004. Online ed. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Jan. 2008. 10 Sep 2010.
- Nicholls, Mark. *Investigating Gunpowder Plot*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press: New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Nicolson, Adam. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible* New York: Harper Collins, 2003.
- Nowak, Thomas Stephen. "Remember, remember the fifth of November": *Anglocentrism and anti-Catholicism in the English gunpowder sermons, 1605-1651*. Unpublished dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1992.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue, from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*. New York: Octagon Books, 1974.
- Owen, John. *Sin and Temptation: Vol. 6*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1978
- Owen, Trevor A. *Lancelot Andrewes*. Boston: Twayne, 1981.
- Peck, Linda Levy, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston; London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- Perkins, William. *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience, distinguished into three books [microform] / taught and delivered by M.W. Perkins in several lectures, examined by his own briefs and published for the common good, by T. Pickering: Printed by J.L. and are to be sold by Thomas Pierrepont ..., 1651*.
- Reidy, Maurice F. *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher: A Study in Early Seventeenth-century Religious Thought*. Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1955.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- . *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

- Schwiebert, Ernest G. *Luther and His Times: The Reformation from a New Perspective*. St. Louis, Concordia Pub. House, 1950.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford; Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Shami, Jeanne. *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*. Cambridge England; Rochester, NY: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Sharpe, Kevin and Peter Lake, ed. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Criticism and Compliment : The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies*. London; New York: Pinter, 1989.
- Shuger, Deborah. *Sacred Rhetoric: the Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Sidney, Sir Phillip. *Apologie for Poetrie: 1595*. Ed. by Edward Arber. London: Constable; New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- Skalnik, James Veazie. *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance*. Kirksville, Mo: Truman State University Press, 2002.
- Sloane, Thomas O. *Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Stewart, Alan. *The Cradle King: the life of James VI & I, the First Monarch of a United Great Britain*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003.
- Todd, Margo. *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England*. London; New York, N.Y: Routledge, 1995.
- Tyacke, Nicholas, ed. *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800*. London; Bristol, Pa: UCL Press, 1998.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1987.

- . *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700*. Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press: Palgrave, 2001.
- Webber, Joan. *Contrary Music: the Prose Style of John Donne*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.
- . *The Eloquent "I": Style and Self in Seventeenth-Century Prose*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Webster, Tom. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620-1643*. Cambridge England: New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Weir, Alison. *The Life of Elizabeth I*. Random House Publishing. 1998
- Whyte, Alexander. *Lancelot Andrewes and his private devotions [microform] / a biography, a transcript, and an interpretation by Alexander Whyte*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1896. 2nd ed.
- Williamson, George. *The Senecan Amble: a Study in Prose Form from Bacon to Collier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- . *Seventeenth Century Contexts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Wilson, F. P. *Seventeenth Century Prose; Five Lectures*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Wright, Abraham. *Five Sermons, in Five several Styles; Or Waies of Preaching. the [Brace] First in Bp Andrews His Way; before the Late King upon the First Day of Lent. Second in Bp Hall's Way; before the Clergie at the Author's Own Ordination in Christ-Church, Oxford. Third in Dr Maine's and Mr Cartwright's Way; before the Universitie at St Maries, Oxford. Fourth in the Presbyterian Way; before the Citie at Saint Paul's London. Fifth in the Independent Way; Never Preached. with an Epistle Rendring an Account of the Author's Designe in Printing these His Sermons, as also of the Sermons Themselves*. by Ab. Wright, Sometimes Fellow of St John Baptist Coll. in Oxford. [London]: Printed for Edward Archer, at the Adam and Eve in Little Britain, 1656.