

Lancelot Andrewes' Doctrine of the Incarnation

Respectfully Submitted to the
Faculty of Nashotah House
In Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of Master of Theological Studies

Davidson R. Morse

Nashotah House

May 2003

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to the whole faculty of Nashotah House Seminary for the care and encouragement I received while researching and writing this thesis. Greatest thanks, however, goes to the Rev. Dr. Charles Henery, who directed and edited the work. His encyclopedic knowledge of the theology and literature of the Anglican tradition are both formidable and inspirational. I count him not only a mentor, but also a friend. Thanks also goes to the Rev. Dr. Tom Holtzen for his guidance in my research on the Christological controversies and points of Patristic theology.

Finally, I could not have written the thesis without the love and support of my wife. Not only did she manage the house and children alone, but also she graciously encouraged me to pursue and complete the thesis. I dedicate it to her.

Rev. Davidson R. Morse
Easter Term, 2003

O Lord and Father, our King and God, by whose grace the Church was enriched by the great learning and eloquent preaching of thy servant Lancelot Andrewes, but even more by his example of biblical and liturgical prayer: Conform our lives, like his, we beseech thee, to the image of Christ, that our hearts may love thee, our minds serve thee, and our lips proclaim the greatness of thy mercy; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever. *Amen.*

-The Proper for the Lesser Feasts and Fasts 2000 together with The Fixed Holy Days

Introduction

Lancelot Andrewes, sometime bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester, is a dominant figure in the history of the Church of England; and thereby to the whole of the Anglican Communion, because of the time in which he lived and the influence that he exerted upon the Church of his day. We know very little about him as a historical figure. He lived the quiet life of the scholar, and would have lived more quietly had his talents not been so greatly esteemed and demanded in the king's court and chapel. If history is the sole domain of heroes and villains, generals and conquest, then Lancelot Andrewes is rightly left out of the tale. Yet, history is not so exclusive, but makes place for those among us who by humble strength of character, power of will and word and purity of life change the world around them. Lancelot Andrewes was such an individual, patiently calling the Church of his day to articulate an authentically Anglican theology.

Andrewes exercised his influence during England's Golden Age. The War of the Roses and the English Reformation successively had decimated the cultural cohesion and financial stability of the realm. But with the long reign of Elizabeth came a relative calm that witnessed a flowering in the fields of theology, science and the arts. Andrewes was a contemporary of Richard Hooker, Sir Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare and was in his own right a light of the English literary constellation.

In many ways his life is a reflection of the new England. He was born to a moderately wealthy family of the rising merchant class in London. While his education followed the medieval academic tradition, his involvement with Cambridge brought him into close contact with the Puritan party whose expanding involvement in the Church and Parliament proved to be the greatest source of conflict in the Elizabethan and Caroline reigns. And finally, his dependence upon the patristic tradition of the first five centuries assisted him in developing a uniquely Anglican identity and approach to theology.

This thesis is principally occupied with Andrewes' incarnational theology. It will therefore exclude all but the most cursory reference to his devotional and polemical writings. Nevertheless, to understand properly his development of thought regarding the mystery of Christ's Incarnation it will be necessary to provide historical and theological contexts.

Chapter I contains a brief biographical sketch of Andrewes, a discussion of the state of the established Church in his day as it searched to achieve the middle way between the Puritan and Roman Catholic traditions, and concludes with an investigation into the patristic appeal for Anglican apologetic.

Chapter II is concerned specifically with Andrewes' ministry as a preacher. Andrewes' influence came from his talents as a preacher, and his teaching is best understood from the collection of ninety-six sermons preached on the great feast days of the liturgical Church year. The primary sources for this thesis consist of the 50 sermons of Andrewes preached on Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday in the years between 1605 and 1624. This chapter will establish Andrewes' affinity for the Fathers and the Christological teaching established in the first four ecumenical councils.

Chapter III addresses Andrewes' understanding and treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation in his sermons. The relationship of the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ is of central importance to Andrewes, and it is from the mystery of this union that he meditates on the plan of salvation for humanity. The sacraments as a means of making present the incarnate Word come as a development of that saving mystery.

Chapter IV is engaged with the dominical sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist as the means by which humanity shares in the person of Christ and in the salvation made available in the Incarnation. This thesis will explore the unitive and purgative roles of the sacraments as agents achieving humanity's deification.

Finally, Chapter V will investigate Andrewes' doctrine of deification. Beginning with a consideration of theological precedents established by Sts. Irenaeus and Athanasius, this paper will discuss Andrewes' development of the patristic doctrine as basic to his understanding of human redemption and glorification. The thesis will also challenge the conclusions made by Nicholas Lossky regarding Andrewes' doctrine of deification in his seminal work *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*.¹

This thesis, then, attempts to examine the incarnational foundation of Andrewes' sacramental theology, relying upon inspection and analysis of his extant sermons, arguing that his attention to the patristic understanding of deification was critical to the future course of Anglican thought and spirituality.

¹ Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 251f.

Chapter I – Lancelot Andrewes the Divine

Lancelot Andrewes was born in 1555 in All Hallows Parish, Barking, London, the first son of a wealthy shipping family from Suffolk. His life spanned a turbulent and adventurous time in England's history. Born the same year that Mary Tudor executed bishops Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer, he lived to see James Stuart's son, Charles I, crowned before his death.

It was customary for boys to be apprenticed to the master of a trade, with a view to their future careers, but his parents and teachers saw in this young boy a great deal of academic promise. Around 1563 he attended the Cooper's Free School in Radcliffe, and from there he made his way to the Merchant Taylor's School to learn under the noteworthy, but strict, Mr. Richard Mulcaster.² For eight hours a day, the boys learned Latin grammar and classics, and in their spare time, arithmetic. Even at this young age Andrewes showed ability in languages, and it is probable that it was at Merchant Taylor's that he first learned Greek. Because of his aptitude in Greek he received a scholarship to university and in 1571 he went up to Pembroke College, Cambridge. During his undergraduate years at Cambridge Andrewes would return to his family's home in London each Easter, where he would engage a tutor in order to learn yet another language. All in all, he is said to have learned Greek, Hebrew, Latin and fourteen other oriental and modern languages. One of his earliest biographers, Thomas Fuller, commented: "he became so skilled in all, especially Oriental languages, that some conceive he might (if then living) almost have served as an interpreter-general at the confusion of tongues [the Tower of Babel]."³ In 1575 he received the Bachelor of Arts. The next year he was made Fellow of Pembroke Hall, and in 1578 he earned the Master of Arts, eventually being ordained deacon in 1580.⁴

Andrewes came from a moderately Calvinistic home, as were so many of the rising Merchant class in London in the Elizabethan Age. It was fitting then that he went to Cambridge rather than the more conservative Oxford for university. Andrewes arrived at Cambridge just one year after the Master of Trinity College, and later Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, deprived the Puritan Thomas Cartwright of his chair at university for his vigorous nonconformist views. Young Andrewes was initially courted by the Puritans, for they saw in him a great mind and a great champion in the making. His strict views on the keeping of Sunday according to Old Testament prescriptions initially drew him to the Puritan preachers who publicly inveighed against sport and any other profane activity on the Lord's Day. It seems that his progression away from Puritanism coincided with a disenchanting discovery. The 17th century historian John Aubrey recounts in his *Lives of Eminent Men*, how Andrewes found out the Puritan preachers: ...these Hypocrites did bowle in a private green at their colledge every Sunday after Sermon; and one of the Colledge (a loving friend to Mr. L. Andrewes) to satisfie him, one time lent him the Key of a Private back dore to the bowling green, on a Sunday evening, which he opening, discovered the zealous Preachers with their Gownes off, earnest at play.⁵

² Paul A. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes: 1555-1626* (London: SPCK, 1958), 9.

³ Florence Higham, *Lancelot Andrewes* (London: SCM Press, 1952), 13.

⁴ Trevor A. Owen, *Lancelot Andrewes* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981), 19f.

⁵ John Aubrey, *Lives of Eminent Men*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick (London: Secker and Warburg, 1949), 6.

His preaching began in earnest when he was appointed Catechist at Pembroke College in 1578. He gave a series of lectures on Saturday and Sunday afternoons upon the meaning of the Ten Commandments. His learning and rhetoric became so popular that members of Pembroke, surrounding colleges and the town would pack the chapel to hear him. This early success and exposure from the pulpit served to garner more accolades for the rising star, being appointed as vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate, Prebendary of St. Pancras, Collegiate Church Southwell, and St. Paul's, London, all in 1589.

One of the ancient duties of the Prebendary at St. Paul's that Andrewes held was the office of the Penitentiary or Confessor. This ministry had been long out of use, but Andrewes made efforts to restore the practice of spiritual direction and giving absolution, even in the face of staunch Puritan resistance, and no little embarrassment to the more conservative churchmen who might otherwise have agreed with him. Notwithstanding the opposition, the grieving and the troubled could be sure to find Andrewes ambling the south aisle of the cathedral, especially on afternoons in Lent.⁶ His pastoral sensitivity and care were remarkable and his sermons bear marks of a dedicated pastor and lover of souls.

Andrewes' talent as a preacher, and his service to the Church converting recusants and nonconformists, quickly drew the Royal attention. Elizabeth I admired his sermons, and he was called to preach in the royal chapels regularly. The queen offered him the sees of Salisbury and Ely, but he refused in protest over her habit of requisitioning church revenues from her appointments' diocese. In 1601, she made him Dean of Westminster, and it is there that he may have preached the sermon at her funeral in 1603.⁷

Upon the accession of James Stuart to the throne in 1603, Andrewes' fortunes continued to rise. James asked him to attend as one of the clergy representing the established Church at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, where Andrewes supported the Church against the claims of the Puritans. He later led the commission charged with the translation of the books of Genesis thru II Kings for the Authorized Version of the Bible.⁸ James so valued his defense of the Church, as well as his learning, that he preferred him to the bishopric of Chichester in 1605.

This was the same year as the infamous Gunpowder Plot. The Plot was uncovered on November 3, 1605, the very day that Andrewes was consecrated bishop of Chichester and was to have been carried out on November 5, the first day Andrewes was to take the bench in the House of Lords. While the Gunpowder Plot was neither conceived nor commanded by the Pope, its discovery reopened the debate over the duties that Roman Catholic Englishmen owed to the crown. In reaction to the attempt on the life of Parliament and the king, James issued the Oath of Allegiance, with the sole purpose of distinguishing between loyal and disloyal Roman Catholic subjects or recusants. The Oath repudiated the papal doctrine that released all subjects from obedience to rulers not in communion with the Pope.⁹ The Pope condemned the Oath and the great theologian and controversialist Robert Cardinal Bellarmine wrote a stinging indictment of the English king's assumption of the rule of the Church. Though James was a theologian of some ability, he enlisted the talents of Andrewes to compose the rebuttal to Bellarmine, which he did in *Tortura Torti* in 1609, and again in his *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* in 1610. Because of his controversial works against Bellarmine James rewarded Andrewes by

⁶ Op. cit. 22f.

⁷ Welsby, 78.

⁸ Alister E. McGrath, *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and how it changed a Nation, a Language and a Culture* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 179.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 143.

translating him to Ely in 1609. He was so much in favor with the king that most believed that he would be translated to Canterbury upon the death of Archbishop Richard Bancroft. However, James chose George Abbot in 1610 to fulfill a promise he had made to the Earl of Dunbar.¹⁰

While bishop of Ely, Andrewes was named to a special Commission to hear a judicial case, which finally resulted in the only blemish on Andrewes' character. The case came to be known as the Essex Affair. In 1613, Archbishop Abbot, Andrewes and a panel of other clergy and laymen were commissioned by James to determine whether Lady Frances Howard and Robert Devereaux, the Earl of Essex, might gain a divorce. Robert Devereaux had been unable to consummate the marriage, and Lady Howard wished a divorce in order to marry Robert Carr, the Viscount Rochester, a favorite of king James. James made his wishes clear to the Commission that the divorce should be approved. Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury whom James had appointed over Andrewes, decided against divorce. It was Andrewes, who could never gainsay the king, who finally consented to the royal wishes. On the day appointed by the king for a verdict, Abbot arrived ready to make his position public. The king quashed debate and demanded a simple "Yes" or "No" vote. Abbot and his supporters left the proceedings and in the end the remaining Commission members, including Andrewes, granted the divorce. The public reaction to the verdict was to reject it as justice gone awry, but the marriage of Lady Howard to Rochester occurred quickly thereafter. In 1615 details came to light that Lady Frances had been giving potions to Robert Devereaux, her first husband, to keep him from being able to consummate the marriage. She hoped that this impediment might enable her to marry Robert Carr. Sir Thomas Overbury, incarcerated in the Tower of London, knew of the Lady's conspiracy with a local chemist against her husband. Fearing that Overbury would tell what he knew to the authorities, Lady Frances Howard had Overbury poisoned in his cell in the Tower ten days before the Commission delivered its verdict. Though Andrewes had no knowledge of the conspiracy, his reputation was damaged because of his willingness to follow the demands of the king despite the testimony of canon law and the dissent of other senior prelates on the Commission.¹¹

In the waning years of his life Andrewes continued to be closely involved with the king and especially over the issue of the accession of his son Charles to the throne. In the fall of 1623, Andrewes called Matthew Wren, one of prince Charles' chaplains, to his residence at Winchester House. When Wren arrived he found Andrewes together with the Bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, and the Bishop of St. David's, William Laud. There Bishop Neile asked Wren what Charles' exact intentions were toward the Church. Wren responded that he was confident that prince Charles was as favorable toward the established Church as his father James ever had been. "I am sure I shall be a true prophet," Andrewes exclaimed,

...I shall be in my grave, and so shall you, my Lord of Durham; but my Lord of David's, and you Doctor, will live to see that day, that your master will be put to it, upon his head, and his crown, without he will forsake the support of the Church.¹²

Andrewes was truly a prophet, for both prince Charles and William Laud would lose their heads to the Parliamentary forces less than 20 years later in support of the established Church.

¹⁰ Owen, 25.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 233ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, 211.

In 1625 James died without the company and comfort of his old friend and confidant, for Andrewes himself was bedridden, suffering from gout. On September 25th, 1626, Lancelot Andrewes died. In his *Diary* Bishop Laud wrote, “about four o’clock in the morning died Lancelot Andrewes, the most worthy bishop of Winchester, the great light of the Christian world”.¹³

Lancelot Andrewes epitomizes the golden age of Anglicanism. He embodies the learning, theology and devotion of the age.¹⁴ However, the Church established by the Elizabethan settlement was a communion divided from the beginning and by the early Stuart Age was straining at the seams. The reforms under Henry VIII had been primarily political in nature, initially serving the king’s need for an heir. That heir, the boy king Edward VI, reigned for such a short time, yet the reformation of the Church under the guidance of Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer turned more and more theological in character. Upon Edward’s death, Mary Tudor took the throne, and undertook to restore Roman Catholicism during her reign. Many reformed churchmen packed their families and passed into voluntary exile on the continent, settling in Geneva, Frankfurt, or Zurich, rather than face sanction, prison or the fires of Smithfield.

When Elizabeth took up the reins of her kingdom it was bankrupt, riven with religious controversy and fearful of invasion from Roman Catholic Spain. It was this divided Church that Elizabeth attempted to pacify with her religious Settlement. Elizabeth’s intent was to establish a Church that moderates in both camps might share in peace. Her policy was intended to enforce, in the words of Archbishop Matthew Parker, “a golden mediocrity”.¹⁵ The Settlement established moderate Protestant practice for the maintenance of national unity. Neither rigorously Protestant in its dogma, nor consistently traditional in its liturgy, the hope for the Elizabethan church was for it to tread lightly along a middle path. The plan addressed the political volatility caused by religion in her realm, but did little to cultivate or swell the spiritual life of her subjects.¹⁶

That is not to say that the new queen’s task was a simple one. Unlike her siblings, she faced the challenge of combining in one realm both of the competing religious parties with the churchmen dedicated to the Settlement. On the continent, either the Lutherans were established and the Reformed churches were excluded or the Reformed churches were established and the Lutherans were expelled.¹⁷ The queen hoped to secure a synthesis between the radical Calvinists returning from exile on the continent and the moderate conservatives that had survived Mary’s reign for the good of national unity. Both Puritan and churchman alike rejected the papal intrusion in political and theological matters. They both agreed that there had been a real need for reform: that the service in English was better than in Latin, and that having a wife was better than having a mistress.¹⁸ But the points of difference were subtler for Elizabeth than they had been for her siblings, Edward and Mary. The question was no longer was the established Church for or against the Bishop of Rome. Instead the question became, what right did the king have to encroach upon the rights of the Church? Greater still, what is the Church, and what is its polity? Is the Church autonomous, or just a department of the king’s government? Can the Church dictate on matters not expressed explicitly in the Scriptures?¹⁹

¹³ Ibid., 259.

¹⁴ A.M. Allchin, *The Living Presence of the Past* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), 56.

¹⁵ Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation* (London: Penguin Books, 1964), 212.

¹⁶ J.G. Bishop, *Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester 1605-1609* (Chichester: Chichester Papers, 1963), 2.

¹⁷ Op. cit., 211.

¹⁸ Ibid., 135.

¹⁹ Bernard Blackstone, “Some notes on Lancelot Andrewes,” *Theology* 53 (1950): 94-101.

It was the Marian exiles, those English subjects that had left to seek asylum in Protestant Europe, who were pressing for more thoroughgoing reform of the Church of England. In exile they had honed their political skills and had developed a deep disaffection toward the crown, having only narrowly escaped the fate of Cranmer and scores of other English Protestants under the hand of Mary Tudor. While away they had learned the theology, not of Luther, but of the eminent Geneva reformer, John Calvin. Calvinism was incredibly appealing to people across the social spectrum. The gripping logic and cohesion of the system reflected Calvin's scholastic training in Paris. Yet, he was a conscientious reformer, rejecting whatever could not be explicitly supported in the pages of Scripture.²⁰ His thought greatly pervaded the English Church, but it was the more radical Calvinists or Puritans, who pressed the logic of Calvin's conclusions into areas in which more moderate churchmen refused to go. Claiming that there was no Scriptural warrant, the Puritans rejected episcopacy and criticized (or ignored) the Book of Common Prayer. The Church could have no authority to "decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith"²¹ and could not require the sacrament of Confirmation, wearing of the surplice, the wedding ring, or the use of the sign of the cross at Baptism.

The early Elizabethan Church provided few clear answers to the Puritan demands. Many churchmen and Puritans agreed on Calvin's interpretation of the knotty doctrine of Predestination. The Articles of Religion, obligatory on all clergy of the established Church, were moderately Calvinist in composition. But on the central point of the Episcopacy, the supporters of the established Church stood their ground.

The defense of the traditional episcopate in England depended upon an understanding of the king or queen as a divinely appointed agent for the welfare of the kingdom. Because the Scripture was ambiguous on the point of Church polity, making no explicit prescriptions for the perfect model of ecclesiastical governance, it was the civil ruler's prerogative to institute the form most agreeable to a realm. Archbishop John Whitgift stated, "I am persuaded that the external government of the church under a Christian magistrate must be according to the kind and form of government used in the commonwealth."²² Whitgift, hoping to maintain cordial relations with the continental Reformed churches, allowed that there were acceptable alternatives in Church government, conceding that government by presbytery was a satisfactory option for continental governments. However, none was so good in England, as the traditional episcopacy.

Richard Hooker changed the rules of the game. Hooker, born the year before Andrewes in 1554, was Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Master of the Temple Church in London and the *par excellence* apologist for the Elizabethan settlement. In his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, first published in 1593, Hooker argued that God had revealed himself to humankind through the illumination of his reason and through Scripture. While rational deduction could never be held in opposition to Scripture, the Holy Ghost's inspiration of the Church qualified it to make decrees that were in harmony with Scripture and natural law.²³ In Book V of his *Laws*, published in 1597, Hooker proceeded to construct a positive defense of the Book of Common Prayer based upon the Church's reasonable duty to develop corporate worship, and based upon the riches of the Christian past, both catholic and reformed. Hooker defended the episcopate

²⁰ Henry R. McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 24.

²¹ *The Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), Article XX, 871.

²² Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 89.

²³ *Ibid.*, 214. The most recent and very helpful text on Hooker is Philip Secor, *Richard Hooker: The Prophet of Anglicanism* (Toronto: The Anglican Book Centre, 1999).

likewise by affirming the divine right of the queen, as “godly prince”, to establish in her Settlement whatever religious ceremonies were beneficial to her realm.

Though Hooker died at a young age in 1600, there were many churchmen who stood ready to take up the defense of the established Church following the arguments he had developed in his *Laws*. Indeed, they were not simply willing to stand with it, but charged ahead, reversing the theological gains that the Puritans had made since the Reformation. For instance, churchmen like Archbishop Bancroft, Hadriana Saravia the theologian, and Bishop Andrewes made the larger claim that it was St. Paul’s intent in the Pastoral Epistles to establish the episcopate as the historic and apostolic order. And while Scripture was indeed primary, Andrewes and his peers pointed to the witness of antiquity as final precedent for their position.²⁴

It is the appeal to antiquity that is characteristic of 17th century Anglican thought as churchmen developed a positive understanding of the English Church in continuity with the historic faith. English theologians began to define their thought in relationship to the early church and not in relationship to the theologians of Geneva or Rome. The discovery of early texts written by Clement, Ignatius, Basil and Chrysostom renewed Anglican scholars’ interest in the patristic writers. At the Hampton Court Conference, Lancelot Andrewes defended the use of the sign of the cross because, “It appears out of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, and it was used in *immortali lavacro*.”²⁵ He and others studied the Fathers to establish theological precedent, to understand parallels between the Church’s nativity and their own time, not out of antiquarian interest, but the desire for continuity.²⁶

At its heart, the dispute between the English churchmen and the nonconforming Puritans or Roman Catholics centered on hermeneutics. The Puritans argued that the Scripture was self-evident and that the Church had little authority in its interpretation and application. The Roman Catholic critics of the English Church maintained that the English Church was outside the historic Faith and was heretical like the other Protestant sects. To both parties, Andrewes answered vigorously that the English Church was in continuity with the Patristic tradition, without interruption to the Apostles in matters of faith or practice, and in accord with Scripture.²⁷ While not doubting the Puritans’ orthodoxy, Andrewes thought the Calvinistic system built upon eternal predestination took the individual outside of the corporate and historic faith and placed too great a distance between God and the human soul. The Puritan ideal neglected the Patristic emphasis on God’s self-giving, his coming, dwelling, and living the human experience. For Andrewes, the problem lay specifically in their failure to grasp the mystery of the Incarnation in the person of Christ and his life in the individual soul.²⁸

Andrewes did not appeal to antiquity to defend the English Church from the internal threat of the Puritans alone, but faced his Roman Catholic critics with the same confidence in the Church’s place within the historic faith. Cardinal Bellarmine rejected James’ assertion that the English Church could still claim the name “catholic” stating catholicity was predicated upon reception of the doctrines promulgated at the Council of Trent: Transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, and the temporal power of the Pope. In the past, Protestant defenders had advanced behind the standard of Scripture as the rule of faith. Though Andrewes was unwilling to abandon Scripture, he saw in the witness of antiquity an affirmation of the English Church’s

²⁴ Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 9f.

²⁵ Welsby, 82.

²⁶ McAdoo, 316.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 317.

²⁸ W.H. Ness, “Lancelot Andrewes and the English Church,” *Theology* 13 (1926): 147-154.

faithfulness to apostolic tradition and chose instead to attack the Roman position using her own weapon of tradition against her. In his *Responsio* Andrewes wrote, “These many things which are laid down in the creeds and canons of the four Councils are enough for us to hold; the points we reject are not of these.”²⁹ And again,

One canon reduced to writing by God himself, two testaments, three creeds, four general councils, five centuries, and the series of Fathers in that period-- the centuries, that is, before Constantine, and two after, determine the boundary of our faith.³⁰

Like Vincent of Lerins, the fifth century monk who provided a guide in the determination of the true Catholic faith in his ‘Commonitorium’, Andrewes believed that the undisputed faith received, practiced and passed on by the undivided Church was the standard by which all ecclesiastical development should be judged.³¹ The term “catholic” could only refer to the core of faith held by all people in all times, and in all places, and could not be exclusively appropriated by one branch of the communion. Therefore the Church of England could reasonably maintain her place in the universal Church without reference to the untraditional demands made by Rome.

²⁹ *Responsio*, 69, in Welsby, *Andrewes*, 155.

³⁰ *Opuscula Quaedam Posthuma*, 91, in Welsby, *Andrewes*, 156.

³¹ *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), s.v. “Vincent of Lerins, St.”, 1422.

Chapter II – The Court Preacher

A. Sermons

Preaching has always had its place in Christianity, but the Reformation placed a new premium upon the pulpit and the spoken word. The reformers sought venues to voice their criticism of the Church or to defend themselves against the attacks from Rome. The preaching office gained prestige as the new theology drew attention to each individual's need to respond in faith toward the Creator. And the move away from the Latin to a service in the vernacular served as incentive for the development of preaching as exposition of the new tradition.³²

This was especially true in Elizabethan England, where churchman and Puritan grappled for control of the Church's future in the pulpit. Nowhere is there a better example of this than the weekly confrontation at the Temple Church in London between Richard Hooker and his second cousin Walter Travers. Travers was a confirmed Puritan, and preceded Hooker to the Temple as Reader in 1581. He expected to receive the appointment as Master. However, Elizabeth did not appreciate Travers' radical Calvinism and preferred Hooker as Master instead. Hooker was only a moderate Calvinist and insisted that the worship of the Temple be conducted according to the Book of Common Prayer. Each Sunday Hooker took the pulpit at the principal service on Sunday morning. While Travers was not usually in attendance, friends would bring him notes of Hooker's sermon. Travers would then preach at the Temple in the afternoon, rebutting Hooker's message. Hooker's style was involved, using long, complicated sentences to communicate his message. To make matters worse, he was near sighted, forcing him to stand close to his manuscript, which he read in a monotone. In contrast, Travers was a fiery speaker who memorized his manuscript so that he might better connect with his audience. Hooker may have won the battle of ideas, but Travers clearly won the battle of hearts, and the conflict wasn't resolved until Travers was removed from the Temple in 1586.³³ Because the Temple was situated adjacent to the Inns of Court, the legal center of London, the sermons preached from the Temple's pulpit reflected the struggle for power between the Establishment and the Puritans in Parliament. Such was the influence and power of pulpit oratory.

In 17th century England, so dominated by the public sermon, Lancelot Andrewes was considered to be the finest preacher in the land. His listeners greeted him with praise, but none as great as the title given him of *Stella Praedicatorum*, or those who called him "an angel in the pulpit".³⁴ As Dean of Westminster, he preached the sermon at Elizabeth's funeral, and James I loved his sermons so well that he demanded his presence at court for all major feasts throughout his reign.

But for all his success in the pulpit, Andrewes believed the sermon to be only a part of the duty and service of Christian worship. Andrewes preached to present the essential truths of the Christian religion, grappling with the mysteries of the Incarnation and Resurrection, expecting his listeners to respond in faith and repentance. But the sermon could not pray nor could it offer the sacrifices of the faithful. These were the function of the liturgy, especially as it is found in the English Book of Common Prayer, and the duties of the people.³⁵ Andrewes criticized the Puritan model, which revolved around the extemporaneous and extensive sermon, as self-serving, placing too much emphasis upon the individual sermon and not enough upon corporate prayer. "Is the pouring of the Spirit to end in preaching? and preaching to end in itself,

³² Arthur Pollard, *English Sermons* (London: Longman, Green, 1963), 8.

³³ Secor, 202f. For a detailed account of the controversy between Hooker and Travers, see chapters 9-12.

³⁴ Owen, 60.

³⁵ Kenneth Fincham, *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (London: MacMillan Press, Ltd., 1993), 81.

as it doth with us? a circle of preaching, and in effect nothing else, but pour in prophesying enough, and then all is safe?"; asks Andrewes.³⁶ The sermon couldn't be an end to itself. Instead, the preacher's solemn duty was to enjoin the congregation to prayer and to communion with Almighty God. "It is the oratory of prayer poured out of our hearts shall save us", he once exclaimed, "no less than the oratory of preaching poured in at our ears."³⁷

Andrewes was the greatest preacher of his day. His unique style of oratory, built upon the mystical rhetoric of the Church Fathers and the order of the *Artes Praedicandi*, the formal rhetorical style developed in European universities during the Middle Ages³⁸. Above all, Andrewes' style shows his love of words. He loved their sound and their meanings. He used words the way an artist uses paint for contrast, shape and meaning. He employs assonance and antithesis to express the mysteries of the faith in ways that are reminiscent of patristic preachers. He puns, rhymes and even makes up words, as he presses forward toward his goal. And his goal is never his own glory as a wordsmith, but the comprehension and exposition of the text at hand. "Andrewes takes a word and derives the world from it", T.S. Eliot once observed, "squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning which we should never have supposed any word to possess."³⁹

B. Patristic Sources

Andrewes was always concerned with the meaning of the text and so the Bible was always the most important source for his sermons. But Andrewes' appreciation for truth caused him to make great use of classical sources and to quote Pliny, Seneca, Aristotle and others liberally, which set him apart from the Puritans who viewed such writers as pagan and unfit to mention in Christian circles.⁴⁰ But more important than his reference to the classical pagan writers is his great use and dependence upon the Fathers of the Church.

The Patristic references in Andrewes' sermons reveal his encyclopedic knowledge of their style and theological purpose. In thirteen of his seventeen sermons preached at Christmas he makes at least passing reference to the Fathers. Sixteen of his eighteen Easter sermons make use of the Fathers. His Whitsunday sermons are full of patristic reference with only two of the fifteen preached at that feast failing to refer to them. Augustine is his most frequent reference, which should be expected considering that Andrewes was a product of the western university tradition that had placed such emphasis upon him and later developments on his thought by Bonaventure, Aquinas and Duns Scotus. But he is very fond of the Cappadocian Fathers: Sts. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. Other great conciliar figures such as Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria and Leo the Great figure in his sermons. They come and go in his manuscripts as easily as if they were compositions original to him, and they tie him and his teaching to the thought of the first centuries of the Church.⁴¹ In his sermon preached on Easter Day in 1617, Andrewes argues the meaning of "heart of the earth" in St. Matthew 12.40, using the testimony of a panel of Fathers from East and West. "'The heart of the earth" with Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Augustine", says Andrewes, "I take for the grave; though I know Origen, Nyssen [Gregory], Theodoret take it for hell..."⁴² Andrewes thirteenth Easter sermon preached

³⁶ Lancelot Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 11, 318.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Charles Smyth, *The Art of Preaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1953), 123.

³⁹ T. S. Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1929), 14.

⁴⁰ Owen, 64.

⁴¹ McAdoo, 329.

⁴² Andrewes, *Works*, vol. II, Resurrection 12, 397.

in 1618 is a patristic *tour de force*. His chosen text on that day was I Cor. 11.16: “But if anyone is disposed to be contentious—we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.” Commenting on Apostolic traditions he says, “... if the ”Churches of God” in general have had it, if it be Catholic.”⁴³ Therefore, Andrewes proceeds to show the patristic precedent for celebrating the great feast of Easter, the feast of the day. First he lists those teachers of the Church who had resisted heretical efforts to terminate the celebration of the feast of Easter, “by Tertullian, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine and Theodoret, all five”.⁴⁴ After briefly summarizing how the Ecumenical Councils established Easter as tradition, he rests his case for Easter before a jury of the Fathers. “We have a full jury, Greek and Latin, of them; and that of the most chief and eminent among them; St. Basil, Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Nyssen, Theolphilus, Alexandrinus, Cyril, Chrysologus, Leo, &c...” However, for Andrewes Gregory of Nazianzus was most persuasive.

I will give you a taste of one. It shall be Nazianzen, surnamed the Divine...
 ‘Easter-day is come, God’s own Easter-day; and again I say, Easter-day is come, in honour of the Trinity; the feast of feasts, the solemnity of all solemnities, so far passing all other feasts, holden not only by or for men, but even in honour of Christ Himself, as the sun doth the stars.’⁴⁵

F. E. Brightman describes the manner in which Andrewes made use of ancient sources thus, ...it is not merely a matter of direct quotation; he knows how to follow up a clue or a suggestion and to construct new forms on old models. And here as elsewhere, he freely modifies and adapts his material to the purpose he has in view.”⁴⁶

In the first Nativity sermon, preached in 1605, Andrewes investigates the mystery of the Incarnation, falling back upon the testimony of the early church to explain God’s compassion upon humanity. “Sure, not without good ground, say the Fathers,” explains Andrewes, “who have adventured to search out the theology of this point; such reasons as might serve for inducements to Him that is...’naturally inclined to pity;’ why upon us He would rather have compassion.”⁴⁷ Again he refers to the Fathers while developing the mystery of the union between the human and the divine in Jesus Christ,

Esay [Isaiah] promised the sign we should have should be from the “deep” here “beneath,” and should be from the “height above,” both “ a child” from “beneath,” and “a Son” from “above.” To conclude; it is an exposition decreed by the Fathers assembled in the Council of Seville, who upon these grounds expound this very place so; the Child, to import His human; the Son, His divine nature.⁴⁸

Whether he refers to the Ecumenical Councils or to specific writers like Chrysostom, Basil, and Leo, Andrewes’ goal was always to impress upon his audience the truth of the Scripture, as the Church had understood it since its inception. It was Scripture, after all, that contained the

⁴³ Ibid., 406.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 415.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 418.

⁴⁶ Lancelot Andrewes, *Preces Privatae*, ed. F.E. Brightman (London: 1903), xlv.

⁴⁷ Lancelot Andrewes, *Sermons on the Nativity*, Nativity 1, 12.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 21.

testimony of Jesus and his apostles. He understood the witness of the patriarchs, prophets and psalms to point to the coming of the Messiah in Jesus Christ. But Scripture never exists in a vacuum, and the Fathers testified to a standard or norm of faith, a consensus of understanding and a handing on of the Faith.⁴⁹ In Andrewes' tenth Whitsunday sermon, preached at Holyrood-House, Edinburgh in 1617, he revealed his understanding of the necessary relationship between the Bible and the Fathers. Referring to the anointing of the Holy Ghost Andrewes says, "This way come we to our anointing now, by books; this book chiefly," indicating the Bible on the lectern in front of him as he preached. "But in a good part also," Andrewes continued, ...by the books of the ancient Fathers and lights of the Church, in whom the scent of this ointment was fresh, and the temper true; on whose writings it lieth thick, and we thence strike it off, and gather it safely.⁵⁰

Lancelot Andrewes realized the value of the Fathers was not in their individual voices, but in the great swell of sound that came from the undivided Church in those first centuries. He was well aware that there was not absolute uniformity. To the contrary, Andrewes knew that the *raison d'être* for the Councils was to answer the heresies that threatened the peace of the Church. But answer they did, and it is where they agree that the Fathers spoke the loudest. A council does not have authority simply by virtue of its gathering. The Council of Ephesus in 449, known as the *Latrocinium* or "Robber Synod", was legally called and sufficiently attended by bishops from across the Empire. Yet they attempted to validate the Monophysite heresy, and the Council of Chalcedon, meeting two years later, rejected their decision. Therefore the measure of a Father, for Andrewes, was not his innovation, but his willingness to defend the truth of the Apostolic Faith. The Fathers are not autonomous; they are "Fathers of the Church". A council is only authoritative as long as it maintained the Truth revealed in Scripture, but more importantly revealed in the Incarnate Word, by the power of the Holy Ghost.⁵¹

C. Patristic Doctrine of the Incarnation

The doctrine of the Incarnation was at the heart of all the theological controversies of the first five centuries of the Church's existence. The ecumenical councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon were principally concerned with addressing Christological heresies. It is important to remember, separated as we are from the Councils by more than 1500 years, that the controversies were more than political, academic or even aridly theological squabbles. To the contrary, the debates circulated around the critical issue of who God was and how the Church understood the manner in which he had chosen to reveal himself to the world. The questions involved the person and work of Christ, his ministry of redemption and the benefits that flowed from him into all of humanity. The Councils were, therefore, a practical matter, defining the Church's understanding of God and holding to the belief in humanity's mystical union with God.⁵² The creedal definition agreed upon by the bishops gathered at Chalcedon in 451 AD was the harvest of those theological seeds that had been planted by Irenaeus and cultivated by Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria.

Irenaeus of Lyons was the most eminent theologian of the second century. It seems likely that he was born in Smyrna, and had known the martyr bishop Polycarp. As Polycarp is

⁴⁹ Welsby, 156.

⁵⁰ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 10, 287.

⁵¹ Nicholas Lossky, 339.

⁵² Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1944), 10.

thought to have been a disciple of the Apostle John, Irenaeus was very close to the apostolic generation. His greatest contribution to the young Church was his theological defense of the Faith against the infiltrating influences of Gnosticism. This syncretistic heresy attempted to combine wisdom and cultic traditions with Christian doctrine and emphasized a dualistic cosmology, which drove a wedge between God and his creation. His critical work *Adversus omnes Haereses*, clearly identified the errors of the Gnostics and did much to combat its influences in the Church.⁵³

Against the Gnostics, Irenaeus insisted that God the Father was creator of the world, and that the Logos was not a demiurge, but was the Son, truly God with the Father. By the Son all things were made and by him all things were remade, or redeemed. The Son effects the salvation of humanity and the world through his Incarnation, by which he gathers all humanity into himself as the true Adam. Borrowing from St. Paul, Irenaeus believed that just as, “death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ.”(1 Co. 15.21-22) In this “recapitulation” Christ brings humanity into reunion with God, adoption by God, and assimilation into God.⁵⁴

The first Christological debate was the Arian controversy of the fourth century, which culminated in the Council of Nicaea in 325. The proponent of the heresy was the Alexandrian priest, Arius, who taught that there once was a time when the Son did not exist. God the Father was the only being that could be spoken of as God in the fullest sense. The Son was created before time, and had been adopted by the Father. Therefore, the Son could be called God and worshipped as such. The Council of Nicaea deposed Arius and anathematized his doctrine, but Arianism continued to sweep across the Empire. It is Athanasius who is credited for the systematic refutation of the Arian heresy. He was bishop of Alexandria, and succeeded Alexander of Alexandria who had been the champion for orthodoxy at Nicaea. Athanasius defended the Nicene formula which established that the Son and the Father were of the same substance, *homoousios*. That the Church teaches that the Son is begotten does not mean that he was created by the will of the Father, but that he had been generated out of the essence of the Father. The Son is eternal, he alone is the Son, and there is no subordination to the Father, all because he and the Father share the same substance.⁵⁵

Athanasius’ attack on Arianism was so vehement and irresistible because he saw in it a blow at the very root of humanity’s salvation, the Incarnation. If the Son was not equal to the Father in his Godhead, but created like the rest of the world, then he could not achieve the redemption that all of humanity so desperately needed. Conversely, if the Son was of the same substance as the Father, then he could redeem humanity, and the whole world. In his Incarnation, Christ assumed human nature, and in the unification of his divine and human natures, he deified humanity. When he overcame death, and was raised in his resurrection body, he did so not simply for himself but for all of humanity. Because the Son, both human and divine, is partaker in the substance of the Father, and member of the triune Godhead, humanity may now be partakers of the Father’s substance.⁵⁶ Speaking of the mystery of humanity’s redemption in the Incarnation Athanasius said, “For he was made man that we might be made

⁵³ Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. I, (Allen: Christian Classics, 1995), 294.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 311.

⁵⁵ Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. III, 68.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 72.

God; and he manifested himself a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father; and he endured the insolence of men that we might inherit immortality.”⁵⁷

The Council of Constantinople of 381 addressed the faults in the teaching of Apollinaris, the bishop of Palestinian Laodicea. Apollinaris was a devoted follower of Athanasius, and emphasized Christ’s divinity in his teaching. Sadly, this stress upon Christ’s divinity diminished his manhood, evident in the way Apollinaris described the divine Logos replacing the human soul of the man Jesus. Basil the Great followed by Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus rejected such an impaired Christology. Humanity could not be saved in body and soul, if the mediator between God and Man was not complete in his Incarnation of the substances of both natures. Therefore, Gregory of Nazianzus replied to the Apollinarians, “both natures are one by combination, the deity being made man, and the manhood deified...”⁵⁸

After John Chrysostom, had been deposed from his office as Patriarch of Constantinople, dying in exile in 407, Nestorius was chosen as Patriarch of the Eastern capitol. He was an aggressive persecutor of heretics of all stripes and was especially critical of Apollinarianism and it’s teaching that there was only the divine soul in Christ. Shortly after his arrival in Constantinople, one of his attending clergy from Antioch began to preach against the title *Theotokos* that had been applied to the Blessed Virgin since the third century, and had the espousal of such eminent thinkers as Origen, Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus.⁵⁹ Nestorius supported his priest against the immediate public outcry, saying that a mere mortal, blessed though Mary was, could not possibly be the “Mother of God”. Cyril of Alexandria and Celestine of Rome censured Nestorius for his refusal to acclaim Mary as *Theotokos*, and Cyril proceeded to call a council in Alexandria to depose him. The central issue at stake was not which titles were appropriate to use in honor of the Blessed Virgin. Instead, it was a clash of Christologies. Nestorius came from the Antiochene School, which began with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels and advanced to ask, “How can man be at the same time God?” Cyril, on the other hand, represented the Alexandrian tradition, which began with the pre-existent Word of the Gospel of John and asked, “How can God also be man?”⁶⁰ Nestorius, following his mentor Theodore of Mopsuestia, reacted so violently against Apollinarianism, that he had trouble understanding the unity between the divine and human within Christ. Christ had two distinct, concrete natures conjoined within him. The result was one person, Christ, with two subordinated natures, the divine and human. Therefore, Mary could not be the Mother of God, because God was eternal. She could be Mother of Christ, because the person Christ, conceived in conjunction, was her child.⁶¹

The Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorius for his dualism and affirmed Cyril of Alexandria’s response. Cyril maintained that the union between the divine and human in Christ is not simply a man carrying God inside of him. Instead the union is as close as that between a person’s own body and soul. They are separate and yet to divide them would mean the destruction of the person.

⁵⁷ Athanasius, *On the Incarnation of the Word*, 54.

⁵⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep. 101*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 37, 180.

⁵⁹ Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1983), 140.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 142.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 147.

“He vouchsafed to be born as we, and proceeded forth, a man from a woman, not ceasing to be what He was, but even when He became man by taking upon Him flesh and blood, still continuing what he was, --God in nature and truth.”⁶²

It was imperative that the Council of Ephesus guarded the orthodox understanding of the union of Christ’s natures, in the same way that the Council of Constantinople had guarded against Apollinaris’ diminished view of Christ’s humanity. The Word was made incarnate that he might redeem humanity from its sins, yet if the union between his two natures was simply a conjunction and not a union, then humanity could never hope to achieve a saving union with the Father through the Son.

After more than 400 years since the inception of the Church, the Council of Chalcedon served to formulate the definitive Christology for the undivided Church. A monk in Constantinople named Eutyches, who was a devoted disciple of Cyril of Alexandria, began to teach that before the Incarnation, Christ had had two natures, but after the Incarnation he had only one. He said, “I worship one nature, that of God made flesh and become man.”⁶³ He believed that Christ was born with human flesh and a reasonable human soul. Yet his flesh was not that of the rest of humanity’s because he was anxious to reject the idea that Christ had assumed an individual subsistent man. He rejected two natures after incarnation because he understood nature to be concrete existence, of which one person could not have two. Instead, he affirmed that Christ’s human nature was swallowed up in the divine nature, like a drop of vinegar in the ocean.⁶⁴ When Flavian of Constantinople, deposed Eutyches for his teaching, he appealed to Leo of Rome. Leo found the monophysitism of Eutyches unintelligible. It was evident to him that there had only been one nature before the Incarnation, the divine. It was only after the Incarnation, when the Word had been conceived in the womb of the *Theotokos* that it was even possible to have two natures. The Council of Chalcedon was called in 451 in rejection of the “Robber Council” of 449. In response to Eutyches, and in affirmation of the orthodox position maintained by Leo of Rome the Council confirmed the *communicatio idiomatum*, which is,

By reason of this unity of person, to be understood in both natures, the Son of Man is said to have come down from heaven when the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin from whom He was born; and again the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried, though He suffered these things not in the Godhead itself, wherein the Only Begotten is coeternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of human nature.⁶⁵

Church dogma serves to clarify and broaden humanity’s understanding of who God is, and does this as a means to worship, communion and reunion. Hence, the Ecumenical councils of the first five centuries, with their battles over subjects often as small as an “iota”⁶⁶, were attempts to proceed toward closer communion with the divine, that is deification. Against the Gnostics the Church maintained that the chief goal of humanity was not knowledge, but union

⁶² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 17, 3.

⁶³ Davis, *Ecumenical Councils*, 171.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 176

⁶⁶ The difference between the *Homoousians* and the *Homoiousians*, conflicting parties at the Council of Nicaea, was over the degree of affinity between the Father and the Son. As their names show, they were divided by an “iota”.

with God. At the Council of Nicaea, the Church maintained against the Arians that the Son was *homoousios*, the same substance with the Father, defending humanity's hope of deification through the incarnation and ascension of the Son. Against the Nestorians, who inserted a partition between Christ's two natures, the Church demanded that there be none that might jeopardize the future reunion and deification with the Father. Finally, against the Apollinarians and the Monophysites at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon in the 5th century, the Church preserved its teaching that the Son assumed the fullness of the human condition. Because Christ ascended bodily into Heaven, humanity could hope to ascend with Christ, receive his eternal inheritance and be deified through the mediation of Christ who is both God and Man.

Chapter III – Andrewes’ Doctrine of the Incarnation

The doctrine of the Incarnation is central to the whole of Lancelot Andrewes’ theology. From it flows his thought on the means and order of salvation for humanity, his sacramental theology and his teaching on the role and authority of the Church. It is important to note from the beginning that his incarnational theology is not exclusively concentrated upon the person and work of Christ. Instead, Andrewes’ doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost is inseparable from that of Jesus Christ. Hence, it is Christ who is made incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, but it is by the power of the Holy Ghost that he is conceived. It is Christ that is baptized in the Jordan, but it is the Spirit that descends upon him in the form of a dove. It is Christ that institutes the Holy Eucharist, but it is the Spirit that fills the sign with what it signifies, the Body and Blood of Christ. It is Christ’s death on the cross that purchased salvation for the Church and the world, but it is the inspiration of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost that conceives the Church and brings it into communion with the divine. The Son and the Spirit are both persons, they are both divine, and they are inseparable.

A. The Saving Mystery of the Two Natures of Christ

Andrewes’ theology is Chalcedonian. It is the Incarnation that opens to humanity the mystery of the Godhead and the hope for salvation. In the person of Christ, the everlasting God made the fullest revelation of himself. In Christ is all divinity and power. Yet, Andrewes was not content to follow the Alexandrian school, focusing exclusively upon Christ’s divinity. He does not dwell too long discussing the divinity of the eternal Word. Neither does he linger on Jesus’ humanity: that he was born of Mary, and that he shared the human condition with all humanity. The mystery of the Incarnation concerns how it could be that one person might be both divine and human at the same time, without confusion, yet without division. It is here that Andrewes stops to wonder, and never departs.

Each of his sermons, beginning with different passages of Scripture, dissects, examines and finally falls back in wonder at the great marvel that is the Incarnation. But Andrewes never follows the speculative probing of the medieval Schoolmen. His theology is not an end in itself, but always straining toward illuminating the minds of his listeners to the mysterious grace and love of the Godhead. His theology is intensely practical, because the Incarnation had unveiled a new reality. The world could no longer exist as it had before God himself had entered time and space, the eternal Word being made as a man. Humanity can no longer exist as it had before the inscrutable majesty of divinity was eternally joined to human flesh. Everything has changed; there has been a new Creation.

And so it is that Andrewes develops each of his sermons with an eye to pondering the mystery of the Incarnation and illuminating the benefits that flow from it. Whether preached at Christmas, Easter or Whitsunday, he takes a passage of Scripture and strives to develop from it the doctrine of the Trinity and the mystery of Christ’s two natures. Though each sermon is quite different from the next, examining one part of the mystery more than another, he never fails to maintain the balance of emphasis between his two natures, which is so characteristic of patristic conciliar thought. Each nature is taken in its turn, and each sermon takes its place in a broad expanse of texture and color as he expounds the mystery of the Godhead and the Incarnation. But the balance of emphasis is not simply in his theology but in his purpose. He does not paint such grand views solely for his own pleasure. No, Andrewes opens the mystery so that all of his listeners might also stand in awe. The mystery is of no use to him without the benefits that come

from it, and he is quick to move on to them. But as a guide, he is unwilling to allow his audience to simply stand and gaze, and not take advantage of the profits of Christ's salvation. He presses on from mystery to benefit, and from benefit to the listeners' duty, which is love, adoration and finally unity with the God who made them.⁶⁷

The doctrine of the Incarnation is an intensely practical matter for Lancelot Andrewes, because it involves humanity's ultimate meaning and purpose in life. Adam and Eve were from the beginning made to live in relationship with God. That relationship was built upon the love that God had for his creation and the creation's love for its creator. Adam and Eve were to express that love for God by obeying his commands out of the freedom of their wills, and by lives dedicated to worshipping Him. Their sinless condition was ruined by their choice to reject God and their relationship of love with Him. Though the relationship was broken, God chose to save the world from humanity's sin. Christ, the only son of God, co-equal and consubstantial with the Father, was made incarnate so that he might save the world. Therefore the Incarnation is essentially soteriological. However, it would be a mistake to understand the Incarnation simply as a vehicle by which God enters the world to die for the sins of humanity. Andrewes' view is much broader than that, and much more patristic. Andrewes found a like mind in the words of Irenaeus when he said,

But when he was incarnated and became a human being, he recapitulated in himself the long history of the human race, obtaining salvation for us, so that we might regain in Jesus Christ what we had lost in Adam, that is, being in the image and likeness of God.⁶⁸

For Andrewes, the Incarnation is as much about anthropology as it is about soteriology. God, in the person of the eternal Word, became a man, a second Adam, so that he might draw all of human history, and each individual into himself by the nature he shares in common with all of humanity. In the sermon he preached on Christmas Day, 1614, before James I at Whitehall, Andrewes expounds upon Is. 7.14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son..." In the sermon he develops the passage in answer to the Manichean and Valentinian heresies, gnostic sects of the early church that attempted to separate the divine from the material world. The Manichees believed that the Christ had no body but had joined with the man Jesus. The Valentinians believed, like the Anabaptists of Andrewes' day, that the Christ had a body, which had been prepared for him in Heaven, preserving him from the experience of gestation in the womb of the Virgin. Andrewes insisted on the necessity for the Christ to be conceived in the womb, and born of a woman. "For our conception being the root as it were, the very ground sill of our nature; that He might go to the root and repair our nature from the very foundation, thither He went", Andrewes explained. His nine months in the womb of a woman was critical because, "what had been there defiled and decayed by the first Adam, might by the second be cleansed and set right again."⁶⁹

Since the time of Augustine, the prevailing thought in the Western Church about the transmission of original sin throughout the whole of humanity depended squarely upon the act of conception, and the concupiscence involved in human procreation. To survive, humanity must continue to procreate, but in the very act of procreation, each succeeding generation passed along the guilt and effects of Adam's first sin, in a never-ending cycle. But in the mystery of the

⁶⁷ Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 32ff, chapter 8 *passim*.

⁶⁸ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III.xviii.1.

⁶⁹ Andrewes, *Sermons on the Nativity*, Nativity 9, 138.

Incarnation, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is conceived, not by natural generation, but by the power of the Holy Ghost. Not only did his conception answer the Augustinian conundrum of transmission, but also Christ used his sanctified human nature to redeem all of humanity.

Yet Andrewes maintains balance in his understanding of Christ's atoning work by focusing upon the necessity of his death on the cross in the first Nativity sermon preached before James I in 1605. In short phrases, he cuts to the root of the argument why Christ had to be made flesh.

And the end why He thus took upon Him "the seed of Abraham" was, because He took upon Him to deliver "the seed of Abraham." Deliver them He could not except He destroyed "death, and the lord of death, the devil." Them He could not destroy unless He died; die He could not except He were mortal; mortal He could not be except He took our nature on Him, that is "the seed of Abraham." But taking it He became mortal, died, destroyed death, delivered us; was himself 'apprehended,' that we might be let go.⁷⁰

Christ was born as the seed of Abraham, to save that same seed. He was born of a woman, and even circumcised so that he would be complete in his humanity. Humanity was under the curse of the Law and was doomed to death, which came from being guilty under the Law. The benefits of his incarnation are twofold. First, the penalty of the Law demanded that someone must die, so die he did. But, more than that, humanity receives the Spirit of Christ and his inheritance as the Son of God, when he took upon himself the estate of humanity. Those who are the seed of Abraham by faith are made children of God through the incarnation of the Son of God.

The Incarnation is central to Andrewes thinking because it reveals in the fullest terms the love that God bears for his children and more importantly, the hope for the final reunion and restoration of communion between humanity and its creator. The transcendent God was not far from his creation. Though humanity had rejected his love at the very moment of its creation, the Creator did not abandon humankind. "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel", said the LORD to Eve in Gen. 3.15. Though Adam and Eve had refused lives of blessing and communion with the God who had created them, God promised the mystery of salvation immediately after the Fall. God could have chosen to save the world by fiat or through the ministry of his prophets. Instead he sent his only Son. "It was voluntary", Andrewes marvels, "He sent him not for need; but for mere love to us, and nothing else." There was no necessity forcing God's hand.

He might have done what He intended by the means and ministry of some besides. God could have enabled a creature; a creature enabled by God, and the power of his might, could soon have trod down Satan under our feet. But if it had been any other He had sent, His love and regard to us had not shewed so full.⁷¹

The Father chose, instead, to send his only Son to be made flesh. By emptying himself of the glories of Heaven, the Son revealed to the world the fullness of the divine love.

But revelation is not an end to itself, and love is not satisfied to exist in itself, but needs an object to love and to reciprocate that love. Love attracts, love gathers others to itself and

⁷⁰ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 1, 10.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 50.

binds others to one another. It is Christ's incarnation, as the ultimate display of divine love, which binds the divine to the human. Returning once again to the Chalcedonian Christological definition, Jesus Christ is fully God and fully human. In him, in time and for all time, Heaven and Earth are joined together, never to be divided. In his 16th Nativity sermon, given three years before his death, Lancelot Andrewes preached on the text of Ephesians 1.10: "...He might gather into one all things...". In comparing the words of Psalm 40.6 "but a body thou has ordained me" and Heb. 10.20 "the new and living way, through the veil, that is his flesh", Andrewes concludes that it is by and through Christ's flesh that the Father will draw all things in Heaven and Earth to himself. It is the union of the two natures in the Incarnation that achieves this.

All in Heaven recapitulate into One, that is God; all in earth recapitulate into one, that is man. Gather these two now, and all are gathered, all the things in either... When things were at the best, God and man were two in number; now God and man are but one Christ. So the gathering nearer than before, so surer than before, so every way better than before.⁷²

Andrewes, using language that is reminiscent of Irenaeus, describes even greater benefits flowing from the Incarnation. According to Irenaeus, Christ had regained for humanity, being in the image of God, what Adam had lost in the beginning. Andrewes sees a greater benefit here. Even in the best of times, the time before the Fall, God and the Man were at peace, but were not united. Christ has gathered the broken and divided world into himself and has made it even better than it was before in the Garden. Christ's Incarnation does not repair the old world, but rather inaugurates a new creation.

B. The Sacraments as the Presence of Christ

How can the post-Incarnation, post-Ascension world be a new creation? Such a daring theological claim militates against common sense. To all appearances the world is quite full of war, pestilence and division, not the peace and gathering implied in the Incarnation. The answer for Andrewes lies in the Sacraments and in the Church, both of which enable humanity to realize the eschatological promises of the Incarnation. The eschaton is often misunderstood as referring to an age that commences after the created order has ceased to exist, in which God will give each person his or her eternal reward. Andrewes did not mean the end of time, in a plane of existence very different from this one. Instead, the eschaton is above time. The "end time", or better, the "above time" finds its fullness in the Holy Eucharist, the Body of Christ represented.

"For as this feast looketh back as a memorial of that is already past and done for us, so doth it forward, and is to us a pledge of another and a better yet to come, the feast of the marriage of the Lamb..."⁷³

The Eucharist transcends time, making present Christ's offering on the cross and his perpetual glory in Heaven. The Kingdom of Heaven is present now, to be enjoyed now, though not in the way it will be when Christ's gathering is complete. The Sacraments as signs make Christ truly present, through the power of the Holy Spirit. The Church is the new creation, the eschatological Kingdom of Heaven. The 16th Nativity sermon, continuing to develop the theme of gathering, or recapitulation, is one of the most powerful and explicit statements of Andrewes' Eucharistic theology.

⁷² Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 16, 270.

⁷³ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. II, Resurrection 7, 308.

For there we do not gather to Christ or of Christ, but we gather Christ Himself; and gathering Him we shall gather the tree and fruit and all upon it. For as there is a recapitulation of all in Heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the holy Sacrament.

And again, describing the benefits obtained by Christ for humanity, Andrewes says, And even thus to be recollected at this feast by the Holy Communion into that blessed union, is the highest perfection we can in this life aspire unto... With which gathering here in this world we must content and stay ourselves, and wait for the consummation of all at His coming again.⁷⁴

And there is continuity between the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. They are inseparable, two sides of the same coin. Even as all things are gathered into Christ, so also the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. From his pierced side flowed water and blood. The water signifying Baptism which washes away the filth of sin, and the blood signifying the cup of the New Testament which washes the conscience from dead works.⁷⁵ By the power of the Holy Spirit the person of the Son is made manifest in the Church and the world. It is the Spirit who conceived the Son, who descended upon the Son in baptism, who raised the Son from the grave, and who manifests the Son in the Eucharistic sacrifice.

The Sacraments are the keys to the life of the Church. The gift of the Holy Spirit on Whitsunday, or Pentecost, instituted the Church as the Body of Christ. In the same way that the Spirit of God had hovered over the waters at the first Creation, so the Spirit hovers over the waters of Baptism to effect a new Creation. That new Creation is the Church, the Body of Christ. The Church depends on the Spirit, because it is Christ's body. No human body can be divided from its spirit or soul, and continue to be a living person. Likewise, the Church as the Body, cannot be in Christ unless the Spirit of God dwells there.⁷⁶ The Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ offered to the Church for the forgiveness of sin. Baptism cannot be repeated, but the Eucharist continues the work of Baptism by sanctifying and consecrating the Church as she is united in fellowship to the Trinity.⁷⁷

And if we ask, what shall be our means of this consecrating? The Apostle telleth us, we are sanctified by the "oblation of the body of Jesus." That is the best means to restore us to that life. He hath said it, and shewed it Himself; "He that eateth Me shall live by Me."

And again, "Such was the means of our death, by eating the forbidden fruit, the first fruits of death; and such is the means of our life, by eating the flesh of Christ, the first fruits of life."⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Ibid., 278.

⁷⁵ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Resurrection 18, 102.

⁷⁶ Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*, 274.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 64.

⁷⁸ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. II, Resurrection 2, 220.

Chapter IV – The Incarnation and the Sacraments

The incarnation of Jesus Christ is central to the theology of Lancelot Andrewes because it overcomes the effects of sin and death in humanity and achieves an even greater end, the union of the Godhead with humankind. It is through Christ's two natures that the Trinity is able to commune with the creature and humanity can identify with the fullness of God. The dogmatic creedal formulas produced by the ecumenical councils of the first five centuries served as the foundational Christology from whence Andrewes could develop all the virtues and benefits that flow as implications from the Incarnation.

Yet, the Incarnation is by definition the autonomous act of the Divine identifying in the closest possible way with humanity, being made in the form of a man. It is God's act of identification, not that of humanity with God. It is the mystery by which salvation is offered to Adam and all his offspring. But, in Christ humanity is enabled to identify with the Divine. God has identified with humanity through the Incarnation, and in Christ made salvation available. It is through the union of the two natures in the person of Christ that humanity is redeemed through the salvation freely offered in him. In the thirteenth Christmas sermon preached in 1619, Andrewes elaborates on Christ as the intersection of the exchange between God and humankind. "You will mark here", says Andrewes, "the Child here is God and Man." Through him the creation gives God glory and through him God sends humanity peace.

Then as God and Man is one Christ, and as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so Christ consisting of these two brings *eudokian* "the fulness of God's favour," the true and real cause of both; yielding them peace while here on earth, and assuring them of glory when there on high; as thither on high we trust to be delivered after our time here spent in procuring Heaven glory and earth peace.⁷⁹

Humanity shares human nature in common with the Word incarnate, and as the Father loves the Son incarnate, he loves those who share his humanity. But the question still remains, by what means does humanity join in communion with the undivided Trinity? More precisely, how does humanity receive the Spirit of Christ having shared its flesh with the Son of God? In the fifth Whitsunday sermon preached by Andrewes in 1612, he asks, "Have ye received [the Holy Ghost]?"

Take the holy mysteries of His body and blood; and the same, the holy arteries of His blessed Spirit. Take all these in one – the attractive of prayer; the word... the bread of life, and the cup of salvation; - and is there not great hope we shall answer St. Paul's question as he would have it answered, *affirmative*?⁸⁰

Andrewes' concludes the sermon emphasizing the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. Through them humanity is able to share in the community of the Godhead through the means of grace ordained by Christ. "We began with one Sacrament, Baptism," exclaims Andrewes, "we end with the other the Eucharist."

"We began with that where we heard of Him; and we end with this other, where we may and shall, I trust, receive Him. And Almighty God grant we so may receive Him at this good time, as in His good time we may be received by Him thither..."⁸¹

⁷⁹ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 13, 214.

⁸⁰ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 5, 200.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

Baptism and Eucharist, each in their own way, make present the person of Christ, to the end that in receiving him in the Sacraments, humanity itself is received by God into heavenly reward. I will consider the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, showing how they both serve to reunite humanity to the Godhead and overcome the estrangement of sin.

A. Baptism

The sacrament of Baptism serves as a “conduit pipe” for the grace of the Holy Ghost. The candidate for Baptism is washed with water that signifies the gift of the Holy Ghost and all the benefits that flow from the presence of the Spirit of God. In his ninth Christmas sermon of 1614 Andrewes says, “And this indeed was the chief end of His being “with us;” to give us a *posse fieri*, a capacity, “a power to be made the sons of God”. How can humankind become children of God? “By being born again of water and of the Spirit”. Andrewes continues, “...for the same original that Himself took in the womb of the Virgin to usward, the same hath He placed for us in the fountain of Baptism to God-ward.”⁸² In the sacrament of Baptism, the Holy Ghost joins the Christian to the incarnate Christ. By being incarnate in the womb of a human mother, God joined with humanity. Now in his baptism, he draws all humanity with him to God.

For Lancelot Andrewes the sacrament of Baptism was the means by which Christians were made one with Christ and through him reunited with the Godhead. Nowhere else is this theme more evident than in his eighth Whitsunday sermon, preached in 1615 on Luke 3.21,22, “Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heaven was opened”. The account in Luke states that as the people were being baptized, Jesus was baptized as well. Neither of the parallel passages in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark includes this important piece of information. The theme of Jesus Christ’s identification with humanity begins with the preacher’s choosing Luke as his text to emphasize the bond formed between Jesus and all humankind. Andrewes chose the passage above the other two with the purpose of showing how Christ submits to the sacrament, and in so doing joins humanity to himself.⁸³ The people were baptized out of necessity for the remission of their sins. Jesus submitted to the rite, but not out of necessity. Quoting Bernard of Clairveaux, Andrewes wonders why the only man who was free from guilt would go down to the water with the people and be washed in the sacrament of repentance. Christ is baptized as an example of humility to the people. But Christ was baptized not only for an example, but more importantly to fulfill justice. The justice in question is the purification of humanity. The means by which humanity would be made just is in the person of Jesus Christ, the representative of the human race, the second Adam. In the eighth Whitsunday sermon preached in 1615, Andrewes says,

To shew you how this comes to pass, we are to consider Christ as having two capacities, as they term them. So are we to consider Him – the second Adam; for so do we the first Adam, as a person of himself, and as the author of a race or head of a society. And even so do we Christ; either as...’a person entire’--they call it a body natural or as *pars communitatis*, which they call a body politic, in conjunction and with reference to others; which others are His Church, which “Church is His body.”⁸⁴

⁸² Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 9, 147.

⁸³ Kenneth Stevenson, *The Mystery of Baptism in Anglicanism* (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1998), 59.

⁸⁴ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 8, 245.

To identify with humanity the Son of God became human, and in doing so was enabled to identify to the fullest extent, participating in John Baptist's baptism as an individual and as representative of the whole human race.

The Spirit is also active in uniting humanity to Christ in his baptism. At his baptism in the Jordan, Christ prayed and the heavens were opened. The Holy Ghost descended upon Christ in the form of a dove falling from the opened gates of Heaven. Andrewes understands the opened heavens as an invitation to humanity to ascend into the presence of the Almighty. "For Heaven-gate", testifies Andrewes, "doth ever open at baptism; in sign, he that new cometh from the font, hath then right of entrance in thither."⁸⁵ Even as Christ had received the Spirit at baptism, so does humanity. And in the power of that same Spirit, humanity may now join the Son in Heaven.

In considering the ramifications of Christ's baptism as an individual, Andrewes quotes Epiphanius,⁸⁶ who noted that Christ being pure, purified the baptismal waters for all time, and thereby established the sacrament of Baptism by submitting to it. "It is certain", affirms Andrewes, "so He received no cleanness, no virtue, but virtue He gave to Jordan, to the waters, to the Sacrament itself."⁸⁷ Conversely, Christ as head or surrogate for humanity was baptized as head for the body, thereby purifying the body. Likewise, by his baptism Christ put on humanity, even as humanity puts on his divinity in Baptism. "For in His baptism He put us on, as we "put Him on," in ours."⁸⁸ This emphasis on putting on humanity begs two questions: how and why? From this text in Luke Andrewes concludes that Christ put on humanity by submitting to baptism in the Jordan, though he needed not do as much. Jesus had no sin of his own and needed no baptism. Yet, by submitting to baptism and identifying with humanity he took upon himself the sinful human nature. "[He] put all our sins upon Him; and then it will come to pass, He will need baptizing, He will need that for me and thee that for Himself He needed not, and baptism in that case may well be ministered to Him."⁸⁹

The theme of identification does not end here, but leads to a broader consideration of Christ's baptism purging the sin of the human race. Employing the same reasoning that he would later take up in his thirteenth Whitsunday sermon of 1620, Andrewes develops the correspondence between water and blood, and the Spirit to wash away humanity's sins. Since there is no remission of sin without the shedding of blood, Christ's water baptism prefigures his future baptisms of blood at Gethsemane, Gabbatha, and Golgotha.

This in Jordan, here now, was but an undertaking of that, then [the cross]; and in virtue of that, doth all our water-baptism work. And therefore are we baptized into it; not into His water-baptism, but into His cross-baptism; not into His baptism, but into His death.⁹⁰

Andrewes shows the difference between the baptisms of John Baptist and that of Christ. John's baptism was water baptism. But water baptism is incomplete, for only blood can purge sin. Sadly, the death is the natural consequence of the shedding of blood. By being baptized into Christ's death, Andrewes understands that humanity dies with Christ, so that it may rise with

⁸⁵ Ibid., 250.

⁸⁶ Anaceph. 7.ad fin.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 246.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 247.

him. By being baptized into Christ's baptism of blood, humanity may now share in the divinity of Christ and make claims upon his inheritance as God's children by adoption.

Andrewes calls Baptism the "laver of regeneration", citing Titus 3.5. It is sin that sullies humankind and it is water that washes that dirt away. But because the dirt is not natural, but spiritual, so must the water be spiritual. In his seventh Nativity sermon, preached in 1612 on the Letter to the Hebrews 1.1-3, Andrewes develops the mystery of the Incarnation in terms of the purgative benefits that it gains for humanity. Jesus Christ is fully God and fully human. His rightful place is at the right hand of the Father in heaven. By virtue of his Incarnation, human flesh may now ascend to be seated in that place which is his by right and ours by adoption. Yet, he may do so because his flesh is perfected by his divinity. Human flesh is still foul because of sin. Therefore Andrewes lays out the necessity of the salvific action of Christ, not simply to be born but to purify humanity. The Incarnation cannot simply make the heavenly inheritance available, but must also make humanity capable to claim that inheritance.

And now, we may be at our choice whether we will conceive of sin as of some outward soil in the soul; and then, the purging of it to be *per viam balnei*, 'needs a bath' with some cleansing ingredients... [He] made a bath of the water that came out of His side to that end opened, that from thence might flow "a Fountain for sin, and for uncleanness" — Water, and mixed with His Blood; as forcible to take out the stains of the soul, as any herb Borith in the world to take away the soil of the skin.⁹¹

Here is an oblique reference to Augustine's understanding of the origin of the dominical sacraments, represented by the dual flow of blood and water coming from Christ's pierced side, in St. John's 19.34.⁹² Both water and blood poured from the wound in Jesus' side when the Roman centurion pierced him with his spear. Augustine, among others, took this as evidence that both Sacraments of Baptism (water) and the Eucharist (blood) were ordained directly from Jesus' side. It is the combined effort of the water and the blood as cleaning agent that meet in the font, the "laver of regeneration", which purge humanity from the sins that bar them from Heaven, and enables humanity to sit on the throne to rule with Christ.

The theme of Baptism as a bath or "laver" for sin is given even greater treatment in his thirteenth Whitsunday sermon, on I John 5.6-7: "This is that Jesus that came by water and blood...and it is the Spirit that bears witness". Andrewes deliberates on the cooperation between the Son and the Spirit in the divine work of salvation of the human race. The Son had completed all that he had to do, but there still remained work to be done, and that done by the Spirit.⁹³ The Son is manifested in the water and the blood, but it is the Spirit that achieves the salvation of humanity in those tokens, the Sacraments. Yet again, Andrewes makes reference to the common origin of the Sacraments in St. John 19.34, attributing the notion to St. Augustine's saying, "These are (not two of the Sacraments; so there might be more, but) the twin-Sacraments of the Church".⁹⁴ The sermon develops the theme of cooperation of parties in humanity's redemption: the Son and Spirit, the two natures of Christ, the water and the blood, the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Eucharist. Again, the progression of Andrewes' argument depends on his assumption that humanity suffers not only from the blot or filth of sin, but the guilt of sin as well. If

⁹¹ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 7, 111.

⁹² Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*, 285.

⁹³ Andrewes, *Works*, vol.III, Whitsunday 13, 344.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 348.

humanity is to be joined to Christ, it must be purged of that sin and relieved of that guilt that is caused by and symptomatic of sin. So, “To take away soil, “water” is most fit; to take away guilt, “blood.””⁹⁵ Sadly, he says that there are those who would take one and not the other. Some prefer to live licentiously, not concerned with purity and wanting simply to be absolved.

“By their good-will would have none come upon them, would not be clean, would be as they are, as swine in their wallow all their life long. No “water” they, but “blood,” as much as you will.”⁹⁶

Others are so scrupulous that they cannot ever be satisfied with the assurance that their sins have been washed away, and so they would have more water and never any of Christ’s blood. But Andrewes sees in this text of I John evidence that Christ comes to humanity in both water and blood, and must be received so.

But indeed, to look well into the matter, they cannot be separate, they are mixed; either is in other. There is a mixture of the “blood” in the “water”...In baptism we are washed with “water;” that “water” is not without “blood.” The “blood” serves instead of “nitre.”⁹⁷

Both water and blood flowed from the pierced side of Christ’s body hanging upon the cross. Humanity is washed by both, not simply in a natural or physical way, but in the symbols of his death, invigorated by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is by virtue of the cooperation of the Spirit as witness, that the baptismal waters mingled with his blood wash away the dirt and guilt of humanity’s sin so that it might join in communion with the Trinity.

B. Holy Eucharist

Lancelot Andrewes’ Eucharistic theology develops as a natural consequence of Christ’s incarnation, and as a fulfillment of the process of salvation begun in Baptism.⁹⁸ It is worth noting that a common element to nearly all of Andrewes’ sermons regardless of liturgical season or date delivered, end with a Eucharistic application, as well as a brief eschatological meditation at the close. While his Eucharistic applications never appear contrived, it does show both his ability and his intent. It displays his ability by displaying the breadth of his thought and willingness to draw from a broad range of images and texts to achieve a central Eucharistic theme. It displays his intent by power of repetition that the Eucharist stands at the center of his theology regardless of the point of departure for any particular sermon in any particular season.

The eschatological connection that he makes between the Eucharist and Heaven reveals his understanding of the nature of the sacrament and its relation to his concepts of Church and time. In making this connection he stands well within the Eastern Church’s understanding of the Eucharist. It is the Church that is able to offer the Eucharist, and conversely in making that offering is constituted as the Church. Andrewes says, “For as there is a recapitulation of all in Heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the holy Sacrament.” And again,

⁹⁵ Ibid., 347.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 350.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 352.

⁹⁸ Nicholas Lossky, 49.

“It is well known that the holy Eucharist itself is called *Synaxis*, by no name more usual in all antiquity, that is, a ‘collection or gathering.’ For so it is in itself; for at the celebration of it, though we gather to prayer and to preaching, yet that is the principal gathering the Church hath, which is itself called a “collection” too by the same name from the chief...⁹⁹

In the Eucharist the Church militant joins the Church triumphant in an act of worship that is beyond the confines of time. The Sacrament looks forward to the eternal feast of Heaven, at which time the Church as the immaculate bride is presented to Christ her husband. Yet the Sacrament looks back to the price paid in blood on the cross.¹⁰⁰

The Eucharist, like Baptism, serves as a means of grace, through which humanity may identify with the man Christ Jesus, and thereby regain communion with the Trinity. Andrewes concludes his sixth Easter sermon of 1611, by describing the purpose of the Eucharistic species.

“And that, a great honour and power, not only to represent, but to exhibit that it representeth, nor to set before us, or remember us of, but even to serve us for a corner-stone. First, uniting us to Christ the “Head,” whereby we grow into one frame of building, into one body mystical, with Him.”¹⁰¹

Both sacraments were established by Christ; instituted in the water and blood pouring from his side.¹⁰² Baptism serves for adoption and regeneration. The Holy Eucharist leads to sanctification and union with the incarnate Son. Speaking of the cooperative work of the Holy Ghost in the Sacraments, Andrewes says,

“...baptism is *effundam super*, upon us, from without; the Holy Eucharist, that is *comedite*, that goeth in. Upon the matter, both come to one. If it be poured on, it soaks in, pierces to the very center of the soul, as in baptism sin is washed thence by it. If it be breathed in, it is no sooner at the heart but it works forth, out it comes again...”¹⁰³

The baptismal flood falls upon a person, symbolically washing from the outside and penetrating within. The bread and wine of the Eucharist, eaten like any other food, goes to the inward most parts of the body and purges sin as the food is digested, becoming part of the whole body. In these two Sacraments, then, Andrewes sees perfection in means in which the power of the Holy Ghost sanctifies humanity. It is for the love of his own flesh, the flesh that Christ took from humanity, that he sends the Spirit upon humanity by the means of the sacraments. Because Christ shares the human nature through incarnation, he shares his divine nature by sending the Spirit, and that most effectively in the Sacraments.

It is the Eucharist that holds pride of place as the sacramental expression of the Incarnation in Andrewes’ thought. All sacraments find their fullest meaning in the Holy Communion, for it is there that humanity may most fully participate in Christ’s two natures, be filled with the power of the Holy Ghost, and be reunited with the Father. Baptism’s agency as initiation into Christ’s death and resurrection, and claim to Christ’s heavenly inheritance is

⁹⁹ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 16, 276.

¹⁰⁰ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. II, Resurrection 7, 308.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, Resurrection 6, 288.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, Resurrection 10, 348.

¹⁰³ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 11, 308.

fulfilled in the Eucharist. The emphasis in the Eucharist is becoming, growing into the Body of Christ. In the seventh Whitsunday sermon, preached by Andrewes in 1614, he expands upon God's desire to dwell with humanity.

And what is more intrinsical in us, abideth surer, groweth faster to us, than what we eat and drink? Then, if we could get "a spiritual meat," or get "to drink of the Spirit," there were no way to that. And behold here they be. For here is "spiritual meat," that is breeding the Spirit; and here we are all made "drink of one Spirit," that there may be but one spirit in us.¹⁰⁴

Bread and wine are effective symbols for the sacramental action that occurs in the Eucharist. People consume bread and wine, they enter the stomach and are digested becoming a unity with the person's body. The meaning and virtue attached to such common elements is that the human spirit may be joined to the Divine even as food is united to the human existence by way of digestion, losing its distinction and truly becoming one with the spirit. Continuing this food metaphor in the ninth Christmas sermon of 1614, Andrewes meditates upon the implications of the Messianic title "Immanuel" the Hebrew word meaning "God with us". The Eucharist is the way God has chosen to be closest to humanity in this world. He says, "nothing so with us, so ours, as that we eat and drink down, which goeth, and groweth one with us." And again,

This then I commend to you, even the being with Him in the Sacrament of His Body—that Body that was conceived and born, as for other ends so for this specially, to be "with you;" and this day as for other intents, so even for this, for the Holy Eucharist.¹⁰⁵

The eternal Son of God entered the world by being born of a woman, forever joining the Divine to the human nature. This is the mystery of the Incarnation. However, that mystery would be forever external and foreign to humanity unless God himself also gave means by which humankind could enter into that mystery. The purpose of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist is to provide humanity with a means of appropriation, of identifying with Christ, and thereby reuniting with the Trinity. In Baptism, the candidate identifies with Christ in his baptism, but more especially with Christ in his Passion. By being grafted into Christ's death humanity may rise again in his eternal and glorious life. In the Eucharist humanity eats the body of the God-man, receives the indwelling of the Spirit, and inwardly made in the likeness of the Godhead.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 239.

¹⁰⁵ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 9, 148f.

Chapter V – The Glory of Deification

The feasts of the Nativity, Easter and Whitsunday present Andrewes with the mystery of the Incarnation, the redemption of humanity and its reunion with the Trinity. For Andrewes, all of theology is geared to achieve the final goal of humanity's reunion with God, or deification.¹⁰⁶ The doctrine of deification flows from his dependence upon the Fathers, is central to his understanding of redemption,¹⁰⁷ and is the end of Andrewes' theology.¹⁰⁸

His thought, as represented in his sermons, is dictated by the season and the text. Andrewes treats the great feasts of the Church calendar in the light of Scripture and the patristic tradition, not engaging in flights of theological fancy, but consistently bringing the listener into the presence of the mystery at hand. T.S. Eliot says of his preaching,

When Andrewes begins his sermon, from beginning to end you are sure that he is wholly in his subject, unaware of anything else, that his emotion grows as he penetrates more deeply into his subject, that he is finally "alone with the Alone," with the mystery which he is seeking to grasp more and more firmly.¹⁰⁹

Lancelot Andrewes' theology is essentially practical, not systematic. It was developed pastorally and liturgically as he preached through the lessons of the Lectionary appointed for the major feasts of the Church year. Even his polemical writings, produced in response to the criticisms of Roman Catholic controversialists, never achieve the level of systematic theology. Instead, Andrewes preferred to follow the arguments of his opponents and answer their criticisms as they came.

Andrewes' theology focuses upon the process by which the Father reconciles fallen humanity to himself through the mediation of the Son and the adoption by the Holy Ghost. The Father from the beginning purposed such an intimate state. Andrewes is close to St. Irenaeus here. Speaking of Adam and Eve in the Garden, Irenaeus says, "He [God] would walk round and talk with the man, prefiguring what was to come to pass in the future, how He would become man's fellow, and talk with him, and come among mankind, teaching them justice."¹¹⁰ For Irenaeus, humanity was young and imperfect in its knowledge of its creator. Humanity in its created state was not in perfect union with God, but was only just beginning to know him and commune with him. Therefore a doctrine of redemption that simply restores humanity to its created condition is stunted, it is incomplete. Andrewes' theological energies drive him and his listeners to join in the mystery of the Incarnation, the God made man, to the end that through him humanity will finally be made one with the Godhead.

A. Patristic Sources for Deification

Andrewes' practical approach to the great mysteries of the Church reveals the confluence of his thought with that of the early Fathers. "The main preoccupation, the issue at stake, in the questions which successively arise respecting the Holy Spirit, grace and the Church herself..." says Vladimir Lossky, "is always the possibility, the manner, or the means of our union with God. All the history of Christian dogma unfolds itself about this mystical centre..."¹¹¹ In the same way Andrewes occupies himself with the central themes of the Christian faith, seeing in

¹⁰⁶ Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*, 32.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 249.

¹⁰⁸ E.C. Miller, Jr., "Pentecost Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes," *Anglican Theological Review* 65 (1985), 315.

¹⁰⁹ Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes*, 21.

¹¹⁰ Irenaeus, *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, 12.

¹¹¹ Vladimir Lossky, 10.

them the divine revelation of God's plan to draw all humanity to himself, adopting humanity as children through the incarnation of the Son and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Because Andrewes' thought on deification depends upon his understanding of the Incarnation and the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, it is natural to explore the sermons that he preached on the feasts of Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday, which contain the most direct statements regarding the deification of humanity.

Andrewes' theology of deification flows from his dependence upon the Fathers. While deification is most often associated with the Eastern tradition, it was not unknown in the West, being taught by none other than Augustine himself.¹¹² St. Irenaeus of Lyon is one of the earliest proponents of deification. In *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus writes that it is out of God's good will that humanity is destined to communion with him, even though through sin it can never be in this world. "For we cast blame upon Him, because we have not been made gods from the beginning, but at first merely men, then at length gods." Citing Psalm 82.6, "I have said, Ye are gods; and ye are all sons of the Highest", Irenaeus affirms that humanity was created for union with God, but because of human infirmity it must be redeemed.¹¹³

St. Athanasius is very close to Irenaeus in *De incarnatione*. Athanasius maintains that deification is the result of the exchange between God and humanity in the Incarnation. "For He [Christ] was made man that we might be made God", affirms Athanasius, "and He manifested Himself by a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father; and he endured the insolence of men that we might inherit immortality."¹¹⁴ In the Incarnation the second person of the Godhead empties himself, not clinging to his divine status, but takes upon himself the state of humanity (Phil. 2.6-7). In so doing, humanity may gain from the exchange by receiving his divine state, and "inherit immortality".

Andrewes is well within the patristic tradition as he employs the theme of exchange throughout his sermons. In the second Christmas sermon, preached in 1606 Andrewes says of Christ's mediation, "A meet person to cease hostility... to incorporate the either to other, Himself by His birth being become the "Son of Man," by our new birth giving us a capacity to become the "sons of God"."¹¹⁵ Likewise, he uses the same exchange between Christ's birth and humanity's new birth in the ninth Christmas sermon of 1614. In the seventeenth Easter sermon of 1623, Andrewes utilizes vivid language to illustrate the exchange between Christ and humanity.

Coming then to save us, off went His white, on went our red; laid by His own righteousness to be clothed with our sin... Yea, He died and rose again both in our colours, that we might die and rise too in His.

Shifting his metaphor from clothing to drink he continues, "he to drink the sour vinegar of our wild grapes, that we might drink His sweet in the cup of blessing." And he concludes, "He in Mount Golgotha like to us, that we in Mount Tabor like to Him."¹¹⁶ Christ suffered death on the cross on Golgotha, so that humanity may ascend to the Father the same way Jesus Christ ascended from Mount Tabor.

¹¹² Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's Conception of Deification," *Journal of Theological Studies* 37.2 (1986): 169-185.

¹¹³ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, IV.xxxviii.4.

¹¹⁴ Athanasius, *De incarnatione*, 53.3

¹¹⁵ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 2, 22.

¹¹⁶ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Resurrection 17, 75-76.

B. Deification and Redemption

Deification is central to Andrewes understanding of Christ's redemption of humanity. In the Christmas sermons redemption is discussed specifically in relationship to the Incarnation. In the sermons preached at Easter, Andrewes is principally concerned with Christ's redemptive work on the cross and in his resurrection. In the Whitsunday sermons redemption is treated in light of the work of the Holy Ghost who seals or "invests" the Christian with the redemption purchased by Christ.¹¹⁷ The Son and the Spirit cooperate in achieving the will of the Father, that all humanity might be deified and "partake of the divine nature"(2 Pet. 1.4).

Andrewes' preached his Christmas sermon of 1605 upon Hebrews 2.16, "For it is clear that he did not come to help angels, but the descendants of Abraham." This, his first sermon preached as bishop at Whitehall before James I, is a careful development of the mystery of the Incarnation using the word *apprehendit* or "lay hold of". As the sermon progresses Andrewes contrasts the conditions of angels and humanity, the descendants of Abraham, to illustrate the magnitude of the divine act to become human.

To take the flesh and blood he must needs take the seed, for from the seed the flesh and blood doth proceed; which is nothing else but the blessed 'apprehension' of our nature by this day's nativity. Whereby He and we become not only "one flesh," as man and wife do by conjugal union, but even one blood too, as brethren by natural union... One we are, He and we, and so we must be; one, as this day, so for ever.¹¹⁸

Christ by his incarnation identifies in the most intimate way with humanity to the end that he might redeem the descendants of Abraham who are so enslaved by their own sins. The purpose of the Incarnation is to deliver Abraham and his descendants from their sins. Nevertheless, as stated above, this is not the *only* reason, or the greatest reason for the Incarnation. The Son of God in his incarnation not only receives from humanity but also imparts to humanity. The respective divine and human natures are transferred between the parties in the incarnational mystery. Even as humanity is cleansed of sin it is "seized upon" by God for his use and glory, "our receiving His spirit, for 'His taking our flesh.'"¹¹⁹ Because God has "laid hold of" humanity in the Incarnation, humanity may in turn lay hold of the Deity by faith in the incarnate God. Speaking of the Eucharist he says,

It is surely, and by it and by nothing more are we made partakers of this blessed union. A little before He said, "Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also would take part with them," may not we say the same? Because He hath so done, taken ours of us, we also ensuing His steps will participate with Him and with His flesh which He hath taken of us.

And finally,

He taking our flesh, and we receiving His Spirit which He imparteth to us; that, as He by ours became *consors humanae naturae*, so we by His might become... "partakers of the Divine nature."¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Nicholas Lossky, 181.

¹¹⁸ Andrewes, *Sermons*, Nativity 1, p.9.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 17.

The celebration of Christ's birth is the celebration of the rebirth of humanity. At Christmas the emphasis may begin with the mystery of God becoming man, but cannot end there. Andrewes understood that the central theme, the inevitable implication of the Nativity is that the human race has been changed irrevocably, that the Son of God has become the Son of Man, and that things will never be the same again. Christ has become a man so that humanity may ascend with him to God.

In 1609, Andrewes preached his fourth Christmas sermon before the king at Whitehall on Gal. 4.4,5: "But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law". This sermon develops the incarnational theme along different lines from the first sermon preached in 1605. In that first sermon Andrewes develops the theme of God's determined pursuit of wayward humanity, laying hold of them by their human nature, and thereby raising them to partake of the divine nature. In the sermon preached in 1609 Andrewes emphasizes the unfathomable mystery of the eternal Word who made all things, now being made of a woman, made under the Law. His interest is to shed light on the Divine purpose, and the human benefit that follows from this making. "And here now at this word, "made of a woman," He beginneth to concern us somewhat. There groweth an alliance between us; for we also are made of a woman."¹²¹ There is an affinity that is established between God and his creation through the shared experience of being conceived and born of a woman, which goes beyond any covenant that God had made previously. Before this meeting God was the maker and humanity was what he had made. The principal element of humanity's estate was that of being made. Now being incarnate, the eternal Word, consubstantial with the Father, is made as well. So he proceeds to the purpose,

For whom is all this ado, this sending, this making, over and over again? It is for us. So is the conclusion, *ut nos*, that we might from this fullness receive the full of our wish. For in these two behind, 1. Redemption, and 2. Adoption; to be redeemed and to be adopted are the full of all we can wish ourselves.¹²²

To be redeemed is to be bought or ransomed from slavery to sin. Another pays the price and the slave is set free from bondage. Andrewes is quick to claim such benefits, yet he sees an even greater result from the Incarnation. By being made a man Christ wins for humanity adoption, the right to be called the children of God.

Of [children] adopted, for natural we could not. That is His peculiar alone, and He therein only above us; but else, fully to the joint fruition of all that He hath, which is fully as much as we could desire. And this is our *fieri* out of His *factum ex muliere*. We made the sons of God, as He the Son of man; we made partakers of His divine, as He of our human nature.¹²³

What Christ is by nature, humanity may become by grace. Humanity may never cross the divide that separates the Creator from the creation. Yet, everything else that he has as Son of the Father, humanity may have as children and partakers of the divine nature.

The second Easter sermon of 1607 is certainly one of Andrewes' most powerful sermons. His text for the sermon was I Cor. 15. 20, "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the

¹²¹ Op. cit., Nativity 4, p.53.

¹²² Ibid., 55.

¹²³ Ibid., 58.

first fruits of those who have died.” The theme of exchange comes quickly to hand as he introduces the text and the Paschal feast. “He shall hereafter conform us to Himself”, proclaims Andrewes, “change our vile bodies,” and make them like “His glorious body.”¹²⁴ It is in Christ’s resurrection that humanity may hope for its own resurrection, and so hope is the overarching theme of this sermon. Unless Christ is risen there is no hope. But because he has risen, there could be hope that others may rise as he did. “Can one man’s resurrection work upon all the rest?” asks Andrewes. He continues,

Can the resurrection of one, a thousand six hundred years ago, be the cause of our rising? It is a good answer, Why not, as well as the death of one, five thousand six hundred years ago, be the cause of our dying?

The answer lies in the mystery of the Incarnation. Since death came to the world in the flesh of one man, it is only just that life comes through the flesh of another. Christ, by virtue of his Incarnation is that man, and it is through him that all flesh is redeemed.¹²⁵ Christ died, not because of the guilt of sin, but as the “first fruits”, representing all humankind.

“And because He came not for Himself but for us, and in our name and stead did represent us, and so we virtually in Him, by His restoring we also were restored, by the rule, *si primitiae, et tota conspersio sic*; “as the first fruits go, so goeth the whole lump,” as the root the branches.¹²⁶

Andrewes saying that humanity is “restored” should not be misunderstood to mean restored to Adam’s condition before he fell. Possibly aware of the dangers of such an interpretation, Andrewes presses on expand upon the glory of Christ’s restoration. When he was created, Adam was a living soul, but he had not entered into full communion with God. In Christ, says Andrewes, humanity will be received into a state, “equal to the Angels, that life Adam at the time of his fall was not possessed of.”¹²⁷ Christ’s resurrection makes humans children of God.

“They that believe in Him,” saith St. John, them He hath enabled, “to them He hath given power to become the sons of God,”... Or, to make the comparison even, to those that are- to speak but as Esay [Isaiah] speaketh of them- “His children;” “Behold, I and the children God hath given Me.” The term He useth Himself to them after His resurrection, and calleth them “children;” and they as His family take denomination of Him- Christians, of Christ.¹²⁸

Even as Christ’s redemption is greater than Adam’s sin, so is humanity’s condition greater than was Adam’s condition.

Lancelot Andrewes preached his first Whitsunday sermon in 1606 on Acts 2.1-4, the giving of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. In it, Andrewes compares the persons and work of Christ and that of the Holy Ghost. Who is greater? Which work is most important: the Incarnation or the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?

¹²⁴ Andrewes, *Works*, Resurrection 2, 206.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 214.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 218.

“For mysteries they are both, and “great mysteries of godliness” both; and in both of them, “God manifested in the flesh.” 1. In the former, by the union of His Son; 2. In the latter, by the communion of His blessed Spirit.”¹²⁹

But his conclusion is that there can be no comparison between the Son and the Spirit because without them both, there could be no “royal exchange”, the exchange of natures. Whereby, as before He of ours, so now we of His are made partakers. He clothed with our flesh, and we invested with His Spirit. The great promise of the Old Testament accomplished, that He should partake our human nature; and the great and precious promise of the New, that we should be *consortes divinae naturae*, “partake his divine nature,” both are this day accomplished.¹³⁰

Christ in his Incarnation, his ministry, his passion and death, his resurrection and ascension had purchased salvation for humanity. But the human race could not on its own, take possession of the divine inheritance, could not partake of the divine nature (2 Peter 1.4) without being vested by the coming of the Holy Ghost. It was the work of the Spirit to conceive the Son, to incarnate the Son. At Pentecost it is the work of the Spirit to conceive the Church by inspiration. It was by the power of the Holy Ghost that the Son of God took a human body, and it is by that same Spirit that the Church is made the body of Christ, being made one with him, and through him participates in the divine nature.

In May of 1610, Andrewes preached his third Whitsunday sermon on the Gospel of John 14.15,16, “If you love me, you will keep my commandments. And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, to be with you forever.” As a matter of introduction of the honor and glory of the feast of Pentecost, Andrewes immediately goes to 2 Peter 1.4.

The Holy Ghost is the Alpha and Omega of all our solemnities. In His coming down all the feasts begin; at His annunciation, when He descended on the Blessed Virgin, whereby the Son of God did take our nature, the nature of man. And in the Holy Ghost’s coming they end, even in His descending this day upon the sons of men, whereby they actually become “partakers... of his nature, the nature of God.”¹³¹

The Gospel text allows Andrewes to employ a homiletical technique, which is typical of his style, in which he demonstrates how the persons of the Trinity are present and active. In it he sees the three persons plainly, and their interest in the salvation of humanity. It is the Father who sends the Spirit, the Son who mediates by virtue of his hypostatic union, and it is the Spirit as advocate who comforts. Each person is God; not three gods, but one God. Each person is consubstantial with the other, in perfect communion with the other two. Yet the Trinity is not content to exist in perfect communion alone but brings humanity into that natural community through the office and ministry of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. As he concluded this Whitsunday sermon Andrewes reintroduces the Trinity. “His Son He gave to be our price, His Spirit to be our comfort, Himself he keepeth to be our everlasting reward.” It is God the Father who is the eternal gift to the Christian. Deification, partaking of the divine nature, is possible because it is the goal of each person of the Trinity to draw humanity into glory. That the infinite

¹²⁹ Andrewes, *Works*, vol. III, Whitsunday 1, 109.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ *Op. cit.*, Whitsunday 3, p.146.

God could give himself to a finite creature defies logic. Yet Andrewes never preaches logic, and gladly rests in the hope of the mystery that is reunion with the Godhead.

Conclusion

Lancelot Andrewes' incarnational theology is his most lasting contribution to the Church. Deeply rooted in the Scripture and the Fathers, Andrewes used his influence as the greatest preacher of his day to create an alliance between the English Church and the patristic emphasis on the mystery of the Incarnation. Andrewes was exceptionally aware of the presence of God manifested in the Church through the Incarnation and the witness of the Holy Ghost. His emphasis upon the incarnational mystery, his invitation to the sacramental life and his hope for humanity's final reunion with God have been defining gifts to the Anglican way.

For Andrewes the union of the divine nature to human nature is the defining event in human history. In this union is bound God's self-revelation, humanity's redemption and the reunion of God and humankind. Jesus Christ reveals the Father's eternal love for humanity, sparing nothing to be reconciled with his creation. Christ also reveals the depths to which God would go to redeem the world. Finally, the union stands as an open door, a link by which humanity may return to communion with God.

Andrewes, therefore, calls Christians to the sacramental life. As means of grace the sacraments make Christ truly present by the power of the Holy Spirit. Through Baptism humanity is united with the Body of Christ, which is the Church. Through the Eucharist humanity is made partaker of the divine nature by consuming Christ's spiritual body and blood. The sacraments seal the link between God and humanity.

Finally, Andrewes' emphasis on the magnitude of the Incarnation leads him finally to deification. Forgiveness of sin is too little an accomplishment for so great a mystery as the Incarnation. God's victory in the person of his Son reaches far beyond simply forgiving the sin of Adam and Eve. In the union of the two natures in Christ, humanity now has claim on Christ's person and on his inheritance. Because Christ is the Son of God, humanity may now claim adoption as God's son.

It is at this point that Nicholas Lossky makes too great a claim by identifying Andrewes' understanding of deification with that of the Eastern Fathers. Such a claim defines deification in terms of humanity sharing the energies but not the essences of the divine, a distinction formalized in the Palamite Synthesis in the Eastern Church in the 14th century.¹³² Deification means taking on God's activity, participating in the energy of the Trinity. However, Andrewes never engages in such discussion. Instead, Andrewes prefers to speak of deification in terms of adoption, long preferred by the Western Church.¹³³ Humanity becomes God's child by being incorporated into the only Son, Jesus Christ. Humanity is by adoption what Christ is by nature. Because he is by nature divine, humanity may partake of the divine nature. Because Christ has inherited all of heaven and earth, and sits in glory at the right hand of the Father, humanity may ascend and reign with him for eternity.

* * *

¹³² *Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, s.v. "Deification," by Rowan Williams.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

Bibliography

I. PRINCIPAL EDITIONS OF THE WORKS OF LANCELOT ANDREWES.

Complete Works

Andrewes, Lancelot, *Works*, ed. J. P. Wilson and James Bliss, 11 vols., *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*. Oxford, 1841-54.

Sermons

XCVI Sermons, ed. Archbishop Laud and J. B. Buckeridge, Bishop of Ely, with a funeral sermon by the latter. London, 1629.

Scala Coeli: Nineteene sermons concerning prayer. The first six guiding to the true doore: the reidue teaching how so to knocke thereat that wee may enter. The formere part containing a preparation to prayer, the latter an exposition upon the former part containing a preparation to prayer, the latter an exposition upon the Lord's Prayer.... London, 1611.

The Wonderfull Combate (for God's glorie and mans salutation) betweene Christ and Satan. Opened in seuen most excellent... Sermons, upon the Temptations of Christ... [by L. Andrewes]. London, 1592.

Lancelot Andrewes: Sermons selected and ed. With an introduction by G. M. Story. Oxford, 1967.

Lancelot Andrewes, *Sermons on the Nativity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955.

Preces Privatae

The Private Devotions of...Lancelot Andrewes. London, 1647.

The Greek Devotions of Bishop Andrewes: Translated and Arranged [by J. H. Newman]. London, 1840 (*Tracts for the Times*, vol. 5, no. 88).

The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, trans. With an introduction and notes by F. E. Brightman. London, 1903.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Allchin, A. M. *The Dynamic of Tradition*. London, 1981.

_____. "Holiness in the Anglican Tradition", in Marina Chavchavadze, ed., *Man's Concern with Holiness*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

_____. *The Joy of All Creation: An Anglican Meditation on the Place of Mary*. London, 1984.

- _____. *The Kingdom of Love and Knowledge: The Encounter Between Orthodoxy and the West*. London, 1979.
- _____. "Lancelot Andrewes", in Geoffrey Rowell, ed., *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, Wantage: Ikon Books, 1992.
- _____. *Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition*. Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow, 1988.
- _____. *The World is a Wedding: Explorations in Christian Spirituality*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1988.
- Andrewes, G. T. *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes and his Influence on the Church*. Winchester, 1906.
- Aubrey, John. *Lives of Eminent Men*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick. London: Secker and Warburg, 1949.
- Avis, Paul. *Anglicanism and The Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Bishop, J. G. *Lancelot Andrewes: Bishop of Chichester, 1605-1609*. Chichester Papers, 33, Chichester City Council, 1963.
- Blackstone, B. "Some Notes on Lancelot Andrewes." *Theology* 53(1950).
- Bonner, Gerald. "Augustine's Conception of Deification." *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 37 (1986):369-86.
- Bosher, Robert S. *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662*. London: Dacre Press, 1951.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Orthodox Spirituality and Protestant and Anglican Spirituality*. New York: Seabury, 1969.
- Brightman, F. E. Introduction and Notes to the *Preces Privatae Of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester*. trans. F. E. Brightman. London, 1903.
- Burke, Robert R. "Touched with Hallowed Fire: The Christmas Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes." *Christian Scholar's Review* 5 No (1976): 3252-259.
- Cardwell, Edward. *A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the year 1558 to the year 1690*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1840.

Chadwick, Owen. "A Defence of Lancelot Andrewes' Sermons." *Theology* 102 (1999): 431-35.

_____. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Christology of the Later Fathers. ed. Edward Rochie Hardy. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

Church, Richard W. "Lancelot Andrewes", in Alfred Barry, D. D., ed., *Masters in English Theology*. New York, 1877.

Clark, John. "Confession and Re-formation: Walter Hilton's Sacramental Theology" in David Brown and Ann Loades, eds., *Christ: The Sacramental Word: Incarnation, Sacrament and Poetry*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Coleridge, S. T. *Notes on English Divines*. 2 vols. London, 1853.

The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical and Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. London: SPCK, 1843.

Cuming, G. J. *A History of Anglican Liturgy*. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England: From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox 1603-1690*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Desilva, David A. "'The Feast in the Text': Lancelot Andrewes on the Task and Art of Preaching." *Anglican Theological Review* 76 (1994): 9-26.

Dugmore, C. W. *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland*. London, 1942.

The Early Stuart Church. ed. Kenneth Fincham, London: Macmillan Press, 1993.

Eliot, T. S. *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays in Style and Order*. London: Faber, 1970.

Ferrel, Lori Anne. *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetoric of Conformity, 1603-1625*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: the Episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Fisher, J.D.C. *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West: A Study in the Disintegration of the Primitive Rite of Initiation*. Alcuin Club Collections 47, London: SPCK, 1965.

Frere, W. H. *Lancelot Andrewes as a Representative of Anglican Principles*. London, 1899.

- Gane, Erwin R. "Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Anglican Preachers: Latimer, Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes [2pts]." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 17 Spr (1979): 23-38; Aut (1979): 169-88.
- Gerrish, B. A. *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- _____. 'The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confession', in Donald K. McKin, ed., *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Gilson, Etienne. *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Press, 1990.
- Greenshade, S.L. *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- "A Hard Going," review of *Lancelot Andrewes: Sermons*, ed. G. M. Story, *Times Literary Supplement*, 8 June 1967.
- Higham, Florence. *Lancelot Andrewes*. SCM Press, Ltd., 1952.
- Holeton, David R. *Infant Communion Then and Now*. Grove Liturgical Study 27, Bramcote: Grove Books, 1981.
- Initiation Services: A Report by the Liturgical Commission, GS1152*. London: Church House, 1995.
- Jeanes, Gordon. "A Reformation Treatise of the Sacraments." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46.1 (1995): 149-50.
- Jurgens, W.A. *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1970.
- Lake, Peter, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- "Lancelot Andrewes," *Times Literary Supplement*, 23 September 1926.
- Lock, Charles. "For Lancelot Andrewes, Again [*Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*, Nicholas Lossky]; review essay." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 39 no 3 (1995): 305-12.
- Lossky, Nicholas, *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1944.

- _____. *The Vision of God*. London: Faith Press, 1963.
- Maloney, George A. *A Theology of Uncreated Energies*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1978.
- Martikainen, Jouko. "Deification or Justification." *Sobornost* 7.3 (1976): 180-192.
- McAdoo, H. R. and Kenneth Stevenson. *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition*. Canterbury Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Sprit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological method in the 17th Century*. London: A&C Black, 1965.
- McCullough, Peter E. "Lancelot Andrewes and Language." *Anglican Theological Review* 74 (1992): 304-16.
- McDonnell, Kilian, OSB. *Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan: The Trinitarian and Cosmic Order of Salvation*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- MacLeane, Douglas. *Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction*. London, 1965.
- Meyers, Ruth A., ed. *Children at The Table: The Communion of all the Baptised in Anglicanism Today*. New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1995.
- Miller, E. C., Jr. "Lancelot Andrewes." *The Seminarian*, Nashotah, 1982.
- _____. "Pentecost Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes." *Anglican Theological Review* 65 (1985):306-323.
- Mitchell, Fraser. *English Pulpit Oratory*. London: SPCK, 1932.
- Modern Eucharistic Agreement*. London: SPCK, 1973.
- More, Paul Elmer and Frank Leslie Cross, eds. *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1935.
- Neale, J.E. *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1559-1581*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1953.
- Ness, W. H. "Lancelot Andrewes and the English Church." *Theology*, Sept. (1926).
- Otten, Willemien, Jean Werckmeister, E. Ann Matter, and Jacques-Guy Bougerol. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*. ed. Irena Backus, Brill Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Ottley, R. L. *Lancelot Andrewes*. London: Methuen, 1894.

- Oulton, J. E. L. *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1951.
- Owen, Trevor A. *Lancelot Andrewes*. Boston: Twayne Publisher, 1981.
- Pollard, Arthur. *English Sermons*. London: Longmans, Green, 1963.
- Porter, H. Boone. *Jeremy Taylor Liturgist*. Alcuin Club Collection 61, London: SPCK, 1979.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Allen: Christian Classics, 1995.
- Quick, Oliver C. *The Christian Sacraments*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1932.
- Reidy, M. F., SJ. *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher, A Study in Early Seventeenth-Century Religious Thought*. Chicago, 1955.
- Robinson, P. G. A. "Baptism in Ritual Perspective: Myth, Symbol and Metaphor As Anthropological Foundations for a Baptismal Theology." Durham University Ph.D., 1997.
- Rowell, Geoffrey. "Spirit, Word and Unity: Reflections from the Anglican Tradition [Andrewes and Maurice Compatible with Orthodox Tradition]." *Dialogue Alliance* 4 (1990): 55-65.
- Schmemmann, Alexander. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1975.
- Schwarz, Robert C. "God's Blood Upon the Spearhead: Hearing a Good Friday Sermon by Lancelot Andrewes." *Sewanee Theological Review* 43 no 3 (2000): 285-302.
- Secor, Philip B. *Richard Hooker: Prophet of Anglicanism*. Toronto: The Anglican Book Centre, 1999.
- Smyth, Charles. *The Art of Preaching*. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Southgate, W. M., *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Spinks, Bryan. "Calvin's Baptismal Theology and the Making of the Strasbourg and Genevan Baptismal Liturgies 1540 and 1552." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 48 (1995), 55-78.
- _____. "Two Seventeenth Century Examples of "Lex credendi Lex orandi": The Baptismal and Eucharistic Theologies and Liturgies of Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter." *Studia Liturgica* 21.1 (1991), 165-89.

- Stevenson, Kenneth, *Covenant of Grace Renewed: A Vision of the Eucharist in the 17th Century*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1994.
- _____. *Eucharist and Offering*, with a foreword by Mark Santer. New York: Pueblos, 1985.
- _____. ““Human Nature Honored”. Absolution in Lancelot Andrewes”, in Martin Dudley, ed., *Like a Two-Edged Sword – The Word of God in Liturgy and History: Essays in Honor of Canon Donald Gray*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1995.
- _____. “Lancelot Andrewes at Holyrood: The 1617 Whitsun Sermon in Perspective.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 52 no 4 (1999): 455-75.
- _____. “The *Mensa Mystica* of Simon Patrick (1626-1707): A Case-Study in Restoration Eucharistic Piety” in Nathan Mitchell and John F. Baldovin SJ, eds., *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh O.S.B.* Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Mystery of Baptism in the Anglican Tradition*. Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1998.
- _____. “Patterns of Christian Initiation” in David R. Holeton, ed., *Growing in Newness of Life: Christian Initiation in Anglicanism Today*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1992.
- Stone, Darwell. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
- Talley, Thomas J. *Origins of the Liturgical Year*. Pueblo, 1986.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*. ed. Kenneth Fincham. Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1994.
- Wakefield, Gordon S. *The Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1983. S.v. “Deification,” by Rowan Williams.
- Welsby, Paul A. *Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626*. London, 1958.
- _____. “Lancelot Andrewes and the Nature of Kingship.” *Church Quarterly Review* 156 (1955): 400-8.