

**The Society for Ecumenical Studies and the Ecumenical Society
of the Blessed Virgin Mary**

**THE ECUMENISM OF ANDREWES AND OTHER
CAROLINE DIVINES**

Campion Hall, 25th March 2000

Marianne Dorman

At the 1988 Lambeth Conference, Archbishop Robert Runcie, in the opening address entitled, *The Truth Shall Make You Free*, committed Anglicans to an all-round and all level ecumenical movement. He saw the reformed Church in England as being in a special position to undertake ecumenical dialogue, especially with the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, but he did not discount the other Reformed churches. (1) (Incidentally in passing, the new archbishop of Westminster, Bishop Cormac Murphy-O'Connor was the chief R.C. observer at this Lambeth Conference of 1988.)

Some four hundred years previously Lancelot Andrewes, who died in 1626 as Bishop of Winchester, and other late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries divines of this reformed Church in England, did not view ecumenism in the same way, although they certainly held it as important. One of the reasons for this was that they did not see this church as being a bridge church as Lord Runcie did. Andrewes particularly never considered this Reformed Church as being *via media*. For him it was the true Catholic Church of England to which all Englishmen should belong. That was why he would say to the Papists, "Why deform a reformed church?" and to the Dissenters, "Why reform a reformed church?" Indeed, as he informed Cardinal Bellarmine, it was not until Pope Pius V's edict of 1570 that any schism occurred in the English Church, when some became *recusants* and refused to attend their parish churches. (2)

When Bellarmine suggested that it was the English Church that had broken from its Catholic past and was nothing more than “modern sectarian opinions”, Andrewes, in *Tortura Torti*, replied that the Cardinal was under a misapprehension to think this. He assured him that if it is “modern”, it is certainly “not ours”. It could not be - because “our appeal is to antiquity - yea, even the most extreme antiquity”. When Bellarmine also intimated that the English Church was Calvinist, Andrewes in *Responsio ad ... Bellarmini*, stated that this could not be the case, as our faith is of the universal church, and not that of Calvin. Again he insisted that there were no innovations in English Catholicism, but this could not be said about “the catholic faith ... at your hands”. “Much filth has it contracted [which] ... has lately, in some parts of the world, been washed off, and the form which the faith originally possessed has been restored. To this faith we cling as *reformed*, not to your deformation of it.” He emphasised that at the most we may “*renovate* what was customary with those same ancients, but with you has disappeared into novelties.” He maintained that to enforce those articles of faith which were not amongst the “many things which are laid down in the creeds and canons of the four Councils” was wrong and hindered oecumenism. (3)

Andrewes' view of the Reformed Church in England was well illustrated whilst he was bishop of Chichester (1605-9). In a meeting with Tobie Matthews, son of the archbishop of York, who was converting to Roman Catholicism, he referred to the reformed English Church as the “English Protestant Catholic Church”. (4) He also used the term *Protestant* in his *Responsio* to Cardinal Bellarmine, but qualified its usage “on the grounds of ‘temporary convenience’ ”; temporary because it would only last as long as those abuses within the Roman Church remain unreformed. (5) When that time came there would happily be again the one true Catholic Church in England. In Andrewes' early days he truly believed that this would happen; that is, members of the Reformed English Church and Roman Catholics would all belong to the one Catholic church in England.

In that meeting Sir Tobie Matthew stated his reasons for converting. The Roman Catholic Church had “a continual visibility, of a perpetuity, of an infallibility, of sanctity, of unity, of universality, of converting nations from idolatry, ... of the learning of her doctors, of the piety of her confessors, of the purity of her virgins, of

the penance of her eremites and innumerable other saints.” Andrewes replied that he agreed absolutely “that all these signs and marks did most absolutely belong to the Catholic Church.” He then informed Matthew that he “held the English Protestant Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church, to be one and the same Church of Christ”, except that “my Church” is “the better swept, and more cleanly kept, and more substantially repaired”. (6) A few years later, Bramhall, who at the Restoration was appointed archbishop of Armagh after living in exile during the Interregnum, extended this imagery when he likened the English Church to a garden before and after it was weeded.

I make not the least doubt in the world, but that the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation are as much the same Church, as a garden, before it is weeded and after it is weeded, is the same garden; or a vine, before it is pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches, is one and the same vine. (7)

Cosin, later bishop of Durham, in his exile in Paris during the Commonwealth period, corresponded with a Fr. Robinson who was trying to convert a certain Lady. Cosin informed him that this lady is “within the bosom of the Catholic Church already, and whose education hath been in the true Faith and religion of the Catholic Church professed and honoured by us in the Church of England.” If she converts she will denounce a Church that is “a true, pure, and orthodox Church of Christ.” (8) Thus Andrewes and other divines of the Jacobean and Caroline periods made it clear that this Reformed Catholic Church represented for them a true expression of the Catholic faith; it was indeed the national Church of England, and the Church in which to live and die.

Andrewes saw the Reformed English Church as standing in that long line of Catholic tradition embedded in antiquity, and faithful to the teaching of the Fathers as authorised by the early Councils. To Cardinals Perron and Bellarmine Andrewes clearly stated that the English Church was now much closer to the early Church, and so, “where Rome parts company with antiquity, England parts company with her.” It was to this faithfulness that Andrewes dedicated his life, energy, prayers, preaching and study. His sermons and prayers were thus to call Englishmen to be

steadfast to the true Catholic faith based on those oecumenical councils. To those whose preaching constantly distorted Christ and the early Church's teaching, he told them that the Christian faith "but floats in [their] brains - [they] but warble about it". Therefore to counter this distorted teaching he constantly stressed that "Christ's way is this", and therefore we should "do as we have been taught." (9) That was the way for harmony and for the Church to be at one.

There was no doubt that "the rule of the Fathers" was Andrewes', as evident in his Nativity sermon for 1611 with its text from the prologue of St. John's Gospel, "And the Word was made flesh". (10) Indeed his lectures and sermons were crammed with comments such as "the Fathers that I have read [say] with uniform consent"; "there is not one of the Fathers that I have read, but interpret it" this way; "the ancient Divines upon this point say"; and "I agree fully with the opinion of the ancient Fathers which are the most wise and the most learned". (11)

Andrewes of course was not the only Caroline divine who stressed that the English Church followed the practices of the ancient Church. Cosin too had insisted, "in truth we have continued the old religion, and the ceremonies ... are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the self-same interest in them which our fathers before us had." Mede, a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge insisted that

our Church, ... goes upon differing Principles from the rest of the Reformed, and so steers her course by another Rule than they do. We look after the Form, Rites, and Discipline of Antiquity, and endeavour to bring our own as near as we can to that Pattern. We suppose the Reformed Churches have departed farther there-from than needed, and so we are not very solicitous to comply with them. (12)

Thus when these divines spoke of ecumenism it was with a vision of the church returning to the beliefs and customs of the early Church based on the oecumenical councils of the first five centuries, which had determined orthodox beliefs on the Trinity and Incarnation against various heresies such as Arianism,

Monophysitism and Nestorianism. It was against the last heresy that Mary was given the title *Theotokos* at the Council of Ephesus in 431.

Christ's prayer "that all may be one" and Church unity were important to Andrewes and the Caroline Divines, who lamented very much schism, heresy and indeed any kind of dissension that rent Christ's body. Andrewes saw dissenters within the Reformed Church in England, the Papal Bull of 1570 and especially the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 as all working against unity. In his Genesis lectures Andrewes compared those who caused schism in the Church as following the example of Cain who was "the first that brings up schism and apostacy." His sin was censured by God and thus he was cast out of His presence. Likewise dissenters, by departing from the Church, place themselves out of God's presence, deny themselves "the spirituall food offered in the sacraments", and are no longer "members but excrements of the mysticall body". As Cosin expressed it, it is the heretics and schismatic "that raise tumults in religion and disquiet the peace of Christ's Church; a kind of people that do nothing else but study to maintain their own faction, and make the breaches of Sion wider than they are already." (13)

After the lay Catholic plot, commonly referred to as the Gunpowder Plot, to blow up Parliament in 1605 was discovered, Andrewes believed this grievously jeopardised any chance of dialogue between the English and Roman Churches at a council level. Such a plot, he maintained, unveiled the devious means that Roman Catholics were prepared to stoop to, so that "we have lost all our general councils at one blow. The Church of Christ hath to this day never a general council, 'with one wipe,' we dash them out all, we leave never a one, no not one. For all that ever have been, have been thus called and kept." Indeed under the new formulation set by the Papacy even those first four "which all Christians have ever had in so great reverence and high estimation" would not be regarded as lawful now. In *Responsio*, he stated, "the world has long since learned who is the real disturber of catholic unity and peace." "The Roman pontiff reckes not how many he sever from the Church - even if it be the whole of the East - so that his own pride may be gratified and there may be occasion for the kissing of his feet." (14)

On Whitsunday 1606, not long after the Gunpowder Plot, Andrewes preached that the Apostles “were all with one accord” after the Ascension, and before the Holy Spirit descended they had gathered “in one place” where “they broke bread ... together.” Without this “accord” it means we cannot truly sing “Come Holy Spirit” at Pentecost. He therefore stressed that for all Christians the first Pentecost morning should be our guide. It is this unity that God wills, that as we are “upon one foundation, so under one roof”. However “there is not a greater bar, a more fatal or forcible opposition” to unity in the Spirit “than discord, and dis-united minds, and such as are ‘in the gall of bitterness,’ ” he added. The Spirit cannot give life to “members dismembered, unless they be first united and compact together”, as instanced in the dead bones in Ezekiel. We should also realise that the Spirit that “loveth unanimity, loveth uniformity”, and so as “the Church was begun, thus it must be continued.” In this same sermon Andrewes beheld the Godhead as the prime example for unity, and the example for Christians to pursue. He described the Holy Spirit as “the very essential unity, love, and love-knot of the two persons, the Father and the Son; even of God with God.” The Spirit, the “essential unity”, can only enter “where there is unity of spirit”, and so “discord, and dis-united minds” are a great bar to unity. Do we thus marvel that when “we sing and say, Come Holy Ghost”, “the Spirit doth scarcely pant in us.” Nevertheless in this sermon he praised those who worked for unity: “high shall be his reward in Heaven, and happy his remembrance on earth.” (15)

Bramhall, in his *Just Vindication of the Church of England*, was also quite forthright against those who caused disunity by schism. “We see what mere schism is, a culpable rupture or breach of the Catholic communion, a loosing of the band of peace, a violation of Christian charity, a dissolving of the unity and continuity of the Church.” In the flyleaf of this work Bramhall had written “my name is Christian, my surname is Catholic: by the one I am known from infidels; by the other, from heretics and schismatics.” He insisted that those who set up “ ‘altar against altar,’ in His Church” limit “the Catholic Church unto his own sect”, and exclude “all the rest of the Christian world, by new doctrines, or erroneous censures, or tyrannical impositions.” On the other side, those who “wilfully break the line of apostolic succession which is the very sinews of ecclesiastical unity and communion, both

with the present church, and with the Catholic symbolical church of all successive ages” are schismatic. (16) To separate oneself “from any part of the Catholic Church as it is a part of the Catholic Church” is to separate oneself “from every part of the Catholic Church”, that is from the universal Church “which hath no existence in its parts”. However, having in mind the Roman Church which makes “Roman and Catholic to be convertibles”, Bramhall stated:

if one part of the universal Church do separate itself from another part, not absolutely, but respectively in abuses and innovations; not as it is a part of the universal church, but only so far as it is corrupted and degenerated; it doth still retain a communion, not only with the Catholic Church, and with all orthodox members of the Catholic Church, but even with that corrupted Church from which it is separated, except only in corruptions (17)

Bramhall wrote to encourage unity. Hence he appealed to all those who caused disunity “by lack of a true Christian sympathy or fellow-feeling of the wants and sufferings of our Christian brethren.” He appealed to those who did not wish nor desire “the peace of Christendom and the reunion of the Catholic Church” as evident “by not contributing ... prayers and endeavours for the speedy knitting together and consolidating of that broken bone.” This was manifested by their

rejecting the true badge and cognizances of Christians, that is, the ancient Creeds; by separating [oneself] without sufficient ground from other Christians in the participation of the same Sacraments, or in the use of the same Divine Offices and Liturgies of the Church and public worship and services of Almighty God, or of the same common rites and ceremonies. (18)

Despite the setback caused by the Gunpowder Plot, Andrewes’ sermons continue a plea for unity and peace in the Church. For example in his 1609 Paschal sermon, he preached “that Christ may have His wish, and there may be peace through the Christian world; that we may once all partake together of one peace-offering.” This sermon revolved around the Risen Christ bestowing His peace to the disciples (clergy) and others present (laity). However, Andrewes asked, “What

is become of it? If we look upon the Christian world, we see it not, it is gone as if Christ had never wished it." What "was first with Christ, is last with Christians." With a clear reference to some of the Puritans, he stated that even if we do wish it, it is but faint, illustrated by our "sitting", rather than our "standing". We are "loath to leave our cushion" and "standing is painful." Thus "our wish hath lips, but no legs." Yet peace and unity will never be had by "sitting and wishing." We must follow our Lord's example that manifested both "His hands and His feet, to shew what must be done with both for it." Even when we stand, our desire for unity must be in "a certain place" - in God's special place. Thus he warned his contemporaries against those who seek peace and unity in the wrong spirit. "If with the Pharisee to the corners, either by partiality one way, or prejudice another, no good will be done." Despite the present and past disunity for over sixteen hundred years, the Church, Andrewes insisted, has offered her daily "peace-offering, the Body Whose hands were here shewed, and the side whence issued *Sanguis crucis*, the Blood that pacifies all things in earth and heaven." By the Sacrament, Christians can still "renew the covenant of ... peace." This, he insisted, should be the aim of all Christians as there is "nothing more worth the wishing." Yet so many "hear it, and then turn their back on it; every man go his way, and forsake his peace; instead of seeking it, shun it, and of pursuing, turn away from it." (19)

Two years later at Easter, Andrewes again attacked those contemporaries whom he held responsible for the fragmentation within the Church. They have refused to see Christ as "the Head-stone of the corner" which is formed when two walls join at right angles. Yet some think unity can be achieved with a single wall; however "they that think to make Christ Head of a single wall are deceived." Referring particularly to dissenters, he described some stones that never "head well nor bed well", and so "lie scattered". "These stones Christ likes not, as He desires that all stones fit "into one frame of building". As with Christ the peacemaker, so Christ the corner-stone meets us in the Sacrament as a unifying element. Hence Christ as the "Head" can make us "living stones" "to grow into one frame of building, into one body mystical with Him" as we "partake of one bread or cup." (20)

In the last of his Jacobean Paschal sermons he continued this theme, that “things out of joint are never quiet, never at peace and rest, till they be set right again. But when all is in frame, all is in peace; and so it refers well to ‘the God of peace’, Who is to do it.” This “putting in joint is nothing but a bringing back again to the right place whence it slipped, that still there is a good coherence with that which went before; the peace-maker, the bringer-back, the bone-setter, are all one.” Andrewes suggested to his contemporaries that it would be easier for them to understand the merit of this ‘putting in joint’ if they first understood St. Paul’s “out of joint”. Here there are “many rubs, lets, [and] impediments. ... A sinew shrinks, a bone is out, somewhat is awry; and what ado there is ere we can get it right!” There are many reasons for this, “either the will is averse, and we have no mind to it; or the power is shrunk, and the means fail us; or the time serves not; or the pace is not meet; or the parties to be dealt with, we find them indisposed. And the misery is, when one is got in, the other is out again.” (21)

His Nativity sermons, too, stressed unity and peace through the message of the angel. That message should invoke in us the desire “to procure the glory of Heaven, and the peace of the earth; to find peace in the good-will of God, and to give Him glory for it, Who hath appointed peace our portion here.” Indeed we cannot “sing Glory without Peace”, if we do, “we sing but to halves”. Thus “no Glory on high will be admitted without Peace upon earth. No gift on His Altar, which is a special part of His glory, but ‘lay down your gift and there leave it, and first go your way and make peace on earth;’ and that done come again, and you shall then be accepted to give glory to Heaven, and not before.” (22)

In his Christmas sermon for 1623 he once again emphasised unity. Taking as his text (from Ephesians), *That in the dispensations of the fulness of times, He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in Heaven and which are on earth even in Him*, he outlined how God had gathered all things in heaven and earth into one in Christ. God through the eternal Word from the beginning gave order and harmony to His creation that existed until the disobedience of Adam. It is those things which gather together to bring order and unity which God “favours” and “loves”; but “scattering [He] favours not”, as this leads “to division, and division upon division” which happened after the fall, and so evident in the Old Testament.

It was not until the Word came as *Salus Mundi of all in heaven and earth* that there was a restoration of “gathering”. “And so we were all scattered without Christ... till He came ...and got them again together.”

Sin had led to divisions between heaven and earth, manifested with angels drawing swords at men; men scattered over “points of religion [and] ..., morality”; “Jews scattered from the Gentiles, and ...the Gentiles scattered [amongst]... themselves.” The Patriarchs, Priests and Levites, and Prophets were unable to stop this “scattering”. It was left to the eternal Word to gather. Hence by “*Ecce venio* of His way was found, those who were thus distracted and scattered before, how to bring them together again.” By “ordaining Him a body, ... He comes this day, and gathers all again.” Thus by the incarnation “there is nothing, not anything, in heaven or earth left out. ... All are in now; all reconciled, as it were, in one mass, all cast into one sum; recapitulated indeed truly and properly. ...

For God *was in Christ reconciling the world*. ... He did so *reconcile them in the body of His flesh*. ... And there is good hope they who are one, will soon be at one; where unity is, union will be had with no great ado.

“Unity preserves, division destroys.” “The very end of the Sacrament is to gather again to God and His favour, ... and to gather us as close and near as *alimentum alito*, that is as near as near may be.” (23)

It was of course the Sacrament of the Altar that Andrewes held to be the pivot of unity. It is the “Sacrament of peace and unity”, and ideally it should unite all Christians. (24) It is “for all sorts”, Andrewes insisted, but nothing it seemed had divided his contemporaries as much as Christ’s Body and Blood. The importance of coming together as one, Andrewes believed, was reflected in one of the names given for the Eucharist in the early Church, *Synaxis*.

In a sermon in his parish church of St. Giles, Cripplegate, London, in 1600, he emphasised that it must be the Lord’s Table to which we come and partake of the Lord’s banquet, and not that of the Devil, whose business is to scatter, rend and divide. Only by partaking at the Lord’s Table do we receive the “Sacrament of

unity” which should persuade us “unto unity and love” for one another. Henceforth “if men could be persuaded that they are one body, there would not be such divisions and dissensions” in Christ’s body which has “one beginning, and one nourishment.” This beginning “in the fountain of regeneration” is when we are “baptized into one body by one spirit, and all made to drink of one spirit”, and “the one nourishment” comes from the Sacrament itself, “therefore they are all one body,” that is, “living stones” in the “body mystical.” (25)

Furthermore at the Liturgy God’s people gather together for prayers and for “the dispensation of His holy mysteries”. That gathering should reflect “the symbols of many grains into the [bread] ... and many grapes into the [wine]”, which is completed at the altar where “we gather Christ Himself”. (26) It is indeed “the Sacrament of accord”. This unity is also demonstrated at the fraction when Christ’s body is broken for all and, in St. Paul’s words, “We are all ‘one bread and one body, so many as are partakers of one bread’.” This makes it “*locus* of unity”. Just as the two natures in Christ are “united together” so in the Sacrament all Christians should be too. (27)

One of Andrewes’ students at Westminster School, John Hacket, later bishop of Lichfield at the Restoration, also emphasised “the gathering together of many into one”, as that which God loves and which has been exemplified in the “many grains of wheat [which] are kneaded into one loaf, [and the] many grapes [which] are trodden, that their liquor may be pressed into one cup.” “It is necessary that many pieces be broken off from one loaf, to typify the body of the Lord broken for us, and that the benefits of his passion are distributed among us.” Therefore “it is a sacrament to combine and to knit together, holding up fast into one communion,” and not a “breaking assunder of the parts and members.” The Sacrament should thus strengthen “the mystical body to continue in one fellowship and breaking of bread, to link faith and love together in Jesus Christ.” (28)

Even the more evangelical, Edward Reynolds, also adopted the ‘Cyprian’ approach, and preached in a similar vein to Andrewes on unity. He thus declared that no communicant has “worthily received these *Holy Mysteries*,” until he

discovers “the *Image of that unity* which is in them, conveyed by them into [his] ... Soul. As the breaking of Bread is the Sacrament of Christs Passion, so the aggregation of many grains into one Mass, should be a *Sacrament of the Churches unity.*” Reynolds further argued, “What is the reason, that the Bread and the Church should be both called in the Scripture by the same name? The Bread is the Body of Christ, and the Church is the Body of Christ too? Is it not because, as the Bread is one loaf out of divers corn, so the Church is one Body out of divers Believers?” He further explained that

if the Beams of the Sun, though divided and distinct from one another, have yet a unity in the same nature of light, because all partake of one native and original splendour: If the Limbs of a Tree, though all several, and spreading different ways, have yet a unity in the same Fruits, because all are incorporated into one stock or root; If the streams of a River, though running divers ways, do yet all agree in unity of sweetness and clearness, because all issuing from the same pure fountain: Why then should not the Church of *Christ*, though of several and divided qualities and conditions, agree in a unity of *truth* and *love*, *Christ* being the *Sun* whence they all receive light; the *Vine* into which they are ingrafted, and the *Fountain* that is opened unto them for all transgressions and for sins? (29)

Andrewes believed that the practices of both Puritans and Papists in their respective attitudes to the Eucharist hindered that unity which the Sacrament should give. He accused the former of distorting “*fractio panis*”, because they saw it as being nothing else but that, and not partaking of Christ’s body. It certainly is “not a sign, figure or remembrance of it” as “the Church hath ever believed a true fruition of the true body of Christ in that Sacrament”. Such imagination also denied “the breaking of bread” as the focal point for unity and fellowship, which had been strikingly evident in the early Church. Papists too had created their “imagination” over the “*fractio panis*” by their *sine fractione*. Andrewes insisted that it was clear from both St. Luke and St. Paul that there could not be a “breaking of bread” without the partaking of it. (30)

In *Responsio*, Andrewes expressed his desire for the holding of a council for all Christians not ashamed of Christ's name, from which might come "*unum per omnia sentire*" ("seeing unity in all things"). "For a long while have we been making our appeal to a council, but to a council duly summoned." He insisted it must be

... a council in which business is conducted in the same manner and order as in the first famous four; wherein there is liberty of voting; wherein prejudice is not set in place of judgment; wherein he sits not as judge, who should be treated as defendant; wherein there are no titular or unreal (*factitii*) bishops; [and] wherein the number is reduced of those Italian prelates who, by the quantity of their votes, outweigh all the other bishops of Europe put together. (31)

He also believed that the recent council of Trent should be revised; and in his correspondence with Carleton, the English ambassador at The Hague, he commented that, if this were to happen, it would only be by the intervention of Princes, as nothing would be achieved "by the pen". (32)

Andrewes sought a General Council in his own time, because he believed that such a council would be the best weapon to fight heresy, schism, dissension now apparent within the Church. One of Andrewes' contemporaries, Harington, commented that if ever a council was held in Europe to end "this great schism in the Church of God", then "this reverend prelate will be found one of the ablest, not of *England* onely, but of *Europe*, to set the course for composing the controversies." (33) Harington wrote,

I persuade myself, that whensoever it shall please God to give the King means, with consent of his confederate princes, to make that great peace which His blessed word, *Beati pacifici*, seemeth to promise, - I mean the ending of this great schism in the Church of God, procured as much by ambition as superstition, - this reverend prelate will be found one of the ablest, not of England only, but of Europe, to set the course for composing the controversies; which I speak not to add reputation to his sufficiency by

my judgment; but rather to win credit to my judgment by his sufficiency.
(34)

Andrewes was not the only one who desired a council to end all schism. Bramhall, who during the Interregnum in 1656 wrote *A Replication to Bishop of Chalcedon*, as a defence of the English Church against the charge of schism, prayed that he might “live to see the reunion of Christendom, for which I shall always bow the ‘knees of my heart’ to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (35) He stressed that he submitted himself “to the true Catholic Church, the spouse of Christ, the mother of the Saints, the pillar of truth” and “to the representative church, that is, a free general Council, or so general as can be procured.” (36) And in his *Just Vindication*, Bramhall viewed Ecumenical Councils as being “the sovereign tribunals of the Church” but which now were “the jurisdiction of the Papal Court.” He too wanted to see the calling of “a free general Council” but not one imposed by the Roman Church and full of Italian bishops. (37)

Andrewes’ ecumenical spirit was also reflected in his contact and correspondence with divines outside of England, especially with those in the Reformed tradition. Although Andrewes left England only once, and that was to accompany James to Scotland in 1617, he had many contacts with Reformed theologians on the continent, some of whom came and stayed with him when they were in England, such as the Dutch Francis Junius and G. Doublet in 1621. He corresponded with the German theologian Gerard Voss and was on friendly terms with Erpenius, professor of oriental literature at Leyden, and Daniel Heinsius, professor of Latin and Greek, also at Leyden. However, his relation with Grotius, the Arminian theologian, soured after the Dutchman abused their friendship. (38)

One of his most important ecumenical and friendly relationships was with Isaac Casaubon, who at one time had been professor of Greek in Geneva. This was followed by a professorship at Montpellier and three years later in 1599 he moved to Paris on his appointment as *lecteur du roi*. He became disenchanted with Calvinism, but felt he could not embrace Roman Catholicism. Like Andrewes he was steeped in the teachings of the Fathers and came to see its best expression in the Reformed English Church. He arrived in England after he received an official

invitation from Archbishop Bancroft on 20th July 1610. He became close friends with Andrewes and also Overall. One of the first tasks Andrewes gave Casaubon was to read and correct his *Responsio ad Apologiam Card. Bellarmini*. He died on 1st July 1614, after receiving the *Viaticum* from the hands of Andrewes.

However, it was in his correspondence with the French Calvinist, Pierre du Moulin, on Episcopacy that we learn something about Andrewes' thoughts on the Continental Reformed Churches. In 1618 du Moulin had written a book entitled *De la vocation des pasteurs*, a copy of which he had sent to James I, who censured three of the author's assertions. It was in relation to these censures that du Moulin began a correspondence with Andrewes, who was also given a copy of the book. The three points of which James disapproved were (i) that the names of "bishop" and "presbyter" were "one and the same" in the New Testament; (ii) that there was only one order for "bishop" and "presbyter"; and (iii) that "bishops" were not "of Divine Right". Andrewes addressed each of these points to illustrate that very early in the apostolic church the names became distinct, as did the order for bishop and presbyter; and that bishops, descendant from the Apostles, are by divine right as they, like the Apostles, were divinely inspired. (39)

Du Moulin also expressed his desire for "all the Reformed Churches who are united by *one faith*" to be united also by "*one and the same bond of Ecclesiastical Government*". Andrewes applauded his desire for unity and declared that that was his "earnest and heart prayer" too. He prayed for it daily, but made clear that that ecclesiastical form of government must be the episcopal ministry, as it was the ancient and historic form of government. "*All Churches everywhere receiv'd this Form of government. Nor were there ever, before this Age, any Churches, which were governed by any other, then by Bishops.*" He also applauded du Moulin for his holding in great esteem "the venerable Antiquity of these first ages" rather than "the new upstart devices of any whatsoever," and for recognising "episcopacy from the very infancy of the Church". Thus he hoped that he would also come to hold the episcopal form of government "in higher esteem". (40)

I daily begg it humbly of God that they may be united in the same Form of Church Policy, by the bond of Ecclesiastical Government; but that same

which desires its pedigree from the very infancy of the Church, from which the Reverend Antiquity of the First Ages; which whosoever opposeth, opposeth himself to all Antiquity which Saint James the Apostle began in the Church of Hierusalem, from whom the succession of Bishops in a long course descended, which condemned Arius, for daring to oppose himself against the Consent and Practice of the Catholik Church, which all Churches, every where received. (41)

Although Andrewes informed du Moulin that “the Government of *our Church* is such, as cometh most, neer to the *form* and manner of the *Antient Church*,” he did not denounce the government of these Reformed churches. “To prefer a better, is not to condemn a thing; it is not to condemn your church, if we recall it to another form, namely our own, which the better agrees with all antiquity.” He added,

Though *Our Government* be by *Divine Right* it follows not, either that here is *no salvation*, or that a *Church cannot stand without it*. He must needs be *stone-blind*, that sees *not Churches standing without it*, He must needs be *made of iron* and *hard hearted* that *denys them salvation*. We are not made of that metal, we are none of those Ironsides; We put a great difference betwixt them. Somewhat may be wanting, that is of *Divine Right ... yet Salvation* may be had.” (42)

In reply to du Moulin’s third letter, Andrewes advised du Moulin that “our writings must be regulated by that of the Apostles, *Not what is lawful, but what is expedient*.” To the Frenchman question, whether the Reformed Churches had sinned “against the *Divine Right*,” Andrewes answered,

I did not say it, this only I said, that *your Churches* wanted somewhat that is of *Divine Right*, some wanted, not by your fault, but by the iniquity of the times. For that *your France* had not yours *Kings so propitious* at the *reforming of your Church* as *our England* had: in the interim when God shall vouchsafe you better times, even this, which now you want, will, by his grace, be supplied. But in the mean while, the *Name of Bishop*, which we find so

frequent in the *Scriptures*, ought not to have been abolish'd by you. Though to what purpose is it to abolish the *Name*, and to retain the Thing. (43)

Many of the Caroline Divines followed Andrewes' approach to the Reformed Continental Churches, as they also did not desire to prejudge these churches, and explained what had taken place as being of "necessity" at the time. Bramhall explained,

I dare not limit the extraordinary operation of God's spirit, where ordinary means are wanting, without the default of the persons. ... I know that there is a great difference between a valid and a regular ordination, and what some choice divines do write of case of necessity; and for my part am apt to believe that God looks upon his people in mercy, with all their prejudices, and that there is a great latitude left to particular churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment, according to the exigence of time and place and persons, so as order and his own institution be observed. (44)

Jeremy Taylor did not assent to the *necessity* assertion to excuse the non-episcopal nature of most of the Reformed churches, as "there were many archbishops and cardinals in Germany, England, France and Italy, that joined in the reformation, whom they might, but did not, employ in their ordinations." He added that he "never heard that necessity did build a church"; for "where God means to found a church, there He will supply them with those means and ministers which Himself hath made if ordinary and absolutely necessity." Nevertheless he did not condemn the non-episcopal churches either.

Shall we then condemn those few of the reformed churches whose ordinations always have been without bishops? No, indeed, that must not be; they stand or fall to their own master. And though I cannot justify their ordinations, yet what degree their necessity is of, what their desire of Episcopal ordinations may do for their personal excuse, and how far a good life and a catholic belief may lead a man in the way to heaven, although the forms of external communion be not observed, I cannot determine. (45)

Another Caroline Divine, Herbert Thorndike, desired fraternal relations with the Reformed churches, even though he believed “there remains no hope for unity” until the Reformed churches agreed with the Church of England “to reform themselves unto the form of the primitive catholic church.”

The honour and esteem which the learned of the reformed churches abroad have professed of the state of our churches, and our charity in excusing the necessities of theirs and acknowledging the efficacy of the ministry which they use, will be sufficient through Cod’s goodness, to actuate the correspondence we desire to preserve with them, without those innovations which they never required at our hands to such purpose. (46)

Yet he did not condemn the non-episcopal churches:

Therefore, though I must not take upon me either to justify or to condemn their ordinations, averring on one side that they are not according to rule, seeing on other side that they are owned by my superiors; yet I must acknowledge that there are very great reasons to hope and presume, that God accepteth of their ordinations, though not made according to rule, in consideration of the necessity that drove them to it, and of the reformation which they were used to propagate. (47)

During the Interregnum Thorndike wrote a major work, *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*. This consisted of three books, the first, entitled *The Principles of Christian Truth*; the second, *The Covenant off Grace*; and the third, *The Laws of the Church*. Its main theme was that unity enhances the “service of God”, and it is for this, he maintained, that the Church exists.

For unity in the Church is of so great advantage to the service of God, and that Christianity from whence it proceedeth, that it ought to overshadow and cover very great imperfections in the laws of the Church; all laws being subject to the like. (48)

Perhaps Andrewes' daily prayers in *Preces Privatae* reflected his heartfelt desire and longing for Christ's body to be one, even more than his sermons. This prayer book consisted mostly of quotations from the Jewish, Eastern and Western traditions. Each day he prayed in some form for the healing of divisions within the Church, for schisms to cease in the churches; for all "who are in error and sin, that they return into the way," and for those who have strayed that they may return "to thy holy and catholic and apostolic church" .

He prayed "For the speeding and strengthening of all the Christ-loving army against the enemies of our most holy faith.., and all our brotherhood in Christ"; for the Church to extend in peace throughout all the world and for "the restoration of the things that are wanting therein" and "the strengthening of the things that remain therein" (49)

His ecumenical spirit was also reflected in the extensive use he made of parts of the Orthodox liturgies in his daily intercessions and preparation for the Eucharist. One of his intercessory prayers was.

In the peace of God, let us pray
for the peace which is from *above*, and for the salvation of our souls;
for the peace of the *whole world*;
the stability of the holy churches of God;
and the union of all men;
for this holy house; and them that with faith and piety enter therein;
for our fathers in holy things, the honourable presbytery,
the diaconate in Christ and all clergy and people:
for *this* holy mansion; and every city and country;
and them that dwell therein in faith...
Commemorating the allholy, immaculate, more than
blessed mother of God and evervirgin Mary,
with all the saints,
let us commend ourselves and one another and all our
life unto Christ God:
unto Thee, o Lord,

for unto Thee is due glory, honour and worship. (50)

To sum up, ecumenism for Andrewes and those who followed in his footsteps could only be achieved within that “*bond of Ecclesiastical Government*” of “the *Reverend Antiquity of the First Ages*”. Andrewes asserted that those “*whosoever opposeth ... himself to all Antiquity, which St. James the Apostle began in the Church of Jerusalem*” and which continued in “*the succession of Bishops*” will be condemned as Arius was, for setting “*himself against the Consent and Practice of the Catholik Church, which all Churches everywhere received.*” His own personal belief was expressed in the bidding prayer preceding the *Concio in Discessu Palatini*: “*Catholica, non Romana, sed Oecumenica, nernpe, quam longe lateque patet terrarum Orbis, longe lateque disseminata.*” (The Church is Catholic, not Roman, but ecumenical (world-wide), which extends throughout the length and breadth of the earth and is spread far and wide).”

I think it would be fitting to finish a paper on ecumenism with one of those prayers that Andrewes assuredly used during his life time routine of praying for Christ's Catholic Church.

Let us pray for the Catholic Church;

for the Churches throughout the whole world;

there truth, verity, unity, and stability, to wit:

in all let charity, thrive, truth live;

for our own church:

that the things that are wanting therein may be

supplied, that are not right be set in order,

that all heresies, schisms, scandals,

as well public as private, be put out of the way:

correct the erring,

convert the unbelieving,

increase the faith of thy church,

destroy heresies,

expose crafty enemies. Amen. (52)

Notes

1. R. Runcie, opening address in *The Truth Shall Make You Free, The Lambeth Conference, 1988* (London, 1988). pp. 11ff.
2. R. Y. Ottley, *Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1894), p. 68. This Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* excommunicated Elizabeth I as it condemned her as a heretic, and therefore absolved Englishmen of any allegiance to her. This put Roman Catholics in the unenviable position of having to choose between their Queen or Pope.
3. *The Works of Lancelot Andrewes*, eds. J. Bliss and J. P. Wilson, 11 vols (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (L.A.C.T.), . Oxford, 1841 - 54), afterwards referred to as Andrewes, Vol. 7, p. 96, Vol. 8, p. 159: trans. Ottley, op. cit., pp. 157-8 and 164-5.
4. A. H. Mathew, *A True Historical Relation of The Conversion of Sir Tobi Matthew to The Holy Catholic Faith with the Antecedents and consequences Thereof* (London, 1904), p.99. Cosin, refers to it as the Protestant Reformed Catholic Church. *The Works of the Rt. Reverend Father In God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham*, ed., J. Sanson, 5 vols (L.A.C.T., Oxford. 1843 - 55), afterwards referred to as Cosin. Vol. 4, p. 167.
5. Andrewes, Vol. 8, p. 26, trans. in Ottley, op. cit., p. 164.
6. Mathew, op. cit., pp. 99-100.
7. Andrewes, Vol. 8, p. 69, trans. in Ottley, op. cit., p. 163; *The Works of The Most Reverend Father in God John Bramhall, D.D. Sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland*, 5 vols (L.A.C.T., Oxford, 1842 - 45), afterwards referred to as Bramhall. Vol. 1, p. 113.
8. Cosin, Vol. 4, pp. 317-8.
9. Andrewes, Vol. 1, pp. 15 and 373, Vol. 2, p. 367.
10. Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 85ff.
11. Ibid.. Vol. 1. pp. 11, 175 and 204. Vol. 2, pp. 49 and 270; Vol. 3, p. 135: *Apospasmata Sacra: Or A Collection of posthumous and orphan Lectures: Delivered at St. Paul's and St. Giles his Church by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes, Lord Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1657), afterwards referred to as Apos. Sacra, pp. 312, 335, 280 and 337.
12. Cosin, Vol. 5, p. 13: J. Mede, *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly Learned Joseph Mede*, 2 vols (London, J. Worthington, 1664), Vol. 2, p. 1061.
13. Apos. Sacra, pp. 458-9; Cosin, Vol. 1, p. 204.
14. Andrewes, Vol. 8, p. 90: trans. in Ottley, op. cit., p. 172.
15. Andrewes, Vol. 3, pp. 107-8 and 112-3.
16. Bramhall, Vol. 1. pp. 108 and 112-3.
17. Ibid., pp. 42 and 100.
18. Ibid., pp. 108 -9.
19. Andrewes, Vol. 2, pp. 243 and 247-251.
20. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 275, 280-1 and 288-9.
21. Ibid., Vol. 2. pp. 96-7.
22. Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 223 and 232.
23. Ibid., Vol. 1, pp.272-6 and 282.
24. E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven and London), p. 92.
25. *Apos. Sacra*, pp. 614-5.
26. Andrewes, Vol. 1, pp. 281-2.
27. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 282; Vol. 2, p. 289; Cyprian, *The Epistles Of S. Cyprian*, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 17 (Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1844), p. 161 (lxiii 10).

28. J. Hackett, *Christian Consolation*, in *The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D. Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore*, ed. R. Heber, 15 vols (London, 1822), Vol. 1, pp. 165-6.
29. E. Reynolds, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God Edmund Reynolds D. D. Late Lord Bishop of Norwich* (London, 1679), p. 429.
30. Andrewes, Vol. 5. pp 66-7.
31. Ibid., Vol. 8, pp. 216 and 448, trans. in Ottley, op. cit., p. 164.
32. Andrewes, Vol. 5, p. 157; P.R.O. S.P. 14/72/42.
33. Andrewes, Vol. 5, p. 146; J. Harington, *A Briefe New of the State of the Church of England, As it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James his Reign to the Yeere 1608* (London, 1653), p. 146. Hooker too had intimated the need for a general synod, for he also believed with Andrewes that it was only in such an assembly that canons and rules could be made to "redress abuses". R. Hooker, *The Works of Richard Hooker*, ed. J. Keble, and revised by R. W. Church and F. Paget, 3 vols., 7th ed. (Oxford, 1878), Vol. 1, pp. 168-9 (Pre:vi.3).
34. Andrewes, Vol. 11, pp. xxvii-xxviii.
35. Bramhall, Vol. 2, p. 21.
36. Ibid., p. 22.
37. Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 100.
38. N. E. McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939), Vol. 2. pp. 110-11.
39. L. Andrewes, *Of Episcopacy, Three Epistles of Peter Moulin Doctor and Professor of Divinity, Answered by the Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes, Late Lord Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1647), afterwards referred to as *Episcopacy*, pp. 4 and 6-16.
40. Ibid., pp. 14-15, 41, 46-7, 58 and 62.
41. Ibid., pp. 62-3.
42. Ibid., p. 24.
43. Ibid., p. 56.
44. Bramhall, Vol. 1. p. 475.
45. J. Taylor, *The Whole Works of the Right Rev Jeremy Taylor D.D. Lord Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore*, ed., C. P. Eden, 10 vols (London, 1847- 1853), Vol. 5, pp. 119-121.
46. *The Works of Henry Thorndike*, 6 vols (L.A.C.T., Oxford. 1844-54), Vol. 1, pt. I, pp. 92-4.
47. Ibid., Vol. 5, p. 430.
48. Ibid., Vol. 2. pt. 1, pp. 6 and 192.
49. *The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes*, trans. and introd. by F. E. Brightman (London, 1903), afterwards referred to as Brightman, pp.76-78, 84, 92-3 and 269-270
50. Ibid., pp. 84-5.
51. Andrewes, Vol. 10, p. 80; *Episcopacy*, pp. 62-3.
52. Brightman, p.32.

"The difficulty in [Lancelot] Andrewes' argument for the continuity of the Church of England with the pre-Reformation Church lies in the fact that the retention of an orthodox view of the Eucharist as presence, sacrifice and foundation of the Church does not in itself guarantee that one will have an 'orthopraxy'—a pattern of rightful action relating one to the rest of. Even if we are able to return to the Anglicanism of the Caroline divines what is going to stem the same heretical tide that has so distressed our Church in the recent decades, or keep it from rejecting its catholic identity all over again? From *The Panheresy of Ecumenism*, by Metropolitan Cyprian (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1995), pp. 10-11. Project Canterbury. Andrewes and the Caroline Divines™ Teaching on the Blessed Virgin Mary. Paper for the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary. November, 2000. by Dr. Marianne Dorman. Neither are we unmindful to bless Thee, for the most holy, pure, highly blessed, the Mother of God, Mary the eternal Virgin, with all the Saints. So prayed Lancelot Andrewes in the Orthodox tradition frequently. Andrewes who ended his life as bishop of Winchester and the Caroline Divines. who followed him in the seventeenth century held the Blessed Virgin Mary in that same light as the third ecumenical council at Ephesus in 431, and of the Orthodox tradition. Theotokos was the official title given to Mary at Ephesus, although it had been in use since the time of Origen. The Divines are the Aedric deities which make up the official pantheon of the Cyrodilic Empire, and thus have been worshiped all across Tamriel.[1] Their membership was defined by Saint Alessia at the founding of the First Empire in the aftermath of the rebellion she led. Her now-emancipated people had long ago adopted the Aldmeri religion of their Ayleid captors, but the rebellion had only been won with the aid of armies from Skyrim, who adhered to the Nordic pantheon.[2] Alessia could not force either group to adopt the religion of the other, for fear of starting another war which would tear... Since the Divines were based on existing local pantheons and common archetypes, in many areas the two co-exist.