

## MAKING DEAD MEN SPEAK: LAUDIANISM, PRINT, AND THE WORKS OF LANCELOT ANDREWES, 1626–1642\*

PETER McCULLOUGH

*Lincoln College, Oxford*

**ABSTRACT.** *This study examines the posthumous competition over the print publication of works by Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626) before the English Civil War. The print history of the two official volumes edited by Laud and John Buckeridge (1629), and of competing editions of texts rejected by them but printed by puritan publishers, sheds important new light not only on the formation of the Andrewes canon, but on Laud's manipulation of the print trade and his attempts to erect new textual authorities to support his vision of the church in Britain.*

---

To say that Lancelot Andrewes influenced William Laud and Laudianism is to say nothing new: scholarly accounts as diverse as those offered by Lord Dacre, Hugh Trevor-Roper, Kevin Sharpe, and Nicholas Tyacke all identify the Jacobean prelate as a light guiding Laud's attempts to reconstruct the English church in the 1630s.<sup>1</sup> But since debates over Laud's role in the Caroline regime show no signs of abating, we need to scrutinize more closely the link that has been taken for granted between Andrewes and Laudianism. To use one of Andrewes's favourite metaphors, we need to look more carefully at the principal 'conduit' of the bishop's influence, the collection of Andrewes's works published in 1629, not least because it was edited by Laud in collaboration with John Buckeridge, bishop of Ely, who was his own mentor and Andrewes's associate.<sup>2</sup> The Laud–Buckeridge edition of *XCVI sermons* and the companion volume of minor works, the *Opuscula quaedam posthuma*, in fact formed a crucial

\* This article grew out of a paper read to the third Reading Literature and History Conference, 'Texts and Cultural Change', July 1995. In expanded form it was presented to the Religious History Seminar at the Institute for Historical Research, and to the Tudor–Stuart History Seminar at Cambridge University. I am particularly grateful for the questions and comments of Drs Nicholas Tyacke, Kenneth Fincham, and John Morrill, and to the early encouragement of Professor Peter Lake and Dr David Armitage.

<sup>1</sup> Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573–1645* (2nd edn, London, 1965), pp. 29–31; Kevin Sharpe, *Charles I: the personal rule* (New Haven, 1993), p. 287; Nicholas Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The early Stuart church* (London, 1993), pp. 62–4. See also Julian Davies, *The Caroline captivity of the church: Charles I and the remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992), p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Buckeridge (1562?–1631) was appointed Laud's tutor at St John's College, Oxford, and the two men held the college presidency successively. Buckeridge was consecrated bishop of Rochester 1611 and translated to Ely 1631 (all biographical information unless otherwise cited is from *Dictionary of National Biography* (DNB)).

link in the transformation of English anti-Calvinism from an avant-garde option at the Jacobean court to a programme for church-wide reform that we describe today as Laudianism.<sup>3</sup> Seen in this light, the Laud–Buckeridge edition of Andrewes is revealed as polemically aggressive, consciously constructed as a new authority and proof-text for the apologists who would defend the reconstruction of the church in the 1630s. The publication of Andrewes’s works was a distinctly ‘Laudian’ project, both in the biographical and political senses of that now-contested term.<sup>4</sup> This is not to deny the significance of Charles I’s public role as patron of the project. Both volumes indeed trumpet his royal commission: ‘*Published by His MAJESTIES speciale Command*’, ‘*Your Majesties first care was for the Presse, that the worke might be publicke*.’<sup>5</sup> They stand as eloquent bibliographical examples of how the two men’s theological and political interests could meet. But a reconstruction of the genesis of *XCVI sermons* and the *Opuscula* suggests that from its inception, the project’s editors, not its patron, defined its textual and ideological boundaries.

We do not know exactly when after Andrewes’s death in September 1626 Laud and Buckeridge received their royal commission to ‘*overlooke the Papers (as well Sermons as other Tractates) of that Reverend and Worthy Prelate, and print all that we found perfect*’, as they summarized it in the dedication of *XCVI sermons*.<sup>6</sup> Nor do we know the origins of Charles’s commission. It must at least be considered that Andrewes himself did not leave the posthumous use of his unpublished sermons and tracts to chance, but arranged for their disposal before his death, for, as we shall see, he carefully controlled his works’ circulation during his lifetime.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, Laud’s and Buckeridge’s intimacy with Andrewes should raise a healthy scepticism about their assertions that collecting and editing Andrewes was somehow all Charles’s idea.<sup>8</sup> That

<sup>3</sup> For the Jacobean Andrewes, see Peter Lake, ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity at the court of James I’, in Linda Levy Peck, ed., *The mental world of the Jacobean court* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 113–33; and Peter McCullough, *Sermons at court: politics and religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 147–55.

<sup>4</sup> For an attempt to redefine ‘Laudianism’ as ‘Carolinism’, see Davies, *Caroline captivity*, a view endorsed by Sharpe, *Personal rule*, pp. 275–6, 284–6. Davies’s diagnosis of Laudianism as ‘the revival of patristic and scholastic doctrines of the Church’ seems as reductive as the opposed explanation by appeal to Arminian theology (*Caroline captivity*, p. 86). More helpful is Lake’s definition of Laudianism as ‘a coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the Church, the divine presence in the world and the appropriate ritual response to that presence’. Peter Lake, ‘The Laudian style: order, uniformity and the pursuit of the beauty of holiness in the 1630s’, in Fincham, ed., *Early Stuart church*, p. 162. Cf. Anthony Milton, *Catholic and reformed: the Roman and Protestant churches in English Protestant thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Lancelot Andrewes, *XCVI sermons* (1629), sig. A2r, A4r.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. A2r.

<sup>7</sup> Andrewes composed his first will (which does not survive) in Oct. 1625 with surviving codicils dated 1 May 1626 and a final will of 22 Sept. 1626. Although he made careful arrangements for the dispersal of his printed books, in none of the surviving documents does he mention his papers and manuscripts. *The works of...Lancelot Andrewes*, ed. J. P. Wilson and James Bliss (11 vols., Oxford, 1846–54), xi, pp. xc–xciii.

<sup>8</sup> For Andrewes and Laud, see n. 1, above; references to Andrewes in Laud’s diary are collected in *Works of...Andrewes*, xi, pp. xc–xcix. Buckeridge’s association with Andrewes probably dates from his 1596 appointment as chaplain to Whitgift, in whose household Andrewes had also served. At the same time, Buckeridge also began to preach at court, then joined Andrewes as a royal

intimacy extended to a widely recognized devotion not only to Andrewes's ecclesiology, but also to his prose style. In 1606 Buckeridge was 'somewhat touched as a plagiarie' for stealing some of Andrewes's thunder in a Hampton Court sermon series. And in 1621 Chamberlain sent Carleton a copy of a court sermon by Laud 'because yt is after the manner of the bishop of Winchester preaching'.<sup>9</sup> Both could reasonably be suspected of proposing a collected edition of Andrewes to the king.

Whatever the earliest origins of the commission, there could have been no more enthusiastic editors of Andrewes in 1626 than Laud and Buckeridge, and they set about their work almost immediately. In the sermon he preached at Andrewes's funeral on 11 November, Buckeridge floated an advance notice of his and Laud's edition-in-progress when he praised Andrewes's writings for their learning and judgement, 'as will appeare to the Reader when...his *Workes*, shall enrich the English Church, with a happy treasure of learning'.<sup>10</sup> But there was competition among both bishops and booksellers over just what jewels from Andrewes's 'happy treasure' would be displayed in print. Two months after Andrewes had been laid to rest in Southwark, Laud noted in his only diary reference to the edition that the bishop of Lincoln John Williams 'pitifully, and to the great detriment of the Church of England' had complained to Charles about Laud's intention to include a number of Andrewes's letters to Pierre du Moulin 'concerning Bishops, that they are *jure divino*'.<sup>11</sup>

Five days later, the bishop of London George Montaigne wrote to warn Secretary Conway that Laud was bringing the wardens of the Stationers' Company 'and some others' before the privy council 'for disobeying the Kinges Ma<sup>ties</sup> Com[m]aundeme[n]t concerning y<sup>e</sup> printing y<sup>e</sup> late Lord Bishop of winchesters workes'. Montaigne protested that 'they all confessed to me and I have witnesses besides y<sup>t</sup> I layd his Ma<sup>ties</sup> com[m]aund vppon the[m]... but they have notw<sup>th</sup>standing printed the booke I beseech y<sup>r</sup> Lp to bring the[m] to better obedience for they are exceding bold in their printinges'.<sup>12</sup> The offending book was an unlicensed reprint of seven sermons on the temptation of Christ published anonymously and apparently without Andrewes's consent in 1592 as *The wonderfull combat... between Christ and Satan*. In 1627 the offending bookseller-printer eager to capitalize on the *post mortem* demand for works by Andrewes

---

chaplain in 1603, and succeeded him at St Giles, Cripplegate, in 1604 (for court preaching, Westminster Abbey Muniment Book 15, fo. 25, a reference I owe to Anthony Milton). See also Lake, 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge'.

<sup>9</sup> *The letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1939), I, pp. 232–3, II, p. 391.

<sup>10</sup> John Buckeridge, 'A sermon preached at the funeral of...Lancelot late lord bishop of Winchester', appended to Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, p. 22.

<sup>11</sup> *The works of the right reverend father in God William Laud...lord archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. William Scott and James Bliss (9 vols., Oxford, 1847–60), III, pp. 199–200.

<sup>12</sup> W. W. Greg, ed., *A companion to Arber* (Oxford, 1967), Montaigne to Conway, 22 Jan. 1626, pp. 72, 235–6.

was Michael Sparke, latterly famous as Prynne's printer and a witness against Laud at his trial. Imprisoned for his breach of the royal commission for an authorized Andrewes, Sparke petitioned the privy council from the Fleet in April, claiming that 'some that labor to haue the printing of the whole worke of the saide reuerend ffather' – Laud and Buckeridge – had attempted first to deprive him of his copyright and then stayed his press pending a licence to print from the bishop of London. The purported licence had not appeared for '9. weeks together & more'; so, pressed by business and domestic debts, he 'printed & dispersed the bookes'.<sup>13</sup> Sparke's version of events is dubious: he had no right to the copy of *The wonderfull combat*, and on Bishop Montaigne's testimony both he and the wardens had been strictly forbidden the publication of any of Andrewes's works. Such was Laud's first encounter with the man about whom he would say after his trial, 'a bitterer enemy, to his power, the Church-government never had'.<sup>14</sup> Together this evidence from the late 1620s reveals an early official anxiety to control the definition and dissemination of the Andrewes canon, with Laud clearly the editor-in-chief not only defining the ecclesiological agenda endorsed by the publication, but, even before his appointment to the London see, policing the press to guard his own interests.

Formal rights to publish what was described in the Stationers' Register as 'All such *sermons and other Tractates* as the right Reuerend ffather in GOD LANCELOT lord Bishop of WINCHESTER deceased left perfect and fitt to be published' were entered at Stationers' Hall by Laud and Buckeridge and the company's wardens to the bookseller and journeyman-printer Richard Badger on 9 October 1628. One month later Badger, in turn, divided one half of his copy into eight parts to be shared among ten other booksellers, presumably to share start-up costs and to limit his own risk in selling the works. In May 1629 Laud and Buckeridge transferred, with Badger's consent, copy for the Latin works and English tracts other than sermons to Andrew Hebb, with the qualification that 'Richard Badger is to have the printinge of this Booke Doeing of it well and reasonably'. The final piece to fall into place, Buckeridge's funeral sermon for Andrewes, was licensed by Laud's chaplain Thomas Turner on 2 June 'to be added at the ende of the said lord Bishop of Winton his workes'. The resulting volumes were *XCVI sermons* in folio (with the funeral sermon appended) and the *Opuscula quaedam posthuma* in quarto, and Laud began to distribute presentation copies of the latter in July.<sup>15</sup>

These entries from the Stationers' Register shed new light on Laud's manipulation of the press in the 1620s and 1630s. We know from contemporary accounts that during his lifetime Andrewes let no piece of his writing appear in print unless the king commanded it, and, accordingly, every one of the eleven

<sup>13</sup> London, Public Record Office (PRO) SP 14/530/48, 49, drafts of Sparke to privy council, n.d. (April 1629). Sparke's 1627 edition, *Seven sermons on, the wonderfull combate... betweene Christ and Sathan*, named Andrewes as its author.

<sup>14</sup> *Works... of William Laud*, IV, p. 268.

<sup>15</sup> Edward Arber, ed., *A transcript of the registers of the company of stationers of London between 1554–1640 A.D.* (Arber) (5 vols., London and Birmingham, 1875–94), IV, pp. 168–9, 177, 179; *Works of... William Laud*, Laud to G. Vossius, 14 July 1629, VI, p. 266.

sermons he himself saw printed were issued from the king's printing house.<sup>16</sup> Given this precedent, why were the royally commissioned collected works not also issued with the royal imprint? Or, put another way, who was the entrepreneurial bookseller backing the edition? A Stratford-upon-Avon native, Richard Badger was apprenticed in London to his townsman Peter Short (1602–10), elected beadle of the Stationers' Company in 1618, and worked in partnership with another successful Stratford émigré, George Miller, from 1625.<sup>17</sup> Imprints bearing Badger's name first appeared in 1625, and in the three years before the Andrewes editions of 1629 his output was small – some five or six titles per year, and these all small format theological pieces.<sup>18</sup> But among these imprints are the first traces of Badger's association with Laud and with the Caroline regime. In 1626 Badger printed and sold Laud's July fast sermon preached before King Charles, and in 1628 three imprints of another court sermon by Laud.<sup>19</sup> More significantly, in 1627 his only known venture was publication of Roger Manwaring's notorious defence of the forced loan, *Religion and allegiance*, which bore the endorsement 'printed by his Majesty's special command'. In 1628 parliament tried and condemned Manwaring for these sermons and investigated those responsible for printing them. On 12 June the Lords summoned Badger to the bar, where he testified that he had received from Manwaring himself full copy of the sermons endorsed by Bishop Montaigne. Not satisfied, the Lords wanted to know by what authority Montaigne had affixed the royal command to print. The prime suspect in the mind of the man deputed to interview Montaigne, Bishop John Williams, was of course Laud. Williams was disappointed, for several witnesses confirmed that although Laud conveyed the royal order to Montaigne, it was the king's express wish.<sup>20</sup> But the question of Laud's greater complicity in publishing Manwaring deserves new attention in light of the fact that the sermons ended up in the hands of the man who proves to be Laud's house stationer.

As we have seen, in October 1628 Laud and Buckeridge granted Badger copy for the Andrewes volumes, and they were off George Miller's press and in Badger's shop by early summer 1629. It is worth emphasizing that *XCVI sermons* and *Opuscula* appeared not only at the advent of Charles's personal rule,

<sup>16</sup> *Letters of John Chamberlain*, II, pp. 309, 362–3.

<sup>17</sup> Paul Morgan, 'Warwickshire apprentices in the Stationers' Company of London, 1563–1700', *Dugdale Society Occasional Papers*, 25 (1978), pp. 20–1. My discussion of Laud and Badger draws on works in progress for a full trade biography of the Badgers. Dr D. F. McKenzie has given helpful guidance.

<sup>18</sup> Based on the handlist in Katherine Pantzer, *A short title catalogue of books printed in England... 1475–1640 (STC)*, III: *A printers' and publishers' index*, p. 19.

<sup>19</sup> Laud, *A sermon preached before his majestie... at the solemne fast* (1626); *A Sermon preached... at Westminster* (1628, with two further variants). *STC* identifies these works (nos. 15303, 15305, 15305.5, and 15305.7) as printed by Badger in the King's Printing House where Badger presumably had access to type and materials as a journeyman printer (III, p. 19).

<sup>20</sup> *Proceedings in parliament, 1628*, ed. Mary Frear Keeler et al. (6 vols., New Haven, 1977–83), v, pp. 628, 642. Under parliamentary pressure, Charles suppressed Manwaring's book in June 1628, but pardoned the preacher from parliament's sentence of suspension from the ministry. See Davies, *Caroline captivity*, pp. 34–5; and J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and ideology in England, 1603–1640* (London, 1986), pp. 127–31.

but also immediately following controversial parliamentary sessions that had sensitized at least MPs and stationers, if not the wider public, to the political currency of Andrewes's works and to their place in Laud's perceived attempts to use pre-publication licensing as a means to advance Arminianism. In Commons debates condemning Manwaring's sermons members cited among the preacher's offensive 'proofs' not only the Jesuit Suarez, but also Bishop Andrewes. Manwaring had marshalled Andrewes's 1609 defence of the royal supremacy *Tortura Torti* to argue that subsidies were 'not a gift but a duty of the people to their prince'.<sup>21</sup> Manwaring's use of Andrewes anticipated the larger-scale use of Andrewes as a textual authority for the Caroline regime made possible by the subsequent Laud–Buckeridge edition. At the same time, Michael Sparke was leading a petition before the committee for the courts of justice complaining that 'orthodox' books were being suppressed by Laud's licensing chaplains while 'all books tending to popery are permitted to be printed'. Cited as evidence was Laud's and Montaigne's confiscation of his unlicensed 1627 print-run of Andrewes's seven temptation sermons.<sup>22</sup> As we shall see, these sermons fitted the puritan Sparkes's definition of 'orthodox', but not Laud's and Buckeridge's. Only one year before the appearance of the official Andrewes edition, the late bishop's works had become controversial pawns in the chess game of Caroline bibliographical politics.

It was at this time that the patronage relationship between Laud, now bishop of London, and his printer becomes more clear. In June Charles, with Laud's endorsement, granted Badger's petition to be made a master printer, a privilege which allowed him to own and operate his own press.<sup>23</sup> Significantly, Badger was the first 'interloper' to break the 1615 Star Chamber statute that limited the number of master printers to nineteen and the total London presses to thirty-three, and Laud's patronage seems the only explanation for this departure from the status quo.<sup>24</sup> But why promote Badger? Services rendered in taking the political and entrepreneurial risks related to the Manwaring and Andrewes editions seem logical explanations. But Badger had also been backing Laudian projects of another sort. Beginning in 1623 he appears repeatedly in the exchequer accounts as a surety to guarantee payment of first fruits by new ecclesiastical incumbents. The incumbents so endorsed by Badger were none other than two of Laud's own chaplains, Richard Baylie (1586–1667) and William Bray (d. 1644).<sup>25</sup> Baylie married Laud's niece, followed both Laud and Buckeridge as president of St John's, and was Laud's executor. Moreover, Laud's patronage of Baylie, one who 'did openly holde

<sup>21</sup> *Proceedings in parliament*, III, pp. 408, 411–12.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, III, pp. 151, 492, 506.

<sup>23</sup> British Library (BL) MS Egerton 2553, undated royal warrant to Badger, June 1629, fo. 42. Badger's petition (which does not survive) along with the king's reference and Laud's endorsement, was read and approved by the board of the Stationers' Company on 12 June. William A. Jackson, *Records of the court of the stationers' company 1602 to 1640* (London, 1957), p. 210.

<sup>24</sup> Sheila Lambert, 'The printers and the government, 1604–1637', in Robin Meyers and Michael Harris, eds., *Aspects of printing from 1600* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 4–5, 9–10.

<sup>25</sup> PRO, E 334/16 fo. 136r, E 334/17 fos. 110v, 148r (for Baylie, Jan. 1623, Jan. 1627, Aug. 1628), E 334/19 fo. 53r (for Bray, 1632). I am indebted to Ken Fincham for these references.

and defend the opinions of Arminius', was held up as evidence in the 1629 Commons debates that painted Laud as one of 'the main and great roots of all those evils which are come upon us and our Religion'.<sup>26</sup> And Bray was well known throughout the 1630s as one of Laud's chaplain-censors responsible for licensing books.<sup>27</sup> One recent print historian sees Laud's action in favour of Badger as evidence that the 'powers that be' were not terribly interested in controlling or censoring the London press – that a government keen on control would not increase the number of printers and presses it had to control.<sup>28</sup> But Badger's relationship with Laud suggests precisely the opposite: setting Badger up as a master printer not only repaid the stationer for financial backing he had proffered for Laudian ventures both bibliographical and ecclesiastical, but also gave Laud a greater degree of *positive* control over the press by having his own man fully established in Paternoster Row.

Badger's output burgeoned after the appearance of the Andrewes edition and his elevation to master rank. And it would appear that Laud had a hand in Badger's thriving business, for a handlist of his output from 1629 to his death in 1641 reveals his continued printing of not only Laud's own works, but also some of the most important and controversial apologies for Laud's innovations. For example, during the *annus terribilis* of 1637 alone Badger printed and sold Laud's speech at the censure of Burton, Bastwick and Prynne, Thomas Lawrence's court sermon on holiness and order, Francis White's anti-sabbatarian response to Henry Burton, and John Pocklington's notorious defence of altars. And in 1641 Laud himself deprived stationer Adam Islip of his copyright to Laud's 1624 *Replie to Iesuit Fishers answere* in order to give its reissue to Badger.<sup>29</sup> The printer was rewarded for his loyalty with more than business: in 1634 he secured the second reversion of his beadle's place for his

<sup>26</sup> Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis* (4 vols., London, 1891–2), I, p. 91; Baylie married Elizabeth, daughter of Dr John Robinson, Laud's half-brother (1668 monument to Elizabeth Baylie, vestry of St Mary Magdalene's Church, Oxford); *Commons debates for 1629*, ed. Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf (Minneapolis, 1921), pp. 34–5, 122. See also Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 136n, 183.

<sup>27</sup> W. W. Greg, *Licensers for the press, &c. to 1640* (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, new ser., 10, Oxford, 1962), pp. 12–13. See also Milton, *Catholic and reformed*, pp. 66, 71, 80, 239.

<sup>28</sup> Lambert, 'Printers and the government', p. 5.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. these Laudian publications, unless otherwise noted both printed and published by Badger: all of Laud's own visitation articles and others for fellow ceremonialists too many to list, but cf. 1633 when he printed blank diocesan forms for general distribution as well as forms specifically for Laud of Canterbury, Montague of Chichester, Corbet of Norwich, and Curll of Winchester (*STC*, nos. 10147.7, 10167, 10182.7, 10296.7, 10363.7); Giles Fleming, *Magnificence exemplified* (1634, for T. Alchorn); Edward Boughen, *A sermon preached at Saint Paul's crosse* (1635), *Two sermons* (1635); Thomas Turner, *A sermon preached before the king at White-hall* (1635); Francis White, *A treatise of the sabbath-day* (3 edns, 1635–6); John Browning, *Concerning publicke-prayer, and the fasts of the church* (1636); John Featley, *Obedience and submission* (1636); William Laud, *A speech delivered in the Starr-chamber* (1637); Thomas Lawrence, *A sermon preached before the kings maiesty* (2 edns, 1637); John Pocklington, *Altare Christianum* (2 edns, 1637); White, *An examination and confutation* (1637); Laud, *A relation of the conference betweene William Lawd, and M<sup>r</sup> Fisher the Jesuite* (2 edns, 1639); James I, *Basilikon doron* (1640); Joseph Hall, *Episcopacie by divine right* (1640, for N. Butter). For Laud and Islip, Leo Kirschbaum, *Shakespeare and the stationers* (Columbus, Ohio, 1955), pp. 82–5.

own son from Lord Keeper Coventry, and by 1638 had been granted the style ‘Printer to the Prince his Highnesse’, and dubbed his establishment ‘the Prince’s Printing House’.<sup>30</sup> As print historians are quick to point out, financial motives drove the print business, and Badger printed more than Laudian propaganda, including plays, poems, conformist devotional works, and even several editions of sermons by the puritan divine John Preston.<sup>31</sup> But no other pattern stands out so unmistakably as the Laudian one. Badger was clearly willing to act as printer-publisher to Laud and his apologists, and Laud also acknowledged Badger as his own. In his account of his trial he wrote flatly, ‘*Badger was the Man whom I imployed, as is well known to all the Stationers.*’<sup>32</sup> Establishing the patronage relationship between the two puts a finer point on our understanding of Laud as a shrewd manipulator of the press, and reminds us that such manipulation took the form not only of sensational censorship like the 1637 mutilation of Burton, Bastwicke, and Prynne, but also the more subtle propagation of works that furthered his ecclesiastical agenda. The Andrewes volumes of 1629 were an early and especially effective example.

Badger issued succeeding editions of Andrewes’s *XCVI sermons* throughout the Caroline years in increasingly embellished forms that made ever clearer the work’s status as a Laudian text. Writing in December 1631 to thank Elizabeth of Bohemia for accepting his presentation copy of the first edition, Laud proudly noted the appearance of the second, ‘not w<sup>th</sup> more sermons but in a more corrected prynt, and in better paper’.<sup>33</sup> In 1632 the second edition appeared with a new imprint, and this time graced by a frontispiece with John Payne’s fine engraving of the bishop and a poem by the young Richard Crashaw. The verses promised the reader that Andrewes lived again not in the engraving, but in the pages of the sermons that followed: ‘*If you think / ’Tis but a dead face Art doth heer bequeath / Look on the following leaues & see him breath.*’<sup>34</sup> Crashaw was an appropriate contributor to the enhanced edition of Andrewes and his recruitment connects the project with the most avant-garde elements of Laudianism in Cambridge. In July 1631 Crashaw had been admitted pensioner at Pembroke Hall (where Andrewes had preceded him as a scholar, fellow, and master) and in October he was elected to the Greek scholarship once held by Andrewes. The scholarship’s oratorical and poetical duties, which included composing verses in Latin and Greek for each Sunday and feast day of the year,

<sup>30</sup> Jackson, *Records*, p. 256; *STC*, III, p. 19.

<sup>31</sup> John Preston, *The saints qualification* (1633, 1634, 1637), *The golden scepter* (1638, 1639). In none of these ventures, however, was Badger the publishing bookseller, but only printer to others.

<sup>32</sup> Laud, *The history of the troubles and tryal of... William Laud*, ed. Henry Wharton (1695), p. 236.

<sup>33</sup> PRO, SP 16/204/14, Laud to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 4 Dec. 1631. The second edition was chosen as the copy text for the Wilson and Bliss *Works*; Andrewes’s best twentieth-century editor considered it ‘the least accurate’. See G. M. Story, ‘The text of Lancelot Andrewes’s sermons’, in D. I. B. Smith, ed., *Editing seventeenth century prose* (Toronto, 1972), p. 23.

<sup>34</sup> Copy for the engraving ‘to be fixed with *the workes*’ was entered to Badger *gratis* on 1 Feb. 1632 (Arber, IV, p. 237). Crashaw’s poem appeared unscrubbed in all issues of *XCVI sermons*, but appears in the earliest surviving manuscript collections of Crashaw’s verse from the early 1630s. It was first attributed to Crashaw in print in his posthumous *Delights of the muses* (London, 1646). See L. C. Martin, ed., *The poems, English, Latin, and Greek, of Richard Crashaw* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 163–4.



and its historical connection with Andrewes, might in itself explain why Crashaw was selected to contribute. But we might also expect the influence of Laud's connections with Arminians in the Pembroke circle, which included the present head, Benjamin Laney; Crashaw's tutor, James Tournay; and Matthew Wren, formerly Andrewes's chaplain and fellow of Pembroke, now master of Peterhouse.<sup>35</sup> Crashaw was not the only young Cambridge undergraduate to write memorial verses on Lancelot Andrewes; in 1626 the eighteen-year-old Milton had eulogized the bishop in a formal Latin elegy.<sup>36</sup> But Crashaw's piece (unlike Milton's) was no work of general praise or stylized mourning. On the contrary, it was clearly commissioned for the Andrewes folio since it not only glossed the Payne portrait ('*See heer a Shadow from that Setting Sunne...*'), but also invited the reader to the sermons themselves ('*Look on the following leaues...*').<sup>37</sup>

A wholly new third edition appeared in 1635 with an even more dramatic Laudian gloss in the form of a 'Table of the Principall Contents'. As Dr Tyacke has shown, this subject index tells us as much about the thinking of Andrewes's editor as of Andrewes himself. As we shall see, the index's entries for subjects such as 'Confession... *How, and to whom to be made*', 'Prayer... *the chiefe part of Gods service*', 'Sermons... *Not the chiefe exercise of Religion*', would lead Laudian apologists straight to Andrewesian proof-texts for their avant-garde piety.<sup>38</sup> Finally, late in 1641 appeared a fourth edition, which, in addition to the frontispiece and appendix, now advertised on its title page the inclusion of 'a Sermon Preached before two KINGS, on the Fift of AUGUST 1606'.<sup>39</sup> By this time episcopal control of the press had collapsed, and Laud himself had been impeached and imprisoned; his involvement in this penultimate edition of *XCVI sermons* can only be guessed.<sup>40</sup> What is clear, however, is Badger's own public commitment to king and bishops after the Root and Branch petition. The sermon 'Preached before two KINGS', Andrewes's first Gowrie Plot sermon, was preached in Latin before King James and his brother-in-law, Christian IV of Denmark in 1606. It had appeared in Latin and English editions from the

<sup>35</sup> Martin, ed., *Poems... of Richard Crashaw*, p. xxi; Austin Warren, *Richard Crashaw: a study in baroque sensibility* (London, 1939), pp. 22–7. For Laney and Tournay, see Milton, *Catholic and reformed*, pp. 72–7; for Wren, see Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 48–9, 51–2, 57.

<sup>36</sup> John Milton, 'Elegia tertia. in obitum praesulis Wintoniensis', in John Carey, ed., *John Milton: complete shorter poems* (London and New York, 1968), pp. 18–19.

<sup>37</sup> This answers the questions raised by F. E. Barker, 'Crashaw and Andrewes', *Times Literary Supplement*, 1855 (21 Aug. 1937), p. 608.

<sup>38</sup> Tyacke, 'Archbishop Laud', p. 62; Andrewes, *XCVI sermons* (3rd edn, 1635, sig. Sssss[1]v, Ttttt2r, Ttttt3v. With Buckeridge's death in 1633 revisions for the third edition presumably belong to Laud or his chaplains. Copy for the table was entered by Laud's chaplain Weekes on 16 April 1634 (Arber, iv, p. 291).

<sup>39</sup> The fourth edition's appearance can be dated in the last half of the year based on Badger's will, dated 19 July and proved 20 August, in which he bequeathed 'vnto my Cosin Thomas Dighton one of the Bipp<sup>e</sup> of winchesters workes to bee delivered to him when they are finished' (London, Guildhall Library, archdeaconry court of London, original will).

<sup>40</sup> For the collapse of the state control of the press, see Michael Mendle, 'De facto freedom, de facto authority: press and Parliament, 1640–1643', *Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), pp. 307–32. The fifth and final edition of *XCVI sermons* appeared in 1661.

King's Printer in 1610, and the Latin was reprinted in the *Opuscula* of 1629.<sup>41</sup> But now only months before the outbreak of civil war, the English translation of this, one of Andrewes's most thoroughgoing defences of divine right monarchy and the established church, received top billing on Badger's title page for his last edition of *XCVI sermons* – a final attempt to make Andrewes speak again in defence of all that Laud and the king had hoped to establish in the preceding decade.

The very design and the contents of *XCVI sermons* underwrote a Laudian style of churchmanship. In their epistle dedicatory to Charles, Laud and Buckeridge quite self-consciously anticipated charges of twisting the publication to their own ends by acknowledging how 'the living may make the dead speake as they will'. Under this suspicion, they said, 'we would be loath to suffer'. There is no evidence to challenge their claim that they were 'Authors of nothing in them'.<sup>42</sup> But the selection and presentation of texts was certainly subject to editorial licence. *XCVI sermons* was a grand gesture. Never before had any collection of English sermons by one author been printed in folio, and its royal commission, episcopal editing, and dedication to the king advertised an endorsement by central authority stronger than that afforded Hooker's *Laws* (1593), and perhaps approached only by Jewel's *Apology* (1562) and the official *Book of homilies* (1559).<sup>43</sup>

But by far the most innovatory characteristic of *XCVI sermons* was the arrangement of the ninety-six sermons themselves. Again, unlike any previous collection of printed English sermons, the majority (eighty-five of ninety-six) were grouped by liturgical feast day. Proceeding in order through the Christian year, there were sermons for Christmas, Ash Wednesday, Lent, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsunday, and rounding out the uniquely Stuart liturgical year, sermons for the deliverances from the Gowrie Conspiracy (5 August) and the Gunpowder Plot (5 November). This editorial decision was certainly appropriate given Andrewes's own insistence that due observance of feasts and fasts was a necessary ritual recapitulation of each believer's profession of Christianity. Here too is a perhaps unsurprising example of the Laudian devotion to the church calendar familiar from works like Cosin's *Devotions* (1627). But it was unique in this instance because articulated through a collection of sermons. At least since the 1590s Andrewes had led the increasingly vocal critique of the English cult of the sermon. In his view the reformers' zeal for preaching had resulted in a warped conception of worship and church service. 'For', Andrewes had asked in his 1617 Gunpowder sermon, 'what is it to *serve* GOD in *holineße*? why, to go to a Sermon ... All our *holineße*, is in hearing:

<sup>41</sup> Andrewes, *Concio latine habita, coram regia maiestate, V<sup>o</sup>. Augusti, MDCVI* (1610); *Two sermons* (1610); *Opuscula*, pp. 45–67 (with a separate title page). Wilson and Bliss create some confusion by assigning its first appearance in *XCVI sermons* as 1661 (corrected in Bliss's preface to vol. xi). See *Works of ... Lancelot Andrewes*, v, p. 235; xi, p. lxiii.

<sup>42</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, sig. A2v, A4r.

<sup>43</sup> That is, folios devoted entirely to sermons. Bishops Gervase Babington and Joseph Hall had published collected works in folio in 1615 and 1625, respectively; in 1629 appeared John Young's posthumous edition of Arthur Lake's sermons and meditations.

All our *Service*, eare-service: that were in effect, as much as to say, all the body were *an eare*'. Explicit in Andrewes's attack on sermon piety was his outrage at the resulting de-emphasis of the liturgy. Crowds came to sermons, but during the liturgical prayer-book services church and chapel were deserted: 'All our holiday *holineße*, yea, and our working-day too, both are come to this, to heare (nay, I dare not say that, I cannot proove it) but, to be at a Sermon.'<sup>44</sup>

Although Andrewes was allowed his satires against preaching in his Jacobean court sermons, the statutory subjugation of preaching to liturgy had to wait until the same year as *XCVI sermons*' publication. In his 1629 Royal Instructions, Charles required that prayer-book service must be read before any sermon preached and that afternoon lectures be replaced by catechizing.<sup>45</sup> Laudian preachers not only praised the king for reining in preaching, but improvised upon some of Andrewes's most familiar anti-preaching tunes, as did Norfolk minister Richard Tedder in a 1636 pulpit satire that is a medley of quotations from Andrewes:

Never was there such a *Sermon-age* as this is... We have turned all our *Members* into *Eares*... as if in *Religion* we were to go *no higher*, then *Autium tenus*, up to the *eaes*. *Preaching* is but the *Means* to bring us to *Prayer*... *Prayer* is the *End* of *preaching*: and the *means* is not to be magnified before the *end*.<sup>46</sup>

Significantly, Tedder's remarks, like their Andrewes originals, were not levelled against sermons *per se*. Andrewes, like Laud, believed that expounding the word of God demanded man's best learning and art, and therefore sermons were noble enterprises if placed in their proper – inferior – relationship to liturgical worship. As Andrewes defined it on Whitsunday 1618, sermons should always expound texts fit for the liturgical season or holiday, and even then, corporate liturgical prayer brought the believer 'a degree neerer at least' to salvation.<sup>47</sup> And this was precisely the point made in book form by *XCVI sermons* itself where sermon texts were literally inscribed or arranged into a larger liturgical whole.

The exception that proves the prayer-centred rule in the Laudian edition of Andrewes's works is the editors' omission of Andrewes's greatest testament to prayer-centred piety, his private devotions. When first translated and printed in 1648 by the Cambridge Laudian Richard Drake, they were offered precisely as antidotes to extempore prayer and preaching. If Laud and Buckeridge were keen to make the same point, why did they omit them? As Drake put it in his dedicatory epistle, they made no mistake for they 'well *knew* Their Work, and *did* it'. Drake suggested that the original Greek would have been 'but a *Barbarian* unto them, whose benefit was chiefly intended in all the *Publications of His Works*'.<sup>48</sup> But it also seems likely that the editors, as Andrewes in his

<sup>44</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, p. 992. <sup>45</sup> Davies, *Caroline captivity*, pp. 27–30.

<sup>46</sup> Richard Tedder, *A sermon preached at Wimondham* (1637), p. 12. Cf. Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pp. 240, 719, 992.

<sup>47</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pp. 710, 720; cf. *Works of... William Laud*, II, p. 113.

<sup>48</sup> Andrewes, *A manual of the private devotions... of... Lancelot Andrewes*, trans. Richard Drake (London, 1648), sig. A4v.

lifetime, were deliberately appropriating their opponents' darling – the sermon – only to redefine it and turn it back on them. Sermons were to be put in their proper place by sermons.

More must be said, though, about the sermons selected by Laud and Buckeridge for their authorized Andrewes. The eighty-five liturgical sermons were, to the very last one, court sermons. Given Andrewes's many years as rector of one of London's most famous parish pulpits, St Giles, Cripplegate, as well as his prebendal stall in St Paul's and stint as dean of Westminster, it seems unlikely that no liturgical sermons for these other auditories were among those that came into the editors' hands.<sup>49</sup> Yet largely because of the influence of Laud and Buckeridge's edition, we programmatically equate Andrewes's sermons with court sermons. The court emphasis in the *XCVI sermons* no doubt does reflect Andrewes's fame in later life as a preacher preferred by King James, but it also provides another instance of how the Stuart Chapel Royal became a precedent for the nationwide imposition of controversial ceremonial reforms including east-end altars, kneeling at communion, and bowing at the name of Jesus. *XCVI sermons* offered model court sermons to fit the model court liturgy – a point strengthened with respect to altar policy and eucharistic ceremony by the fact that as sermons for the great feasts which were always marked by communion, Laud and Buckeridge were able to anthologize sermon after sermon that concluded with Andrewes's baroque invitations to the sacrifice of the altar. The sermons themselves, like their organization in the folio, were not ends in themselves, but a means to a more important sacramental end. Whereas Andrewes's sacramental ceremonialism was a minority opinion at James's court, the folio's massive assemblage of sermons preached 'before the king's majesty' gave a strong – but inaccurate – sense of unqualified royal endorsement by James to their contents.<sup>50</sup>

So much for the first eighty-five. To get up to ninety-six the editors appended in a second section, separately paginated, 'Certaine sermons preached at sundry times, upon severall occasions.' These eleven sermons have no seeming connection; though six of these are again court sermons, they were not preached on festival days. When read, though, with the Laudian programme in mind, it seems more likely that these eleven were deliberately chosen as proof-texts for causes dear to Laud's and Buckeridge's heart. They included the parochial sermon, 'Of the Worshipping of Imaginations', a trenchant critique of the idols of puritanism; 'Of the Power of Absolvtion', oft-cited in the 1630s for its sacerdotalism and endorsement of auricular confession; 'Of Iustification in

<sup>49</sup> Some dozen feast day sermons not included in *XCVI sermons* do survive in Lambeth Palace Library MS 3707, Cambridge University Library MS Add. 7976, and Emmanuel College, Cambridge, MS 181. There is no evidence for exact date or place of delivery for these, and their quality is distinctly inferior to those in *XCVI sermons*.

<sup>50</sup> Other research shows that Laud and Buckeridge programmatically assigned the subtitle 'before the kings majesty' to many sermons in *XCVI sermons* not actually preached before James (McCullough, *Sermons at court*, pp. 152–3). Cf. also the emphatic spelling 'CHRIST-MASSE DAY' used in all editions for the nativity sermon's half-title page – liturgically nostalgic, if not confrontational in the 1630s.

CHRIST'S Name', a careful engagement with Bellarmine on justification *sola fide*; 'Of the giving CÆSAR his due', a forthright defence of subsidies; and 'Of the doing of the Word', one of Andrewes's most scathing attacks on sermon-centred piety.<sup>51</sup>

The biases of *XCVI sermons* can also be inferred from what sermons Laud and Buckeridge omitted. Why, for example, did the official editors not assert their right to the sermons pirated by Michael Sparke in 1627? Those Elizabethan sermons would hardly have sat well with a Laudian Andrewes. There were in them some of Andrewes's most uncompromising attacks on predestinarianism. But these are juxtaposed with more Calvinist observations on the difference between the temptations of the 'Saints, and Reprobates'.<sup>52</sup> So too is there a marked difference between Andrewes's early remarks on fasting and those offered in the last sermons he wrote for Ash Wednesday at James's court, printed in *XCVI sermons*. In *The wonderfull combate* Andrewes noticed without disapprobation that the Huguenots had abolished the Lenten fast since 'they sawe an inclination in their people to superstition'. But 'the Church wherein we liue, vseth her libertie in retayning it', he argued pragmatically, because 'the maintenance of store... is of great importance'. 'This is no fast', he concluded, 'but a change of meate'. But at court thirty years later he would insist that the Lenten fast was not 'as the *States Politique* in their *Proclamations*, to preserve the breed of *cattel*, or *encrease of strength by Sea*', it was 'no *Physicall*, *Philosophicall*, *Politically*; but a *Propheticall*, yea an *Evangelicall fast*' that, not unlike kneeling at the holy name, was no thing indifferent but a duty prescribed by scripture.<sup>53</sup> This later Andrewes was the Andrewes Laud and Buckeridge wanted to present in 1629.

But if Laud and Buckeridge could pick and choose, why ninety-six sermons? Is the title simply descriptive of the random number that the editors claimed they 'found perfect'? Search for a precedent for their liturgical arrangement may suggest yet another Laudian gloss over them. The absence of any English precedents, with the exception of medieval homiletic collections like John Mirk's *Liber festialis*, leaves patristic models as possible exemplars. The only patristic sermons cited by early modern preachers, including Andrewes himself, from collections arranged liturgically were those by St Bernard of Clairvaux and Pope St Leo the Great. Is there any connection? Perhaps. For since the middle ages the Leonine canon has consisted of epistles numbering 432, and sermons numbering exactly 96. Is this a crowning gesture in Laud and Buckeridge's bibliographical effort to place Andrewes, their latter-day 'Primitive Bishop', among the ranks of the fathers? The concurrence of both the arrangement and number of Andrewes's and Leo's ninety-six sermons seems at the least a remarkable coincidence, especially given the sympathies between Leo's life and works and Andrewes's own. Leo's epistles and sermons

<sup>51</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pt 2, pp. 25–38, 49–65, 67–85, 87–97, 129–42. Titles quoted are Laud's and Buckeridge's running titles.

<sup>52</sup> Andrewes, *The wonderfull combate*, pp. 64, 9.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17–18; Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pp. 209–10.

insisted on the importance of the outward observance of religious customs in the cycle of feasts and fasts. Doctrinally, his nativity sermons in some ways defined the western church's teaching on the incarnation. As a bishop he combined strict enforcement of uniformity with deference to imperial power.<sup>54</sup> And these hallmarks of Leo's life and writings match precisely the over-riding concerns in Andrewes that link him with Laudianism: an intense Christocentrism that insisted upon the universality of grace, a strict enforcement of liturgical uniformity, and a high view of the efficacy of prayer, alms, and fasting. Andrewes himself cited Leo regularly in his own sermons to underscore precisely these points.<sup>55</sup> Nothing else in *XCVI sermons* guides the reader to a possible allusion to Leo's ninety-six, but there is some evidence that at least in Laud's Oxford a 'Leo' was a slang term for an avant-garde conformist who rhapsodized about the authority of the ancient Catholic fathers. In 1610 Daniel Price's refutation of the 'revolted late Minister' Humfrey Leech charged that before Leech's conversion to Rome his talk had been 'nothing but Leo, Leech, and all the Fathers', and, he accused, 'The *Title of Leo Leech* was so commonly growne to a Proverb of you, as that you grew proude of it.'<sup>56</sup> Even if the ninety-six of Lancelot and Leo are a coincidence, the arrangement and presentation of the Andrewes folio does make a bid for it to be afforded the stature – at least as a book – of the patristic fathers.

But if the presentation of *XCVI sermons* begged its acceptance as an authority, was it treated as such? The sermon and pamphlet literature of the 1630s suggests that it was.<sup>57</sup> Perhaps not surprisingly it was William Prynne who first flattered *XCVI sermons* by treating it as an authority, though to attack it, in his 1630 *Appendix concerning bowing at the name of Iesus*. The *Appendix* was largely a refutation of Andrewes's 1614 Easter sermon on Philippians 2.10 ('At the name of Iesus, every knee shall bow ...') wherein he asserted that bowing at the name of Iesus 'was a duty of the Text'.<sup>58</sup> The sermon had been printed in quarto in 1614, but Prynne's citations show him reacting to its reappearance in *XCVI sermons*: 'Bishop Andrewes in his workes London 1629 p. 475.476.477.' Prynne insisted on a metaphorical, rather than Andrewes's literal, reading of the Pauline injunction, and Laudian apologists were quickly marshalled to defend the ceremony. But the debate over kneeling was also a referendum on Andrewes's authority, with many gasping at Prynne's presumptuous challenge to it. For William Page, fellow of All Souls' and Laud's hand-picked respondent to Prynne, Andrewes 'conquers were hee goes; a man, to whose opinion (if to

<sup>54</sup> C. Gore, 'Leo I', in William Smith and Henry Wace, eds., *A dictionary of Christian biography* (3 vols., London, 1882), III, pp. 440–61.

<sup>55</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, p. 64, for Leo on universal atonement, and pp. 524–5, for Leo as exemplar of episcopal jurisdiction authorized by imperial power.

<sup>56</sup> Daniel Price, *The defence of truth* (1610), sig. \*2r, pp. 223–4.

<sup>57</sup> I limit this discussion to actual citation of Andrewes; broader imitation of his style could hardly be surveyed here.

<sup>58</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, p. 477. For the sermon's Jacobean context, see Lori Ann Ferrell, 'Kneeling and the body politic', in Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier, eds., *Religion, literature and politics in post-Reformation England, 1540–1688* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 70–92.

any man) I durst subscribe, euen without examination . . . yet *you* will vndertake to confute *him*, and vary from *him*, as easy as you can from the *Sorbonists* and *Rhemists*, amongst whom you ranke him'. According to Oxford vicar Giles Widdowes, 'the distinction of the Right reverend, and learned Bp. *Andrewes* concerning the name *Jesus* might haue satisfied any rationall capacity'. 'Orthodoxe Bishop *Andrewes*' had shown 'that bowing . . . is a necessary ceremony' and those holding anything less 'are to be Questioned, and Censur'd for church Rebelles'. By 1636 Prynne's last salvo in the kneeling debate could refer in its title to '*Bishop Andrewes and his Followers*' and to Laudian apologists as led by 'their great Guide *Bishop Andrewes*'. Their charter was *XCVI sermons*.<sup>59</sup>

In a 1635 visitation sermon, Essex minister Alexander Read would laud *XCVI sermons* as among 'the ornaments of the greatest Libraries in the world' and 'in the most Preachers hand in this land (who are worthily famous for preaching) and are many a time the credit of their best sermons'. When Laud's protégé Robert Skinner, bishop of Bristol, proposed a reading list for his clergy in a 1637 visitation sermon, he instructed his young divines to limit themselves to the ancient fathers and 'our own excellent Writers, such as *Juel*, *Hooker*, *Bilson*, *Field*, *Andrewes*, to be silent of their Names that are living; whose Lives smell of the Lamp of Antiquity'.<sup>60</sup> Read and Skinner were fulfilling Laud and Buckeridge's stated hopes for the public use of *XCVI sermons*. The Andrewes sermons were to serve a pedagogical function as models for imitation by the nation's preachers. According to the editors, contemporary preachers had 'zeale and diligence', but they, as well as their sermons, were not tempered with 'wisedom'. Zealous and frequent preaching without scholarly discretion threatened a conflagration that would 'fire that house which it intended but to warme'. Andrewes's sermons, or those that imitated his, would convert preachers from a threat to church and state into an arm of it – or rather, in the editors' memorable metaphor from Jerome, turn them into 'the *Lawbones of the church, which by preaching, beate downe . . . all sedition and disobedience to Lawfull Authoritie*'.<sup>61</sup> Far from following any inherited *via media*, Laud and his circle were actively fashioning a church complete with new proof texts and authorities and Andrewes was to be one of its new fathers. This was an act of canonization nicely captured not only in Bishop Skinner's reading list, but also by Charles I's commendation of three books to his children on the eve of his execution: Hooker's *Laws*, Laud's *Conference with Fisher*, and Andrewes's *XCVI sermons*.<sup>62</sup>

Skinner's endorsement only of those authors whose works and lives 'smell of the lamp of Antiquity' articulated a crucial aspect of Andrewes's thought that became a ground-bass of Laudian churchmanship: the concern to limit

<sup>59</sup> William Page, *A treatise or iustification of bowing at the name of Jesus* (Oxford, 1631), pp. 4–5; Giles Widdowes, *The lawlesse kneelesse schismaticall ppritan* (Oxford, 1631), pp. 3, 79; William Prynne, *Certaine queres propounded to the bowers at the name of Jesus* (1636), sig. [A1r], A1v. Cf. John Swan's later use of Andrewes – 'once also a maine pillar of Gods Church among us' – to defend bowing in *Profanomastix* (1639), pp. 6–7, 50.

<sup>60</sup> Alexander Read, *A sermon preached . . . at Brentwood in Essex* (1636), pp. 19–20; Robert Skinner, *The speech of Dr Robert Skinner* (1744), p. 17.

<sup>61</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, sig. A3v.

<sup>62</sup> *Reliquiæ sacræ carolinæ* (1658), II, p. 88.

interpretation of both God's word and the church's laws to a highly educated ecclesiastical elite whose own guides were patristic divinity and church custom. For Andrewes and his heirs, interpretation of church matters was to be left to men like themselves who were the literally ordained successors to the first interpreters of scripture in the primitive church. The gift of interpretation and preaching – one of the gifts of Pentecost – did not come to everyone. 'No', Andrewes insisted in one Whitsun sermon,

we behoove to light our lamps oft, and to spend much oyle at our studies, yer we can atteine it. This way, come we to our *annointing*, now, by *bookes*: This *Booke* chiefly; but, in a good part also, by the *bookes* of the *Auncient Fathers*, and *Lights* of the *Church*, in whom the *sent* of this *ointment* was fresh.

There was in Andrewes, then, a distrust of the foundation of Elizabethan evangelical Calvinism, that word-centred personal piety based on each Christian's right and duty to search the scriptures privately and without the mediation of either priest or liturgy. Such individual enthusiasm not only led to individual error, but threatened church and commonwealth as inferiors took upon themselves to school their masters: parodying, the godly Andrewes had sniped, 'we be hable to go the way, without a *guide*; to be *guides* to our selves; Nay, to be *guides* to our *guides*, then: (the world is come to that, now)'. Indeed, 'Every artisan hath a whole Synod of Scribes in his brain, and can tell where Christ is better than any learned man of them all.'<sup>63</sup> Originally such pronouncements underwrote the Jacobean restriction of preaching on disputed points of divinity and matters of state or the imposition of English ecclesiology on Scotland. But in the 1630s Andrewes's rhetoric, available in large quantities for the first time in print, was recast into ammunition against a broader base of the English church that disputed Laudian efforts to reorient popular modes of worship.

For Laudians like Thomas Lawrence, master of Balliol College, Oxford, or the Kentish rector Edward Boughen, strife over church discipline was caused by laity – Andrewes's 'every Artisan' – presuming the interpretive rights of the clergy. According to Lawrence, preaching at Oxford in 1634, they 'lead their *Catechumeni* through all the Romane, and the Belgicke controversies... giuing way to the saucy liberty of their tongues and pens, against all our Ecclesiasticall Hierarchies'.<sup>64</sup> Boughen, in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1630 reversed a century of evangelical Protestantism in a full-scale attack on the individual's right to interpret scripture: 'we must not presently appeale to the Scriptures, nor make our tryall by them... since in and by them onely the victory will bee none, or very uncertaine'. 'I know', he continued, 'there be many in the world, that never saluted either *Vniversity*, and have no tongue, but what their mothers taught them, that hold the Scripture every mans profession... But this is well knownen to be the Anabaptisticall tenet, and is the way to banish all learning out of the Church.' And to what authority did Boughen turn to prove that

<sup>63</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pp. 702, 145.

<sup>64</sup> Thomas Lawrence, *Two sermons* (1635), pt 1, p. 15.



'every interpretation may be justly suspected... that hath no evidence from learned and religious antiquity'? He reached for a text not printed until the previous year in *XCVI sermons*: Andrewes's sermon on the text 'Be not high-minded' (I Tim. 6.17), preached at the Spittal on Easter Wednesday 1588. Boughen intoned, 'As that learned and most Iudicious Bishop of *Winchester* Dr *Andrewes*, did sometimes complaine in the eares of this City; we are grown to a strange exalting our selves, to a wonderful pride in these days', and went on to quote Andrewes *in extenso* on the presumption shown by those who 'take themselves to be so qualified, as they be able to over-rule our matters in Divinity, able to prescribe Bishops, how to governe, and Divines how to preach'.<sup>65</sup>

Another controverted point in the 1630s that prompted appeal to Andrewes's works was auricular confession. Calls for its revival had been used occasionally at Elizabeth's and James's court by the most progressive anti-Calvinists, inspiring a predictable *frisson* of anti-popish horror among the conformist elite.<sup>66</sup> But Lancelot Andrewes had been the only begetter of that revival, both in practice as penitentiary canon at St Paul's from 1589, and then in an infamous court sermon of 1600 on John 20.23 ('Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them'). Court observers gossiped that nothing like it had been heard there before.<sup>67</sup> But by the 1630s calls to confession had become more widespread in pulpit and print. The flash-point was Cambridge in 1636–7. In the summer of 1636 Sylvester Adams of Peterhouse preached on the same text from John to assert the necessity of confession and the priestly power of absolution; in spite of prosecution by Samuel Ward and other conformist heads, Adams was successfully shielded by the university's Arminian bloc headed by John Cosin. Ward complained to James Ussher that such positions 'swerv[ed] from the doctrine of o[ur] Church, both in o[ur] Liturgy & the Homily of repentance, and Bpp Iewell, & other Bpps of o[ur] nation wch have written since the Reformation'. But if such mainstays of English conformist thought were being brushed aside, Andrewes was being summoned to take their place. Adams's sermon does not survive, but Ward's parting moan to Ussher was that 'this Adams would have Bpp. Andrewes in his sermon of absolution to patronage him' – that is, the sermon preached in 1600 but not part of the public domain until published by Laud and Buckeridge in *XCVI sermons*.<sup>68</sup>

One pro-confession sermon from Laudian Cambridge does survive in print, by Anthony Sparrow. Although Sparrow did not name Andrewes as an authority in his sermon, he hardly needed to, for it was steeped in the phrase and argument of Andrewes's 1600 court sermon. The puritan compilers of a

<sup>65</sup> Edward Boughen, *Two sermons* (1635), pp. 25–7; Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pt 2, p. 6.

<sup>66</sup> Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The ecclesiastical policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), p. 204.

<sup>67</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, pt 2, pp. 49–65; A. Collins, ed., *Sidney papers* (2 vols., 1746), II, p. 185. Sir John Harington, *A supplie or addicion to the catalogue of bishops to the yeare 1608*, ed. R. H. Miller (Potomac, MD, 1979), p. 140.

<sup>68</sup> Bodl. MS Cherry 23, Ward to Ussher, n.d., pp. 181, 183.

1641 catalogue of religious innovations in Cambridge singled out two particularities that added salt to the doctrinal wound inflicted by Sparrow's sermon. First, that it was 'printed at London, which thing was conceived a grand injury & scorne put vpon ye government of ye Vniversity'; and second, this quotation from Sparrow's conclusion: 'confesse also to the Priest, if not in private, in the eare, since that is out of use, (*male aboletur*, saith a devout Bishop, 'tis almost quite lost, the more the pittie;) yet how ever, confesse as the Church appoints, publickly before the Congregation'.<sup>69</sup> The 'devout Bishop' appealed to was of course Andrewes, and in a text not only never printed until *XCVI sermons*, but never even preached, only prepared for delivery at court on Ash Wednesday 1624. Citing the antiquity and benefit of '*Canons penitentiall*' and other priestly confessors, Andrewes lamented the latter-day withering of their office, 'laid aside, and neglected by *us*, because not sought after by *you*. Therefore not *studied*, but by very *few*... because it is grown out of request quite.'<sup>70</sup> Sparrow and Adams were doing their best to use Andrewes's own words to redress matters.

Attention has so far focused on *XCVI sermons* and its competitors. But the royal commission to print, and Laud and Buckeridge's original entry in the Stationers' Register, considered the works *in toto* – 'all such *sermons and other Tractates*'. The *Opuscula* played an important part in the editors' agenda for collecting and publishing Andrewes, for this seemingly mongrel assortment of minor works was aimed at a more erudite, and probably a continental, audience. The dedicatory epistle, though signed by Laud and Buckeridge, was purportedly written by the émigré and former Andrewes client Meric Casaubon and professed to bridge the *XCVI sermons* language barrier by presenting a collection of Latin works. As Laud himself explained in the letter accompanying a presentation copy of *Opuscula* to the Dutch theologian Vossius, he was pleased to have brought Andrewes's sermons to light, but did not send them because they were written in English. Instead, he sent another volume of the bishop's works that, though smaller, was in a common language and contained many things he wanted them to see.<sup>71</sup> Among those things Laud was eager to broadcast to the wider European audience were several Elizabethan and Jacobean pieces that like the vernacular *XCVI sermons* underwrote what in the 1630s would become a distinctly Laudian churchmanship. These included a 1593 convocation sermon that inveighed against the growing cult of the sermon, the 1606 sermon before two kings with its nascent absolutism, and an unfinished tract addressed to the French cardinal du Perron in which Andrewes asserted a corporal, sacrificial eucharist and spoke favourably of altars. Also weighing heavily in the collection were the same letters to du Moulin objected

<sup>69</sup> Anthony Sparrow, *A sermon concerning confession of sinnes, and the power of absoltion* (1637), p. 18. Sparrow was Restoration bishop of Exeter and Norwich, and published Andrewes's church consecration service and notes on the liturgy in *A rationale of the Book of Common-Prayer* (1668). London, British Library, Harley MS 7019, p. 60.

<sup>70</sup> Andrewes, *XCVI sermons*, p. 258.

<sup>71</sup> *Opuscula*, sig. [3]r–v; Milton, *Catholic and reformed*, p. 65; *Works of... William Laud*, Laud to Vossius, 14 July 1629, vi, p. 266.

to by John Williams, their inclusion being the final rebuff to his fear that the letters would offend neighbour Protestant churches.<sup>72</sup>

But Andrewes was not a transparent authority for Laudianism, and conformists and puritans not only resisted the Laudian attempt to appropriate him but also tried to claim him as their own. Significantly, Samuel Ward was actually bemused by Anthony Sparrow's use of Andrewes as an authority for auricular confession. His full comment to Ussher was, 'This Adams would have Bpp. Andrewes in his sermon of absolutism to patronage him, wch I cannot conceyve he doth, nor doth my Ld of Sarum [John Davenant].' This takes us to a crucial paradox at the heart of the Laudian use of Andrewes: as works that in their late Elizabethan and Jacobean context voiced a minority opinion in careful, calculated terms, there was built into them an ambiguity that both allowed Laud to proffer him as an authority palatable to the whole church, and allowed opponents to take issue with Laudian uses of him.

Attention to competition over Andrewes's bibliographical legacy after the collapse of Laudian controls on the print trade in 1641 should reopen debate over Andrewes's purported puritan phase at Cambridge in the 1570s and 80s.<sup>73</sup> Competing editions of Andrewes's minor works in the 1640s make it clear that there was sufficient evidence in early writings not canonized by Laud and Buckeridge for a spirited attempt by the godly to create an early Andrewes in their own image. As we have already seen, even in his ascendancy Laud had to beat down Michael Sparke's attempts to exhume the textual remains of the early Andrewes; and he did not have a fighting chance to enforce his royal monopoly over Andrewes's works after his imprisonment in March 1641. The loose cannon in the Andrewes canon was a series of catechetical lectures on the ten commandments delivered in Pembroke College chapel in the 1580s, notes of which circulated widely in manuscript and were later known collectively as 'The pattern of catechistical doctrine'. According to Heylyn, Andrewes 'professedly disavowed' the lectures as 'taken from his mouth by some ignorant hand', and Laud and Buckeridge, if they did not suppress them, tacitly ignored them.<sup>74</sup>

None the less, the lectures were discretely published by others. On 20 April 1630 bookseller William Garrett entered for his copy of the *Patteme* by 'W. L.', perhaps an anagram of Andrewes's episcopal signature 'Lanceloti Wintoni-

<sup>72</sup> Andrewes, *Opuscula*, pp. 31–3 ('Concio...in synodo Provinciali'), pp. 45–67 ('Concio Latine... V<sup>o</sup>. Augusti, MDCVI'), pp. 159–200 ('Responsiones ad Petri Molinaei'); 'Strictvrae: Or, a briefe answer to... Cardinall Perron's reply' (appended to *Opuscula*, separately paginated), pp. 2, 6–7; Peter Heylyn, *Antidotum Lincolnense* (1637), pt III, p. 8.

<sup>73</sup> See M. M. Knappen, 'The early puritanism of Lancelot Andrewes', *Church History*, 2 (1933), pp. 95–104, a piece prone to exaggeration and an easy target for rejoinders by Paul Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes, 1555–1626* (London, 1958), pp. 20–9, and Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes the preacher, 1555–1626* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 11, 106. A much-needed reassessment of Andrewes's theological evolution will be Tyacke, 'Lancelot Andrewes and the myth of Anglicanism', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and orthodoxy in the English church, c. 1562–1642* (London, 1998).

<sup>74</sup> Heylyn, *Cyprianus anglicus* (1668), p. 166. Heylyn's claim that an edition of the lectures appeared in Andrewes's lifetime cannot be substantiated. Cf. the editors' claim to have respected Andrewes's wish to distance himself from some early writings: *Opuscula*, sig. a[1]r.

ensis'. He probably avoided Laud's vigilance over copyright by obtaining his licence not from one of Laud's chaplains, but from Archbishop Abbot's man, Thomas Buckner. The whole entry was crossed out with Garrett's consent the following November, which suggests nervousness about publishing a work associated with Andrewes without obtaining a Laudian imprimatur.<sup>75</sup> A decade later, and less than two weeks after Laud entered the Tower, Garrett tried again, entering for his copy to the *Patterne of catechisticall doctrine* 'comprehended in 3 volumes in folio, in manuscript, very large. ~~Supp~~ by L.A.' Not only does this entry record a tantalizing picture of the manuscript copy text, it captures the indecision about whether new editions of works by Andrewes could be publicly attributed to him. Although the cautious 'supposed' was discarded in favour of the more affirmative 'L.A.', Garrett's three 1641 editions of the *Patterne* appeared anonymously.<sup>76</sup> A confused flurry of entries for copyright and publication of unofficial works by Andrewes gave witness to the collapse of Laud's attempts to control Andrewes in print, as well as the print trade.<sup>77</sup>

If Laud's Andrewes was being deconstructed, the process was complete in 1641–2 with the appearance of *The morall law expounded*.<sup>78</sup> This volume included the first edition of the catechetical lectures to be openly attributed to Andrewes, as well as other sermons including those spuriously printed by Michael Sparke in 1627. Sparke now headed *The morall law's* publishers and was having a fine taste of bibliographical revenge. But why were these texts appealing to mainstream conformists and puritans and suspect to Laudians? First we must not wholly dismiss Laud's and Buckeridge's high editorial standards: they were professedly committed to publishing only those pieces which they found perfected by Andrewes's own hand.<sup>79</sup> Although the catechetical lectures did survive in an authorial manuscript, Andrewes had not drawn them up in any final form; layers of his later annotations to his original text recorded years of

<sup>75</sup> Arber, iv, p. 199; Greg, *Licensers*, pp. 15–16. Garrett published three anonymous editions of the *Patterne* in 1630 (*STC*, nos. 603, 603.3, 603.5).

<sup>76</sup> G. E. Briscoe Eyre, H. R. Plomer, and C. R. Rivington, *A transcript of the registers of the worshipful company of stationers from 1640 to 1708 A.D.* (3 vols., London, 1913–14) (Eyre and Rivington), 1, p. 16. Two of the 1641 editions were printed by Richard Badger – either Laud's printer or his son of the same name. See Donald Wing, *Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America ... 1641–1700* (2nd edn, 3 vols., New York, 1994) (Wing), 1, nos. A3145 and A3146.

<sup>77</sup> On 9 April Richard Cartwright entered copy for sermons on Genesis and *A manuall for the sick*, 'as is supposed by Doctor Andrewes'; lectures on Genesis did not appear until *Apospasmata sacra* (1657, by Richard Hodgkinson), the *Manual* in 1648 (for Humphrey Moseley). On 24 April Garrett entered for his copy of *A summary view of the government of the comonwealth & church* 'written by a worthy reverend divine who is now w<sup>th</sup> god'; this appeared in a collection of tracts on episcopacy anonymously edited by James Ussher (Oxford, by Leonard Litchfield, 1641). Finally, on 17 Sept. Garrett entered copy for a now unknown sermon, 'The measure in mirth, or the young man's caveat amidst his follity, &c an excellent sermon preached in...Cambridge by D<sup>f</sup> Lancelott Andrewes'. Eyre and Rivington, 1, pp. 19, 21, 41.

<sup>78</sup> The 1641 edition is extremely rare; one copy survives at the John Rylands Library, Manchester.

<sup>79</sup> 'nec ultimâ manu Venerandi Senis omnes expoliti, Luce tamen non indigni, prodeunt'. *Opuscula*, ded. ep., sig. [3]v.

changing thought not suitable for Laud's or his opponents' purposes. And the proliferation of private manuscript copies only tainted their authenticity further.<sup>80</sup>

*The morall law* was also a collection of sermons of a special sort that appealed to godly sensibilities more than *XCVI sermons*'s liturgical sermons. This was not the Andrewes of what Buckeridge called the 'solemn sermon' – erudite pieces painstakingly written for a handful of feast days per year – but the Andrewes who, it appears, could also churn out afternoon lecture series of practical divinity. Andrewes was here held up as an exemplar of precisely the kind of frequent, extra-liturgical preaching Laud and Charles had tried to restrain. And in 1642 the catechetical lectures' emphasis on legation captured the spirit of the times. Whereas Laud's volumes had been dedicated by bishops to a king, *The morall law* was dedicated by a future member of the Assembly of Divines to the Long Parliament. Legislative authority, he cautioned, lay with 'not onely Kings, but ... all Magistrates and Civill powers', so though the volume might merit the 'patronage of the greatest Christian Prince in the world', in 1642 it could 'no where be laid so properly as at the feete of the Parliament'.<sup>81</sup>

Even *The morall law*'s frontispiece could be read as a *riposte* to *XCVI sermons*. Like the post-1632 Laudian folios, it included an engraved portrait frontispiece, but was adorned not with verses by the crypto-Catholic Crashaw, but the puritan George Wither. The Laudian engraving had portrayed Andrewes as he had died under Charles I, as bishop of Winchester. But the Andrewes presiding over *The morall law* was the Jacobean bishop of Ely in 1618. The unsigned portrait, dated 1618, is the earliest known engraving of the sitter, and exists in a variant, also dated 1618, identifying Andrewes as bishop of Winchester.<sup>82</sup> Neither version had appeared in any printed book before *The morall law*, which would suggest that in 1642 the publishers deliberately chose the Ely version and customized it by adding Wither's verses. Why the anomalous use of Andrewes as Ely in 1618? That year was a turning point in the life of the English church, a time when James's addiction to the Spanish match sparked a resurgence of radical puritanism and ushered anti-Calvinist, pro-match clergy into prominence and favour at court.<sup>83</sup> Andrewes was at the centre of this shift. With his translation from Ely to Winchester in July 1618 Andrewes also became dean of the Chapel Royal and prelate of the Garter. Before Winchester, his principal court office had been as lord high almoner, the

<sup>80</sup> Andrewes's manuscript, presumably that described in Garrett's copyright entry (Eyre and Rivington, I, p. 16) is described in the anonymous preface to Andrewes, *The pattern of catechetical doctrine* (1650), sig. \*\*3v, \*\*4r. Henry Burton boasted that variants in his own manuscript copy of the devotions showed Andrewes to be more sabbatarian than in the printed edition of 1630. Henry Burton, *A briefe answer to a late treatise of the sabbath-day* (Amsterdam, 1635), pp. 15–16.

<sup>81</sup> The epistle was signed (sig. A2r) by John Jackson (1600–48), Yorkshire minister and preacher at Gray's Inn, 1642–4; cf. J. Venn and J. A. Venn, eds., *Alumni Cantabrigiensis... Part. I* (4 vols., Cambridge, 1922–7), II, p. 455.

<sup>82</sup> Attributed on stylistic evidence to Simon van de Passe. see D. Franken, *L'œuvre gravé des van de Passe* (Amsterdam, 1881), pp. 67–8; Freeman O'Donoghue and Henry Hake, *Catalogue of engraved British portraits preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* (6 vols., London, 1908), I, p. 48. <sup>83</sup> Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical policy', pp. 198–202.

principal preacher to the king.<sup>84</sup> Yielding the almonership after appointment to the Chapel deanery, Andrewes's influence at court was felt less as a preacher than as a liturgist and an ecclesiastical politician.<sup>85</sup> Andrewes as bishop of Winchester was an icon of anti-Calvinist churchmanship wedded to royal favour, a type that foreshadowed the Laudian anti-type. So the choice of a portrait of the bishop before the zenith of his court favour cast an eye back to Andrewes the preaching pastor, not the court prelate.<sup>86</sup> And it visually expressed the puritan claim, articulated by the commonwealth preacher William Barlee, that Andrewes 'got himself a better fame in the Church by some writings of good note, especiallie that of his *Catechisticall doctrine*, written by him, when as most think that knew him, he was as much, if not more a *Saint*, then when B. of *Winchest*'.<sup>87</sup>

But like the sermons on the temptation in the wilderness, the catechetical lectures did not offer an uncompromising Calvinism; they in fact contained brief but pointed comments on grace and ceremonies that few puritans would have applauded.<sup>88</sup> Still, there was one peg that the godly were eager to hang their hats on: Andrewes's treatment of the second and fourth commandments. Of all the texts collected in *The morall law*, John Jackson in his dedicatory epistle specially commended the two '*strong and sinewy Tractates*' against idolatry and sabbath-breaking, both of which would '*redargue the late heterodox insinuations of both doctrine and practice*'.<sup>89</sup> In the mid-1630s Andrewes's claim in the lectures that the Mosaic sabbath was of moral and not merely ceremonial institution gave the radical puritan Henry Burton a trump card in his defence of strict sabbath observance against the Stuart endorsement of Sunday sports. And in 1641 William Twisse crowed that 'Sabbatarian doctrines, are the doctrines of D. Andrewes'.<sup>90</sup> Laudian apologists like Francis White weakly questioned Andrewes's authorship, only to fall back on an insistence that the lectures were undigested thoughts of Andrewes's 'younger daies'. The official Laudian edition was the touchstone for canonicity and closed the debate for White: after 'hee was come to maturity of judgement', Andrewes had 'not in any Tractate, published by himselfe, while he was living, or by *some Reverend Bishops*, after his decease, maintained the former Doctrine'.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., pp. 190–1.

<sup>85</sup> McCullough, *Sermons at a court*, pp. 150–4; iv, 3; Davies, *Caroline captivity*, p. 20.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Fincham on the competing iconographies of episcopal churchmanship in *Prelate as pastor, the episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 248–9, 293.

<sup>87</sup> William Barlee, *Prædestination... defended against post-Destination* (1657), p. 190. Barlee was responding to the latter-day Laudian Thomas Pierce's adulation for Andrewes and the 'Saint Andrian order' (p. 206) in Pierce's *Correct copy of some notes concerning Gods decrees* (1655), pp. 47, 56, 70. Pierce responded with extensive use of Andrewes in *The divine purity defended* (1657), and in his preface (signed 'T. P.') to Andrewes, *Apospasmata sacra* (1657).

<sup>88</sup> H. C. Porter, *Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 396.

<sup>89</sup> Andrewes, *Morall law*, sig. A4r.

<sup>90</sup> Burton, *A briefe answer*, pp. 14–17; William Twisse, *Of the morality of the fourth commandment* (1641), p. 164.

<sup>91</sup> Francis White, *An examination and confutation of a lawlesse pamphlet* (1637), pp. 83–4. The final rebuff to the puritan appropriation of the lectures came with a new edition of the *Pattern* (1650), corrected to an autograph copy and supplemented with extracts from the official Laudian editions

It now remains to position this examination of pre-Civil War editions of Andrewes in the wider context of debates about Laudianism and the use of print during the Caroline regime. First, in the impulse to vest the power of interpretation in the hands of an elite lay much of the reason for the rebellion against ecclesiastical licensing of books in 1641. But it may be too easy to exaggerate censorship in the 1630s. Certainly Sheila Lambert's reminders that licensing laws were a largely ineffective form of censorship deserve attention. Yet Laud's promulgation of Andrewes casts a shadow of doubt over her claim that 'there is little sign that [the government] ever attempted to go beyond punishing subversion and quietening controversy on the religious issue'.<sup>92</sup> Arguments for both a weak and a pervasive censorship of the press in the period argue from the prevailing assumption that censorship is essentially the restriction of the transmission of objectionable texts. But of perhaps more importance to Laud – and certainly more to his credit as a politician – was a kind of *positive* censorship. We need to pay more attention to the establishment's active endorsement and promulgation of approved texts, like *XCVI sermons* and *Opuscula*, rather than focusing only on the more sensational suppression of objectionable ones.<sup>93</sup> This was, after all, precisely what Laud's enemies thought he was up to with the Andrewes edition itself. As early as 1637, the Scots covenanter Robert Baillie would complain to a correspondent of 'Andreas... the semigod of the neu faction' and the promulgation of sermons by him 'dedicat to King Charles by this sam Canterburie', a complaint that Baillie turned into the leading piece of evidence in his later *Cantrburians self-conviction*: 'The chiefe witnesses which in the following action are brought in to depone' included works by Laud and 'Andrewes opuscula posthuma set out by him, and dedicate to the King'.<sup>94</sup> Detractors could even claim that Laud was doing precisely what, in the dedicatory epistle to *XCVI sermons*, he insisted he was not doing: making a dead man 'speake contrarie' to himself. In 1637 John Hacket, in a visitation sermon defending his patron John Williams's criticisms of Laudian altar policy from attacks by John Pocklington, questioned the canonicity of Andrewes's *Answers to Cardinal Peron* from the *Opuscula*. Pocklington had cited Andrewes's defence of the word 'altar' and his assertion of the real presence as justification for the eastward position and bowing to the altar.<sup>95</sup> But, Hacket asked, 'those short chapters in Answ<sup>r</sup> to Cardinall Perron, are but imperfect platforme of a book, w<sup>ch</sup> should have been finisht. And who knows how he would have limited his

---

of Andrewes to counter the early lectures' potential puritanism. Appropriately it was published by Richard Badger's son, George, with the *XCVI sermons* frontispiece.

<sup>92</sup> Sheila Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and censorship', *Past & Present*, 124 (1989), p. 58.

<sup>93</sup> For the importance attached to print publication by conformist Calvinists in the 1630s, see Amanda L. Calpern, 'The Caroline church: James Ussher and the Irish dimension', *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 79–82.

<sup>94</sup> Richard Baillie, *The letters and journals of Robert Baillie, A.M.*, ed. David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1841–2), 1, pp. 1–2; *Ladensium... the Cantrburians self-conviction* (1641), sig. +3v–+4r.

<sup>95</sup> John Pocklington, *Altare christianum* (1637), p. 109.

own meaning in that & diverse other short Chapters if he had finisht them.<sup>96</sup> So too Baillie in 1641, who turned Laud's own metaphor from the *XCVI sermons* dedication back upon its author: 1628–9, he said, was

that yeare when his Grace sitting in the chaire of *London*, had gotten now the full superintendence of all the presses there, and could very easily... put in practice that piece of policie among others, to make men after their death speak in print, what they never thought in their life... as many passages in these posthume works of *Andrewes*.<sup>97</sup>

The Lancelot Andrewes revived in print by Laud and Buckeridge has spoken now for centuries with a surprising authority. The arrangement of *XCVI sermons* influenced the presentation of other seventeenth-century sermon collections and still dictates how Andrewes is read and edited. In the generation after its first appearance *XCVI sermons*'s hitherto unique liturgical arrangement was consciously imitated by the editors of sermons by John Donne, Ralph Brownrigg, Mark Frank, and John Hackett.<sup>98</sup> The still-standard Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology edition of Andrewes (1841–56) scrupulously preserved the order of *XCVI sermons*, as did Andrewes's best twentieth-century editor; and the most illuminating monograph yet written on Andrewes takes the folio's feast day arrangement as its own chapter divisions. The result is a preoccupation with a distinctly de-historicized Andrewes, the liturgical Andrewes, the Andrewes of T. S. Eliot's Anglo-Catholic 'style and order'.<sup>99</sup> Laud and Buckeridge would be pleased. What we lack now is something that George Potter and Evelyn Simpson gave to Donne scholarship fifty years ago: a major scholarly edition that unpacks the sermons from their ahistorical liturgical compartments, presents them in chronological order, and tests and supplements the *XCVI sermons* with other manuscript and print evidence.<sup>100</sup> Perhaps with such an edition we will be better able to understand Andrewes's use of his sermons in his own lifetime, as well as the use of them by others in theirs.

<sup>96</sup> Bodl. MS Cherry 2, fo. 135v.

<sup>97</sup> Baillie, *Ladensium*, p. 101.

<sup>98</sup> John Donne, *LXXX sermons* (1640), ed. John Donne, who acknowledged Laud as the source of 'the encouragement I have had to give it this light' (sig. A3v). Ralph Brownrigg, *Fourty sermons* (1661), and *Twenty-five sermons* (1664), both ed. William Martyn; Mark Frank, *A course of sermons for all the Sundays and festivals throughout the year* (1672); John Hackett, *A century of sermons* (1675), ed. Thomas Plume. Other similarities between these and the *XCVI sermons* prototype, including engravings, dedications, tables, half-titles, and running titles, are striking but too numerous to detail here.

<sup>99</sup> Andrewes, *Sermons*, ed. G. M. Story (Oxford, 1967); Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*; T. S. Eliot's seminal essay 'Lancelot Andrewes' first appeared anonymously in the *Times Literary Supplement*, 1286 (23 Sept. 1926), pp. 621–2, becoming the title essay in *For Lancelot Andrewes, essays on style and order* (London, 1928). The tradition continues with Marianne Dorman's excerpts and paraphrases published as *The liturgical sermons of Lancelot Andrewes* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1992–4).

<sup>100</sup> George Potter and Evelyn Simpson, eds., *The sermons of John Donne* (10 vols., Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953–64).