



The Senses of Sight in Lancelot Andrewes's Sermons

Paul Norris

Volume 44, numéro 4, automne 2021

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1089350ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38643>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)

2293-7374 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Norris, P. (2021). The Senses of Sight in Lancelot Andrewes's Sermons. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 44(4), 139–171. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38643>

Résumé de l'article

Lancelot Andrewes convoquait des scènes très évocatrices d'un point de vue visuel et des images symboliques pour capter l'attention de son auditoire ; il ne laissait pas pour autant celui-ci oublier que cette enargia était enracinée dans les mots du texte sacré, et qu'elle n'avait par conséquent aucune réalité en dehors de la réalité communiquée par la Parole de Dieu. Ainsi, sa stratégie consistait non seulement à rendre la présence du Christ concrète et accessible à ses auditeurs, mais encore à laisser entendre que Dieu serait toujours hors de portée, à la manière d'une vérité qui ne peut être vue. Afin d'explorer cette stratégie rhétorique, je me concentre en particulier sur le sermon du Vendredi saint de 1604, sur le sermon de Pâques de 1620 et sur le rite de consécration de 1620. Ces sermons ont été prononcés au début et à la fin de la carrière d'Andrewes à la cour de James I, mais tous deux se distinguent par leur examen approfondi de ce que signifie voir le Christ à travers les yeux de l'esprit, du corps et de l'âme.

The Senses of Sight in Lancelot Andrewes's Sermons

PAUL NORRIS

University of Cambridge

Lancelot Andrewes constructed visually intense scenes and symbolic images to capture his auditors' interest, but he never let them forget that his visual enargia was rooted in the words of scripture and had no reality outside that given by God's Word. His strategy was, therefore, not only to make Christ's presence concrete and accessible to his listeners, but also to hint at how God will always be out of reach, a truth that cannot be seen. In exploring this rhetorical strategy, I focus especially on Andrewes's 1604 Good Friday sermon, 1620 Easter sermon, and 1620 consecration rite. The two sermons were delivered at opposite ends of Andrewes's career in James's court, but both are notable for their intense scrutiny of what it means to see Christ in the eyes of the mind, body, and soul.

Lancelot Andrewes convoquait des scènes très évocatrices d'un point de vue visuel et des images symboliques pour capter l'attention de son auditoire ; il ne laissait pas pour autant celui-ci oublier que cette enargia était enracinée dans les mots du texte sacré, et qu'elle n'avait par conséquent aucune réalité en dehors de la réalité communiquée par la Parole de Dieu. Ainsi, sa stratégie consistait non seulement à rendre la présence du Christ concrète et accessible à ses auditeurs, mais encore à laisser entendre que Dieu serait toujours hors de portée, à la manière d'une vérité qui ne peut être vue. Afin d'explorer cette stratégie rhétorique, je me concentre en particulier sur le sermon du Vendredi saint de 1604, sur le sermon de Pâques de 1620 et sur le rite de consécration de 1620. Ces sermons ont été prononcés au début et à la fin de la carrière d'Andrewes à la cour de James I, mais tous deux se distinguent par leur examen approfondi de ce que signifie voir le Christ à travers les yeux de l'esprit, du corps et de l'âme.

Introduction: "into the wilderness"

Our Sauioir makes this question, *Math.II.7* vpon their going out to see Iohn Baptist; *What went yee out to see?* As if hee should haue said, They would haue neuer gone out into the wilderness, except it had beene to see some great and worthy matter: and behold a greater and worthier matter heere.¹

Lancelot Andrewes begins his first sermon on Christ's temptation by tempting his auditors, enticing them "to see the combat betwixt our grand enemy, [...] and our Arch-duke [Christ]," to "goe out into the wilderness to

1. Andrewes, *Seven sermons*, 2. This sermon was not authorized for printing by Andrewes and the text is most likely a reconstruction by a listener.

see it.”² Temptation in this sermon series is a distinctly visual phenomenon. Visuality is especially prominent in the sixth, penultimate sermon, delivered on the text where the devil takes Christ to a mountain and “sheweth him all the kingdomes of the world, and the glory of them.”³ Andrewes surmises that “[t]here is nothing so soone entised and led away, as the eye: it is the Broker betweene the heart, and all the wicked lusts that bee in the world,” yet it is his listeners’ eyes which he first seeks to move.⁴ This might be surprising given that sermons are intuitively conceived as primarily aural, centred on scripture. Hugh Latimer famously preached that to take away preaching is to “take away salvation.”⁵ By inducing his auditors to “look” rather than to hear at the beginning of his first Temptation sermon, Andrewes plays both saviour and tempter. This article explores the tensions between these two roles in Andrewes’s sermons and his contributions to liturgy, moving from a consideration of the visual aspects of his preaching (reading the text of his sermons in print, his visual performance as he preached, and the appearance of the churches and chapels in which he preached) towards a reflection on how visuality works in the language of the sermons themselves.

Andrewes’s use of a vivid material object as part of his *movere* has long been recognized by the critical tradition. Most critics have not taken Horton Davies’s view that “Andrewes’s appeal is more intellectual than emotional,” with images “delivered in a brisk and businesslike manner.”⁶ More often, Andrewes’s readers note his gift for unifying intellectual and emotional appeal by turning his scriptural subject into an imagined object. Debora Shuger describes Andrewes as epitomizing a habit of thought where passion “forms the precondition of knowledge” in sermons where “the visible sign quite literally contains the invisible reality.”⁷ Joan Webber praises Andrewes’s “creative use of words both as signs and as things.”⁸ B. J. Opie writes that Andrewes’s text becomes “the verbal equivalent of an emblem or icon.”⁹ Boyd Berry agrees, writing that

2. Andrewes, *Seven sermons*, 2–3.

3. Matthew 4:8; in Andrewes, *Seven sermons*, 83.

4. Andrewes, *Seven sermons*, 89.

5. Fourth Sermon preached before King Edward, 29th March 1549, in Latimer, fol. 52.

6. Davies, 449.

7. Shuger, *Habits of Thought*, 65, 54.

8. Webber, 256.

9. Opie, 433.

Andrewes incarnates his text “in a very physical and highly formalistic sense.”¹⁰ Peter McCullough links Andrewes to Martin Luther in their use of “physical externals” to mediate God’s grace.¹¹ Noam Reisner observes that Andrewes isolates “a small particle” to involve the congregation in a textual sacrament.¹² Peter Lake contrasts Andrewes’s sermons with those concerned with “the transfer and assimilation of information,” arguing that they instead present “the figure of Christ.”¹³ Recent criticism often takes a phenomenological approach to Andrewes’s work, considering how he appeals to the senses. Sophie Read writes that his puns “argue for a necessary congruence which can be felt and thought.”¹⁴ In another chapter she mentions Andrewes’s use of smell.¹⁵ Joe Moshenska describes Andrewes as “fascinated both by the varied forms that touch could assume, and the linguistic richness which the word itself contained.”¹⁶ No critic as far as I am aware, however, has given sustained attention to the rich ambivalence of Andrewes’s use of the sense of sight.

Sight and divine knowledge: “absurd cogitations”

Reading Andrewes’s uses of sight is essential for understanding his epistemology, given the pervasiveness of Aristotle’s visual psychology, which endures in our language and which so often figures comprehension as clear sight: seeing is understanding. “Seeing” God in a vivid description of Christ, however, cannot mean fully understanding him, because God is beyond what the mind can conceive, even though made flesh. Andrewes had to appeal to his hearers’ mental eyes as well as ears, without surpassing the bounds of legitimate human knowledge.

Andrewes was well placed to navigate sight’s conflicting significations. His humanistic learning gave him an Aristotelean outlook which saw some degree of passion, stirred up by rhetoric, as necessary for moral action.¹⁷ This

10. Berry, 13.

11. McCullough, “Lancelot Andrewes’s Transforming Passions,” 581.

12. Reisner, “Textual Sacraments,” 674.

13. Lake, 115, 124.

14. Read, “Lancelot Andrewes’s Sacramental Wordplay,” 17.

15. Read, “What the Nose Knew: Renaissance Theologies of Smell,” 191.

16. Moshenska, 48.

17. See Tilmouth, 23–26.

connection between passion and moral action comes across in Andrewes's play on the word "move" in the 1604 Good Friday sermon, where affect (feeling moved) is forcefully brought together with a moral call to action (moving towards Christ): "Will not both these together move you? What will move you?"¹⁸ The passions aroused by imaginative images are useful to Andrewes, even if he recognizes their dangers.

Andrewes was bold to emphasize the value of imaginative sight given the suspicion of rhetoric, especially visual rhetoric, that pervaded at his time. The general trend of the Reformation was towards a religion centred on hearing God's Word, rather than on perceiving God with the eyes. Luther called the ears "the only organ of the Christian."¹⁹ In England, the liturgy was reformed to make the priest's words more audible, as sacraments were believed to have value only when the congregation could hear them being celebrated, a rejection of the Catholic principle of *ex opera operato*.²⁰ The 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* altered the eucharistic liturgy to centre on the Word: the creed was placed before the sermon, making belief a precondition for hearing God's Word rather than its effect. In his 1615 Gunpowder Plot sermon, Andrewes specifically addresses this, advocating a return to the more ancient form of having the sermon earlier in the service, implying a diminution of preaching's importance.²¹

The environment in which Andrewes was educated in the 1570s was distinctly anti-theatrical and anti-visual, and placed the sermon at the centre of the liturgy.²² He would resist this throughout his ecclesiastical career, preaching at St. Giles, Cripplegate in the 1590s that the suppression of images has simply allowed equally pernicious "imaginationes" to enter the church: there "hath beene good riddance made of *images*: but, for *imaginationes*, they, be daily stamped in great number, and instead of the old *Images*, sett up, deified, and worshipped."²³ Preaching—"that wresting and tentering of the *Scriptures* (Which S. *Peter* complaineth of) with expositions and glosses newly coined, to

18. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 20 (of 22; original unpaginated).

19. Quoted in Santmire and Cobb, 117.

20. Targoff, 26. Targoff argues that Cranmer's 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* made the liturgy more communal and standardized, where the medieval Mass had been private and individualized.

21. McCullough, "Absent Presence," 58.

22. See Collinson, especially 235.

23. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 26 (second pagination system).

make them speak that, they never meant"—could be one of these imaginations, no matter how fervently opposed to images.²⁴ By arguing that sermon-centred piety has become a kind of idol, Andrewes is able to adopt iconoclastic language to criticize the extremes of reformed religion as pharisaical, distracting and detracting from the gospel.

By the time Andrewes was a preacher in James I's court, views about the spiritual value of sight, imaginative and otherwise, were diverse. Many believed sight to be solely detrimental to the spirit: George Hakewill describes the eye as utterly deceptive, "being as it were a liuing looking-glasse, & the looking-glas again a dead eie."²⁵ But these views were not mainstream: Hakewill, a fervent Calvinist, lost his position as chaplain to Prince Charles with the rise of Arminianism at court.²⁶ John Smyth, of the English separatist church at Amsterdam, went to the extreme of prohibiting reading books in church, since "bookes or writings are in the nature of pictures or Images."²⁷ Smyth's and Hakewill's views were not widely shared, and James's ambivalent reception of more radical reforming ideas at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 indicates that these did not define the centre of power. Nonetheless, that such extreme views could be expressed in print and practised in church at all reveals how commonplace an idea it was that sight had a dangerous capacity to deceive. In common parlance, to "gaze" had negative overtones, denoting absorption in sensory ephemera.²⁸ The Word was the centre of worship, sight a distraction.

Even imaginative vision occupied an ambivalent position in Renaissance moral psychology, an ambivalence traceable to Aristotle, for whom sight could induce both knowledge and harmful passion. For Aristotle, sight is intimately tied to knowledge: "without an image thinking is impossible."²⁹ Sight is the sense that "best helps us to know things, and reveals many distinctions."³⁰ Even

24. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 27 (second pagination system). For the inclusion of this and other sermons critical of sermon-centred piety at the end of the *XCVI. sermons*, see McCullough, "Making Dead Men Speak," 412–13.

25. Hakewill, 20. His ostensible purpose, of comforting a blind woman, gave him some licence to exaggerate.

26. Clark, 26.

27. John Smyth, *The Differences of the Church of the Separation* (1608), quoted in Hunt, 28.

28. Aston, 932.

29. Aristotle, "On Memory," 450a.

30. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, bk. 1, 980a, in *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, xvii.

its epistemological function might discredit sight, however. In *On the Soul*, Aristotle suggests that the worthiest subjects are most resistant to representation. The perfection of our knowledge is inversely proportionate to the perfection of the subject of our knowledge.³¹ If God is the perfect subject, then he must be impossible to know.³² So even a purely intellectual look towards God might be morally corrosive.

Andrewes's response to this problem of knowledge can be seen by comparing his sermons with those of William Perkins, Andrewes's contemporary at Cambridge. Perkins was suspicious of imaginative visions of scriptural events. Commenting on *visiones* (vivid mental pictures used by rhetoricians to stir up their own emotions), Perkins recognizes that a preacher "must first be godly affected himself who would stir up godly affections," but describes the use of mental images as "impious; because it requireth absurd, insolent and prodigious cogitations." The preacher must instead "imprint in his mind [...] either axiomaticall, or syllogisticall, or methodicall the seuerall doctrines of the place he means to handle."³³ In Perkins's sermon on the temptation of Christ, he introduces his topic as explicitly doctrinal rather than spectacular, saying he comes to it "hauing formerly handled the doctrine of *Conscience*."³⁴ Perkins uses visual terms in an abstracted, idiomatic way, lacking vividness: "seeing our life depends vpon Gods word"; "our eies and our hearts must be fixed on him"; "in their temptations they may looke vnto Iesus."³⁵ The only time Perkins takes a sustained interest in vision is when the devil attempts to deceive Christ through his sight: Satan "can represent vnto the eie in his counterfet visions such strange and admirable sights."³⁶ For Perkins, visions lead away from God; if they give any knowledge, it is only of worldly things.

Perkins was influenced by the Ramist tradition which saw rhetoric almost exclusively as a matter of words that impart doctrinal information, taking less interest in *movere*. Andrewes would have been exposed to Ramist ideas at Cambridge in the 1570s, but his style addresses the emotions directly via the

31. Trimpi, 98–102.

32. See Evans, 38.

33. Perkins, *The Arte of Prophecyng*, 130–31.

34. Perkins, *The Combat Betweene Christ and the Diuell Displayed*, 1.

35. Perkins, *The Combat Betweene Christ and the Diuell Displayed*, 23, 54.

36. Perkins, *The Combat Betweene Christ and the Diuell Displayed*, 37.

visual imagination.³⁷ In his sermons on the same text, as I have already argued, the spiritual value of seeing is much less clear than it is for Perkins. Although Andrewes recognizes the spiritual dangers of sight, he also regards preaching itself as a visual medium. Here he is influenced by apophatic theology: as no conception of God can do him justice, visual representations are no worse than any other. Influenced by the negative theology of Pseudo-Dionysius, Thomas Aquinas wrote that “what [God] is *not* is clearer to us than what He is.”³⁸ Andrewes's library included Thomas's complete works, and the writers share a sense that seeing a visual representation of scripture might be spiritually helpful, even if this image could never be strictly true to metaphysical reality.³⁹ It is against this backdrop that Andrewes stimulated his listeners' visual imaginations.

Andrewes in print: “a dead letter”

Our knowledge of Andrewes's sermons is now purely visual, coming from the written word. But the preacher himself was clearly conscious of what was lost when his sermons were printed. Writing about Andrewes's 1621 Easter sermon, the letter-writer John Chamberlain complained that the preacher would “not be intreted to let yt come abrode, unles the King commaund him.”⁴⁰ Another preacher at the time described the anxieties that accompany committing one's words to print: “whereas I spake before with the gesture and countenance of a living man, [I] have now buried myself in a dead letter of less effectual persuasion.”⁴¹ Andrewes himself touches on the inadequacy of printed texts in his 1610 Easter sermon. Here, Job desires that his words “might remaine to memorie; and because *writing* serves to that end, they might be *written*,” but rejects the “corruptible stuffe” of paper and ink, favouring methods of stone inscription which would be less practical for a sermon: “The words would be immortall, that treat of immortalitie.”⁴² Although Andrewes took painstaking

37. Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 193–94.

38. Aquinas, *The Summa Theologiae*, I. Q. 1, A. 9, R. 3.

39. Chambers, 104.

40. John Chamberlain, letter to Dudley Carleton, 18 April 1621; quoted in Hunt, 137.

41. John King, *Lectures upon Jonas delivered at Yorke* (Oxford: 1597); quoted in Carlson, 281.

42. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 425–26.

care over the printed form of his sermons, reading them is an experience detached from Andrewes's original intentions, second-best even as a means of preservation, as his description of Job's mistrust of paper and ink suggests.⁴³

By removing them from their context, committing Andrewes's works to print imposes its own biases. Laud and Buckeridge arranged Andrewes's sermons by liturgical occasion, obscuring the fact that as well as unfolding doctrines about Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, Andrewes often simply sought to restore balance to the court's piety. He preached to a king whose ideal chapel service consisted of, as McCullough puts it, "a sermon sandwiched between two anthems," minimizing the amount of time spent on the rest of the liturgy.⁴⁴ Andrewes's sermons were often bold polemics against "the common error, that Sermon-hearing is the *Consummatum est* of all Christianitie."⁴⁵ He repeatedly criticized a piety in which "[a]ll our *holinesse*, is in hearing: All our *Service*, eare-service: that were in effect, as much as to say, all the body were *an eare*."⁴⁶ Andrewes argued against a grotesque enlargement of the ear, rather than criticizing preaching more generally. Printing his sermons as much as three decades after they were preached and arranging them liturgically rather than chronologically obscures their polemical intent, and implies that Andrewes was a stauncher opponent of sermonizing than he really was.

Andrewes's theology did not consist of a simple preference for either eye or ear. His bolder criticisms of sermon-centred piety (found for instance in his already-quoted sermons from 1607 and 1617) are counterbalanced by statements criticizing excessively visual spirituality:

In matters of faith the eare goes first, ever, and is of more use, and to bee trusted before the eye.⁴⁷

To love, it is not enough to *heare*, or *see*; it is carried farther, to *touch* and take holde. It is *affectus unionis*, and the nearest union is *per contactum*.⁴⁸

43. For Andrewes's attentive involvement in the printing of his 1620 Easter sermon, see Klemp, 157–58.

44. McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 161.

45. Sermon preached to King at Greenwich; quoted in Hunt, 293.

46. Sermon on 5 November 1617, quoted in McCullough, "Making Dead Men Speak," 410–11.

47. Easter sermon 1620, in Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 242.

48. Easter sermon 1621, in Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 544.

[A]ll our Religion is rather *Vidimus*, a *Contemplation*, than *Venimus*, a *Motion*, or stirring to doe ought.⁴⁹

These quotations are from the latter end of Andrewes's career in James's court, by which time James's religious pluralism would have been fully internalized by his preachers, perhaps making Andrewes bolder.⁵⁰ Despite being preached at different occasions, the phrases use similar images of movement to represent faith: "the eare goes first," leading the believer; love "is carried further" than either seeing or hearing; a better kind of religion than merely seeing would involve "stirring." Most of his surviving sermons were preached at feast-day Eucharists, before the celebration of communion. They point beyond the sermon itself, towards the sacrament to come. Andrewes does not want his auditors to listen or gaze idly at a preacher, no matter how inspired or charismatic, but to look towards Christ in the Eucharist.⁵¹

Andrewes's *actio*: "visible petitions"

Though cautious that religion should not consist of idle gazing, Andrewes took a great interest in what his auditors saw as well as what they heard. His concern with *actio* (delivery, including physical gesture) is evident from his commentary on Christ's preaching. In his 1615 Easter sermon, Andrewes speculates on "whither He [Christ] carried His hand, or cast His eye up to *the fabrique* of it [the temple]; or whither He bare them, to *His bodie*."⁵² He uses this to resolve an ambiguity over whether Christ is referring to his body or to the temple, punning on "waive" as both laying aside an idea and a physical gesture: "We will then wayve theirs as the wrong meaning."⁵³ Perhaps Andrewes himself waved to dismiss this misguided notion, making his wordplay visible to his congregation.

Andrewes was particularly adept as a performer, and was praised by a much younger contemporary for his use of "visible petitions to the eye of

49. Nativity sermon 1622, in Andrewes, *Sermons*, 111.

50. Lake, 114.

51. For the centrality of the Eucharist to Andrewes's theology, see Lossky, especially 341, and Lake, especially 115–26.

52. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 483.

53. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 483; "waive, v.1" 3c, and "waive, v.2" 1, in *OED Online*.

compassion.”⁵⁴ John Wesley links Andrewes’s use of gesture to his schooling at Merchant Taylors’ under Richard Mulcaster, who had his students present “sum playes to the court, in whiche his scholars wear only actors [...] and by that meanes taughte them good behaviour and audacitye.”⁵⁵ Lynn Enterline suggests that Mulcaster’s pedagogy, with its emphasis on physical and verbal imitation, lent “a kind of theatricality to everyday life.”⁵⁶ The theatricality of Andrewes’s schooling has obvious significance for his use of *ethopoeia*, but also relates to the general tendency of his devotion towards a language of embodied, visible signs.

He used these visible signs in private devotion as well as in the pulpit, and even on his deathbed. Andrewes’s friend and fellow preacher John Buckeridge describes how “when he could pray no longer *voce*, with his voice, yet *oculis & manibus*, by lifting up his *eyes* and *hands* he prayed still,” and when these failed, “*corde*, with his *heart*, he still prayed, untill it pleased God to receive his blessed soule to himself.”⁵⁷ The order in which Buckeridge places these forms of prayer implies that each method brings Andrewes closer to his heart, so the physical gesture is closer to the spirit than the spoken word. This accords with Andrewes’s own views about the importance of physical disposition in prayer, views which he expressed in a memorable image: “[God] will not have us worship Him like *Elephants*, as if we had no joints in our *knees*.”⁵⁸

As well as a visual language of gesture, Andrewes ascribed meaning to the physical space around his listeners, creating a visible counterpoint to the words he spoke. His linguistic mirroring of language and space is, like his *actio*, an imitation of Christ. Andrewes describes Christ borrowing the vocabulary of his preaching venue: “being in the *Temple*, He takes His termes from thence; Even from the *Temple*.”⁵⁹ And Andrewes does just this in his 1614 Easter sermon,

54. Bulwer, 32.

55. James Whitelocke, *Liber Familicus*, ed. John Bruce (London: Camden Society, 1858), 12, quoted in Wesley, 684.

56. Enterline, 4. (Page reference to the online edition.)

57. John Buckeridge, “A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the R. R. Father in God, Lancelot late Bishop of Winchester” (1626), in Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 22 (third pagination system). For kneeling as a sign of religious and political allegiance during James’s reign, see Ferrell, 70–92 (especially 79–88).

58. 1614 Easter sermon, in Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 475–76. It is interesting that Andrewes’s phrase was later taken up by Calvinist conformist Anthony Maxey, perhaps because it had become commonplace. See Ferrell, 82.

59. 1615 Easter sermon; in Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 481.

referring to the architecture of James's chapel royal to create a tension between what his words describe and what can be seen: "And sure, when men are so high, as higher they cannot be (as Kings) there is no other way to *exalt them*, left us, but this; to spread abroad, to dilate their *names*."⁶⁰

Emma Rhatigan rightly observes that James's elevated position in the royal closet echoes "the upward movement of [Andrewes's] rhetoric."⁶¹ Andrewes lifts his auditors' eyes upwards, towards the royal closet, hinting at a visual sign: James in his royal closet representing Christ. But Andrewes also subtly suggests the inadequacy of this sign, creating an ironic distance between James and Christ. He says that "to give a name, is even to exalt his very exaltation itself," and then does not grant James this exaltation. James is invoked only through implication and (presumably) gesture, not by name. Claire Colebrook suggests that irony "posits a point of view higher than the immediately present or visible," and here the preacher's irony conveys God's infinitely higher position.⁶²

Andrewes's nod towards the royal closet functions like an image used by Donne in his sermon at the consecration of a new chapel at Lincoln's Inn. Donne calls on God to "let thy *Doue*, thy blessed *Spirit*, come in and out, at these Windowes."⁶³ The windows are a permeable membrane through which the spirit enters but also exits, allowing Donne to assert that God is especially present within churches without falling into the superstitious, Roman Catholic error of making the church too distant from ordinary Christian life. Exactly when the spirit enters, and whether the spirit can enter into other structures, is deliberately ambiguous. In Andrewes's sermon, too, the sign of James's closet asserts an ambiguous presence. McCullough describes how the privacy of the closet made the king "a kind of present absence."⁶⁴ The sign establishes God's presence, but also indicates that this presence cannot be perceived by the senses.

Church design: "put thy name there"

Throughout his career as a bishop, and as dean of the Chapel Royal, Andrewes ensured that churches were endowed with visual signs to lead towards God.

60. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 473.

61. Rhatigan, 107.

62. Colebrook, xv.

63. Prayer before Sermon on Ascension Day, 1623, Lincoln's Inn, in Donne, *Oxford Edition*, 132.

64. McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 21.

Under his deanship, the Whitehall chapel was renovated in 1621–22. A visitor to the chapel after Andrewes's changes reported that "the Kings chapell at Whithall is curiously painted and alle the images newe made and a silver crusifix amaking to hange therin, against the spanish Ladys coming."⁶⁵ This last clause introduces a note of ambivalence into Andrewes's motivations, suggesting that he may have been compelled by James's political interests (the monarch wished to impress the Spanish royal family to make his son Charles's proposed marriage more likely to succeed). Andrewes had been dean of the Chapel Royal since 1618; the fact that he did not implement these proto-Laudian changes sooner suggests that the political situation was a significant factor. And Andrewes's changes were not especially original: the trend for more visually elaborate church design began in earnest in 1620, when Dean Richard Hunt replaced Durham Cathedral's communion table with a marble altar.⁶⁶ In his actions as dean, then, Andrewes treated visual signs with the same ambivalence as his sermons. He was not a pioneering advocate of "eye-service," as Laud might have wished, but nor did he seek to exclude sacred sights from worship.

Something more of Andrewes's attitude to church ornamentation can be gleaned from his consecration rite. Consecration had previously been neglected, going unmentioned in the *Book of Homilies* and *Book of Common Prayer*.⁶⁷ At the inauguration of a new chapel, Luther denied, rather defensively, "that we are making a special church of it, as if it were better than other houses where the Word of God is preached."⁶⁸ This seems to have been the orthodox view throughout Elizabeth's reign, with James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, decrying the "popish" belief that a "hallowed" place is "more holy than the rest."⁶⁹ In Andrewes's 1620 consecration rite, the sacred is defined by being "severed from all common and profane uses."⁷⁰ Andrewes seems anxious to justify why this building needs to be consecrated. By emphasizing its being set apart, or what it *is not*, he is less obliged to define exactly what a church *is*.

65. Sir Thomas Knyvett, October 1621, in *The Knyvett Letters (1620–44)*, ed. Bertram Scholfield (1949), 56; quoted in McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 34.

66. Rhatigan, 98.

67. Morel, 301.

68. Martin Luther, preaching at Hartenfels, Torgau, October 1544, in J. Pelikan et al., eds., *Luther's Works*, 54 vols. (St. Louis: 1955–76), 51:337; quoted in Spicer, 209.

69. Quoted in Spicer, 210.

70. Andrewes, *The form of consecration of a church or chappel*, 11.

His other major defence of consecration is an appeal to antiquity, mostly to the Old Testament, but also to the early church. He notes that "Christians in all Ages" built churches "for the Celebration of Divine Service and Worship (Monuments of their Piety and Devotion) as our eyes see this day."⁷¹ In the 1615 Easter sermon, he reminds his congregation that "[a] *dedication* was ever a *Feast of Joy*, and that *great Joy*," clearly approving of this tradition as he uses it to heighten the importance of Easter, which is the dedication of the temple of Christ's body, a day of "*joy upon joy*."⁷² In his 1620 rite, Andrewes frames his congregation's sight of the church in the context of past devotions. He uses a similar argument elsewhere to justify the use of visual signs in churches. For Andrewes, candles and incense recall early Christian meetings in "places dark and so needing light, and dampish and so needing good savours."⁷³ Andrewes historicizes visual forms of worship as based in God's Word and early Christian practice, circumventing the intervening years of Roman corruption and investing the visual setting with symbolic and historical meaning, rather than appealing only to the senses.

For similar reasons, Andrewes bases his consecration liturgy on the Old Testament, especially Solomon's prayer at the foundation of his Temple.⁷⁴ Andrewes's plea that God's eye might "be open towards this House day and night" is directly lifted from Solomon.⁷⁵ The rite uses the same methods of textual analysis as Andrewes's sermons, taking images or even single words from Solomon's prayer and expanding them. Solomon's request "that thou wouldest put thy name there," for instance, is used to justify the potentially controversial sanctification of the church. Though God's glorious presence

canst not be contain'd within any the largest compass, much less within the narrow walls of this Roome; yet forasmuch as thou hast been pleased to command in thy holy Law, that we should put the Remembrance of thy Name upon places, and in every such place thou wilt come to us and bless us; we are here now assembled to put thy name upon this place, and the

71. Andrewes, *The form of consecration of a church or chappel*, 24.

72. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 490.

73. *Opuscula quaedam posthuma*; quoted in Tyacke, 27.

74. 2 Chronicles 6:18–40.

75. Andrewes, *The form of consecration of a church or chappel*, 27. See 2 Chronicles 6:20.

Memorial of it, to make it thy house [...] and wholly and only consecrate it to the invocation of thy glorious Name.⁷⁶

Here, Andrewes invokes Christ's name to justify delimitating a particular space to God. Speaking Christ's name renders the "Jesus Chapel" at Pear Tree holy, so that its holiness is ultimately textual, based not only on the Word but on the Word shared among believers. The building is consecrated to the "invocation" of Christ's name, consecrated to the gathering of the faithful, dampening any sense that the space itself might have special access to the numinous independent of its occupants, and remaining faithful to scriptural teaching on Christ's presence at gatherings of his followers.⁷⁷ A similar point is made more explicitly by Bishop George Montaigne, whose collect at the consecration of the Lincoln's Inn chapel (where Donne preached about the dove coming and going through the window) asks God to "Consecrate us, we pray thee, as an holy temple unto thine owne selfe."⁷⁸ The analogy of the body as a temple provides a justification for sanctifying the chapel, as both body and chapel are sanctified as one.

This renders the faithful both components and members of the spiritual temple of the church, a rich paradox that Andrewes explores in his 1611 Easter sermon: "Of this Spirituall *Building*, we all are *Stones*: and (which is strange) we all are *Builders* too."⁷⁹ Given Andrewes's belief in the effectiveness of outward signs at communicating inward beliefs, it is a small step from "this Spirituall *Building*" to something more concrete: each of us should build God "an *Oratorie*," each household "a *Chappell*," each "Country or Kingdome, [...] a *Basilica*, or *Metropolitan Church*."⁸⁰ At each of these levels, the faithful belong as well as build. They recognize their own relationship with (and imitation of) Christ as embodied individuals and as communities, rather than worshipping an idol entirely outside themselves. Equally, in Andrewes's consecration rite, it is the occupants as much as the building who are being raised towards God, avoiding any charge of idolatrous belief in the holiness of stone.

76. Andrewes, *The form of consecration of a church or chappel*, 44–46.

77. Matthew 18:20.

78. Packman and Wall, 184.

79. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 437. The text of the sermon is Psalm 118:22: "The Stone which the Builders refused, the same Stone is become (or *made*) the Head of the Corner."

80. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 437.

Andrewes's justification comes immediately after he has foreseen a criticism of consecration, noting that God "canst not be contain'd [...] within the narrow walls of this Roome." Dedicating the church to the "glorious name" of Christ and extensively quoting the Bible roots the building's sacredness in the Word, uniting the religion of the Word with what can be seen and experienced. This gesture could be understood as Andrewes's equivalent of the medieval dedication rite, where the bishop would trace out the Latin and Greek alphabets across the body of the church. This represented the unity of the Old and New Testaments, one growing naturally out of the other. It also hinted at the unity of scripture with sacred space, suggesting that the building was a natural development from the Word.⁸¹ Sixteenth-century reformers distrusted church architecture's ability to speak for itself. Whitewashing stained glass and covering church walls with writing made a building, in Diarmaid MacCulloch's words, "a giant scrapbook of the Bible."⁸² On the contrary, Andrewes was, as McCullough suggests, critical of "those who would reform Christ's body by taking things away."⁸³ For Andrewes, a church's ornaments are not only justified by the scriptures but contained within scripture: the Bible's message could be experienced in a church, without turning the church into a Bible.

Image in word: "have ye no regard"

The vivid ornamentation of Andrewes's sermons also requires justification. His debut in James's court, the 1604 Good Friday sermon, uses complex strategies of containment: the sight of Christ is folded into and mediated by the Word. Andrewes's choice of scriptural text is a sign of his careful attitude to visuality, gesturing towards a tradition where the sight of the cross was carefully controlled. Lamentations 1:12 was sung in the medieval *Improperia*, also known as the *Reproaches* and still part of the Roman Catholic commemoration of Good Friday, where a crucifix is carried through the church towards the altar. The cross is at first hidden by a veil, which is removed in three stages.⁸⁴ In the absence of a physical representation of Christ's suffering, Andrewes unveils an

81. Hamilton and Spicer, 18.

82. MacCulloch, 559.

83. McCullough, "Absent Presence," 54.

84. Duffy, 29.

image of the cross through words, but is always careful to remind his listeners of the verbal basis of his images. It is, as McCullough suggests, as if “the crucifix both is and is not there in front of you.”⁸⁵

At the beginning of his sermon, Andrewes gives only an impersonal description of the text’s speaker, which leaves ambiguous whether he will place the passage in its original context (spoken by Jeremiah) or immediately apply it to Christ’s Passion. Andrewes adopts the position of a lawyer addressing a jury, with the as-yet unnamed Christ figured as defendant. Christ is “a party in great extremity” and a nameless “Afflicted”; his is “verily a heave case.”⁸⁶ This last phrase can mean a pitiful circumstance, as it does in Kyd’s *Spanish Tragedy*, but has a legal application too.⁸⁷ The “heavy case” could be an overwhelming legal action against Christ, with Andrewes imitating Christ’s bold defender, in *prosopopeia*. The preacher plays with the physical reality of the “court” and his own legal knowledge, which was sufficient for him to be made James’s high almoner the next year.⁸⁸ A legal register allows Andrewes to focus on the doctrinal structure into which the suffering body of Christ fits (the facts of the case) before presenting Christ visually.

With these facts established, Andrewes can make his emotional appeal to the auditor, his *enargia*. Quintilian suggests that rhetoric fails when “the judge merely feels that the facts [...] are being narrated to him, and not displayed in their living truth to the eyes of the mind”⁸⁹ Legal examples are common in Quintilian’s work, sometimes making rhetoric’s effect on reason uncomfortably stark: “the judge, when overcome by his emotions, abandons all attempt to enquire into the truth of the arguments.”⁹⁰ For Quintilian, it is not necessarily a problem for a vivid image to affect a judge’s emotions if this yields the right outcome. But for Andrewes, who surely had less faith than Quintilian in the power of any human individual to determine the “right” outcome, allowing an image too much power over the passions, independent of reason, might

85. McCullough, “Lancelot Andrewes’s Transforming Passions,” 586.

86. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 3 (of 22).

87. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.6.11, in Clare, 47.

88. See Houston, 283. The almoner tended to be the monarch’s favourite preacher but also oversaw Star Chamber suits relating to the monarch’s distribution of alms.

89. Quintilian, 8.3.62, 3:246.

90. Quintilian, 6.26, 2:421.

lead to idolatry. Emotions are important to Andrewes, but always dangerous. His mental icons must be carefully managed, hence the delay in introducing Christ's image.

Before he presents a picture to the mind's eye, Andrewes develops the word "regard" to mean not only a physical act of looking, nor even an imaginative one, but a more abstracted consideration of Christ's suffering.⁹¹ He makes this clear by contrasting the right kind of regard, beholding and considering, with a mere gaze: "to *Behold* and not to *Consider*, is but to gaze."⁹² Andrewes also plays on the meaning of "regard" as "esteem" to ensure that his listeners do not unthinkingly gaze on the mental images he gives them.⁹³ Christ responds to our lack of regard for him with his own regard for us, which unites all the senses of that word: "he Regarded us," though we are "utterly unworthy [of] even His least regard," recognizing, understanding, and esteeming us in one look, one word.⁹⁴ In another pun that combines Christ's care with his compassionate gaze, we are "not worth the looking after," and yet Christ does look after us, in both senses. The listener's distracted gaze, their lack of regard, is contrasted with the constancy and fullness of Christ's gaze, Christ's regard. The image of Christ looking demands reciprocation beyond a quickly forgotten glance.

Etymology and enargia: "fulness of truth"

Often this awareness of Christ's presence in the text means returning to the original scriptural language. The rhetorical use of etymology in preaching is hardly a new invention with Andrewes: the medieval rhetorician Osbern of Gloucester wrote that "it is hard to know the deep secrets of Latin without knowledge of this art."⁹⁵ When explaining the etymologies of Hebrew and Latin words, Andrewes might seem to warrant Peter Mack's comparison of the preacher to a teacher "drilling his class on a sentence from Cato."⁹⁶ For Andrewes, like many

91. From 9.a ("Originally: to look at. Later: to gaze at; to observe") to 6.a. ("To take notice of, heed, pay attention to; to take or show an interest in; also: to look after, take care of"), "regard, v." *OED Online*.

92. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 6 (of 22).

93. 3.b., *OED Online*.

94. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 16 (of 22).

95. Copeland and Sluiter, 353.

96. Mack, 266.

preachers at the time, etymology is “a way of moving aside the ‘veil’ of obscurity that clouds our understanding of Scripture.”⁹⁷ But the visions Andrewes uncovers are unusually vivid: his extensive use of etymology is emotionally powerful as well as doctrinally edifying. His etymologies conjure images that are designed to be moving, but also suggest that these images are contained within words, and that they should not be allowed to run loose of their verbal origins.

Andrewes uses the etymology of the early church fathers’ Latin and Greek translations of Lamentations 1:12 as the basis for a recurrent image. The Hebrew הִגָּה (*Hoga*, “afflicted”) becomes *Vindemiavit me* in the Vulgate and ἀπεφύλλισέ με in Theodoret’s Greek. For Andrewes, rather than depart further from the original word, each subsequent translation intensifies its sensory and theological power. Jerome’s Latin introduces the comparison of Christ to a tree being stripped: *vindemio* literally means removing grapes. A single Hebrew word has grown into a vivid image: Christ is “[a]s a Vine, whose fruit is all plucked off.”⁹⁸ This captures the violence of this moment and the utter submission of the victim, while also hinting at its ultimate value for his auditors: grapes are plucked to make wine, just as Christ’s blood is shed to feed his followers in the Eucharist.

Turning his attention to Theodoret’s later translation, Andrewes’s metaphor becomes still more visceral, likening Christ to “a Vine or tree, whose leaves are all beaten off, and it left naked and bare.”⁹⁹ Later in the sermon, Andrewes allows the metaphor to bear more fruit: Christ is “the tree, whose leaves and whose fruit are all beaten off quite, and it selfe left bare and naked both of the one and of the other,” deprived of the leaves of human comfort, “left in the estate of a weatherbeaten tree, all desolate and forlorne.”¹⁰⁰ With this image, Andrewes positions his sermon as a culmination of a long tradition of translation and exegesis, such that his own rendering of the Word into the English tongue is neither a diminution nor a faint echo, but an expansion: the horror of Christ’s suffering is made fully present to his listeners, all the richer in theological meaning and visual effect for all the languages it has passed through.

97. Crawforth, 113. Crawforth gives a useful summary of Renaissance preachers’ attitudes to etymology (109–15).

98. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 7 (of 22).

99. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 7 (of 22).

100. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 11 (of 22).

Another Hebrew etymology yields one of Andrewes's most gruesome (and celebrated) images: Christ's bloody sweat. Andrewes translates גְּלוֹעַ (*Gholel*) as "Done to me," but notes that it is "taken from a word that signifieth *Melting* in a fornace [sic]."¹⁰¹ This leads Andrewes to unify the immediate meaning of גְּלוֹעַ with its etymology in a vivid *descriptio* of the sweat, given that "it should seem by this fearefull Sweat of his, he was near some fornace, the feeling whereof was able to cast him into that Sweat, and to turne his Sweat into drops of Blood."¹⁰² This image arises from a connection between the two meanings of a Hebrew word.

Andrewes employs etymological rhetoric as interplay between word and image. He reconciles word and image but prevents either from becoming dominant in the listener's mind. Andrewes creates an image of Christ that exhausts the text's capacity to generate meaning and the human capacity to imagine pain. It is the tenacious pursuit of meaning that T.S. Eliot so admired in Andrewes, describing the preacher "squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning."¹⁰³ Christ's body is fully legible, yielding every possible meaning not only of the words of scripture, but also of images.

Our very eye will soone tell us, No place was left in his Body, where hee might be smitten, and was not. His skinne and flesh rent with the whips and scourges, His hands and feet wounded with the Nails, His head with the thornes, His very Heart with Speare-point; All his sences [sic], all his parts loden with whatsoever wit or malice could invent. His blessed Body given as an Anvil to be beaten upon, with the violent hands of those barbarous miscreants, till they brought him into this case, of *Si fuerit sicut*.¹⁰⁴

Though Andrewes does not explicitly compare Christ to a book (as he does in his previous surviving Good Friday sermon, where Christ is "the very *booke of love* laid open before us"), his language unifies word and image.¹⁰⁵ Christ

101. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 7 (of 22).

102. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 9 (of 22).

103. Eliot, 20.

104. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 8 (of 22).

105. Andrewes, 1597 Good Friday sermon, in Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 132.

has “senses” and “parts,” words that suggest a kind of redemptive grammar. As in John Fisher’s Good Friday sermon, Christ is written on, his body covered with wounds that are as meaningful to us as they are grievous to him.¹⁰⁶ For Andrewes, language and the human body find their fullest expression in Christ, and especially in his Passion. Texts like Lamentations 1:12 are applied to Christ “in more fitnessse of termes, and more fulnesse of truth, then they were at the first spoken by *David*, or *Jeremie*, or any of them all.”¹⁰⁷ The Word’s meaning is progressive: it is not frozen in time in a single text, but able to express itself anew in each age. Not only does Lamentations look towards Christ to find its fulfilment: it also looks forward to Jerome, to Theodoret, and to Andrewes, to grow in vividness, right in front of believers’ eyes. Andrewes’s Christ fulfils the sense (meaning) of Lamentations and fully fills the (bodily) sense of sight. Language and sight have “more fulnesse of truth” in Christ than is possible in anyone else.

Andrewes’s negative way: “never but found”

This exhaustion of sense means that Christ both invites comparison and surpasses it. In this sermon, Andrewes conveys the lack of similarity between Christ’s suffering and our own by repeating the phrase *non sicut*, “never the like.” These words are a variation of the Vulgate text of Lamentations 1:12, which uses *sicut* in a conditional rather than a negative clause (*si est dolor sicut dolor meus*).¹⁰⁸ In other biblical passages the words often emphasize God’s separation from the physical world, and Christ’s unique status as God made man: Christ is *non sicut scribae*.¹⁰⁹ Andrewes’s *non sicut* urges the listener to look beyond words: Christ’s suffering “is a *Non sicut* this, It cannot be expressed as it should, and as other things may; In silence we may admire it, but all our wordes will not reach it.”¹¹⁰ And it is beyond images: “this (I am sure) is a *Non sicut*: as that which the eye, by all it can see; the eare, by all it can heare; the

106. Fisher, 300.

107. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 4 (of 22).

108. “If ever there were sorrow like my sorrow.” The NIV translation preserves the Latin’s tense but loses the conditionality: “Is any suffering like my suffering?”

109. Matthew 7:29 and Mark 1:22, Vulgate. The NIV translation is “not as the teachers of the law.”

110. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 12 (of 22).

heart, by all it can conceive, cannot patterne it, or set the like by it."¹¹¹ Andrewes encourages the listener both to enshrine and to negate his words and the images these words create. Christ is beyond words and beyond images: Christ's suffering is *non sicut*, beyond them all. But Andrewes's image of Christ is also contained in the words of scripture. This image is present to us in our minds, and also reflected in myriad lesser sufferings in the world.

Donne expresses this crux in his poem "Of the Crosse," where the cross has an incomparable redemptive power (working "fruitfully / Within our hearts") but also invites comparison everywhere as the eye attempts (in Andrewes's words) to "patterne it."¹¹² A swimmer's arms, birds, and meridian lines are all crosses. These patterns are inescapable, as the cross reduplicates itself, like a hydra, whenever it is denied. The removal of a material cross simply creates a spiritual cross (of tribulation) for the poet: "the loss / Of this cross were to me another cross."¹¹³ Yet the cross is found not in these comparisons, but in their negation. Donne makes a paronomastic link between "the cross" and the verb "to cross," inducing the reader to "cross thy senses" on the basis that true understanding requires unlearning and ignorance.¹¹⁴ The first example Donne reaches for is sculpture, where an image is created by reduction: "carvers do not faces make, / But that away, which hid them there, do take."¹¹⁵ In a sermon, Donne likens sculpture to apophatic theology: both advance towards knowledge of their subject "by Substraction [sic], by Negation," by removing what is false.¹¹⁶ Christ's perfection, then, can only be apprehended by removing our imperfect images of him.

For Donne, the poem itself is an imperfect image. The reader's eye forms yet another cross as it moves across and down the page. Donne draws attention to this by spacing his reference to the eye's movement along an enjambed line: "most the eye needs crossing, that can roam, / And move."¹¹⁷ The poem implicates itself in the patterning of crosses which must be recognized ("Be

111. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 19 (of 22).

112. John Donne, "Of the Crosse," lines 61–62, in Donne, *Complete Poems*, 467–74.

113. Donne, "Of the Crosse," lines 11–12.

114. Donne, "Of the Crosse," line 43.

115. Donne, "Of the Crosse," lines 33–34.

116. John Donne, Sermon on Trinity Sunday, 1627, in *The Sermons of John Donne*, 8:54.

117. Donne, "Of the Crosse," lines 49–50.

covetous of crosses; let none fall”) but also cancelled, as seeing a cross is often an invitation to cross something out (the brain’s resemblance to a cross leads to an invitation to “Cross and correct concupiscence of wit”).¹¹⁸ Paradoxically, the more the cross is recognized, the more it negates the process of recognition, the more it erases itself. Underlining is a finger’s width from crossing out.

Andrewes evinces some of this self-cancelling tendency, but he does not want his listeners to completely reject his sermons, to cross them out of their minds. If his call towards the wilderness is a temptation, Andrewes wants the listener to yield. Sight is more chancelled than cancelled, contained rather than destroyed.¹¹⁹ Some critics recognize Andrewes’s capacity to work against himself and his own images, but perhaps go too far in reading his sermons as entirely self-cancelling. Stanley Fish finds a self-cancelling tendency in Andrewes’s 1620 Easter sermon, but not in relation to imagery. For Fish, the narrative sequence of the sermon becomes “the vehicle of its own abandonment,” an indication that all sequences are arbitrary.¹²⁰ Here, Fish is essentially restating what another critic wrote more than a century before: Andrewes’s sermons have a strange simultaneity; he is “in every part of the system at the same time.”¹²¹ But Fish goes beyond this in implying that Andrewes’s sermon deliberately negates itself; elsewhere he uses the phrase “the vehicle of its own abandonment” to describe a self-consuming artefact.¹²² More recently, Georgia Brown asserts that in this period truths can be adumbrated only in “self-cancelling forms.”¹²³ This might, then, be a partial description of how Andrewes’s works operate, leading the listener on a negative way towards God, where each image is valuable only insofar as it is negated.

Andrewes hints that this may be part of his method in a sermon that dwells on explanation. I have already mentioned two instances where Andrewes’s comments on Christ in his 1615 Easter sermon are also comments about his own preaching: his use of his spatial surroundings (“being in the

118. Donne, “Of the Crosse,” lines 58–59.

119. For the etymological link between “chancel” and “cancel,” see Aston, 302. Both words come from the Latin *cancelli* (bars). The lattice sequestering the chancel is the analogue of the line that crosses out a word.

120. Fish, “Structuralist Homiletics,” 1219.

121. Mozley, 173.

122. Fish, *Self-Consuming Artifacts*, 3.

123. Brown, 82.

Temple, He takes His termes from thence”) and *actio* (“by His very gesture, at the delivery of this particle [*hoc*] they must needs know what *Temple* it was, He intended”).¹²⁴ Alongside these two self-reflexive examples, in the same sermon Andrewes finds his own tendency to explain the metaphorical significance of a word in Christ. By revealing his own body to be the temple, Christ “loose[s] and undo[es] this terme for us.”¹²⁵ The choice of loose and undo, both words relating to destruction, in a sermon about the temple, is revealing. Much of the sermon is preoccupied with the Latin *solvite*: “Destroy [*solvite*] this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”¹²⁶ To “loose and undo” is to reveal. But it is also to destroy, as Andrewes explains. He applies the word to Christ’s death: “For, *death*, is a very *dissolution*: a *loosing* the cæment, the soule, and bodie are held together with.”¹²⁷ Andrewes exhaustively unpacks the multiple meanings of this word *solvite*, using the metaphor of Christ as a temple to connect loosening with destruction (as the sentence quoted suggests, using cement as a building material holding soul and body together).

There is one meaning of *solvite* Andrewes does not mention, but which runs subliminally through this sermon, and through all his sermons: as Andrewes’s use of the phrase “loose and undo” implies, *solvite* means “to explain.” George Herbert is right to complain about preachers like Andrewes “crumbling a text into small parts,” because all explanation is a kind of crumbling.¹²⁸ Explaining scripture, a sermon’s main purpose, is a kind of destruction (the word “analysis” comes from the Greek for “loosing or releasing”), a loosening of the bounds that hold normal language together, and an undoing of the images it creates. The crumbling that Herbert finds objectionable is at least a little gentler than the “wresting and tentering” of which Andrewes implicitly accuses his rivals in his sermon at St. Giles.

Andrewes’s images do not undo themselves: they are not intrinsically paradoxical, and are contained within the words of scripture as if within fortresses, guaranteeing their truthfulness. This is in contrast to the self-cancelling imagery of Andrewes’s near-contemporary at both Merchant Taylors’

124. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 481, 483.

125. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 481.

126. John 2:19.

127. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 485.

128. George Herbert, *A Priest to the Temple, or, The Countrey Parson*, in Herbert, *Works*, 233.

and Pembroke College, Cambridge: Edmund Spenser. In Spenser's Bowre of Blisse, "Pleasure dwelles in sensuall delights" which the reader is expected to repudiate.¹²⁹ Art's very excesses suggest a paradoxical instability. Nature is "too laushly adorne[d]."¹³⁰ Trees are so heavily bejewelled that their "weak boughes, with so rich load opprest [...] bow adowne, as ouerburdened."¹³¹ Visual splendour is dangerous, unstable, and inherently contradictory. In contrast, Andrewes's images have the security of being closely entwined with scriptural text.

Ultimately, however, Spenser does not lead his reader to a rejection of the eye's witness. The destruction of the Bowre is achieved by Guyon, who "lookt still forward right," passing by temptation not through a repudiation of the senses (unlike Odysseus's resistance to the Sirens in the *Odyssey*, a model for this section) but through its proper application.¹³² If visual temptation is faced, it should, as the Palmer suggests, "be red" allegorically.¹³³ Though Andrewes's images are not allegorical as such, they are designed to be read rather than gazed on, as they are so entwined with scripture.

Looking is therefore both a necessity and liability for the spirit. This comes through most clearly in Andrewes's 1620 Easter sermon, with Mary looking into the empty tomb. She sees a sign which (like the royal closet in Andrewes's 1614 Easter sermon) gestures towards God's presence only through an absence.

No force, she will not trust her selfe, she will suspect her owne eyes, she will rather thinke, she *looked* not well before, than leave off her *looking*. It is not enough for love, to *looke* in once. Thus we use, this is our manner when we seeke a thing seriously, where we have sought already, there to seeke again, thinking wee did it not well, but, if we now looke againe, better, we shall surely find it, then. *Amor quarens ubi quaesivit*. Love, that never thinks, it hath looked enough.¹³⁴

129. Spenser, 2.12.1.8, p. 270.

130. Spenser, 2.12.50.8, p. 278.

131. Spenser, 2.12.55.5–6, p. 279.

132. Spenser, 2.12.53.4, p. 279.

133. Spenser, 2.12.9.6, p. 271.

134. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 229.

Here the inadequacy of looking is framed as a reason to look again: Mary's scepticism about what she has seen (or rather not seen: Christ's body) causes her to take a second glance. Each look is incomplete in itself. Like the *super* which repeats to infinity in the 1614 Easter sermon ("upward now, it is, *Super*, no stint, but higher and higher still"), leading beyond James's closet, there is no possibility of a definitive viewing, a final sight.¹³⁵ Andrewes suggests that if we look for "a thing seriously [...] we shall surely find it" on a second viewing, but here that is not possible. No amount of looking will bring back Christ's body. To love God is to commit to radical scepticism about what is seen, and to a love that "never thinks, it hath looked enough." No single look can capture God, but repeated looks capture something of what God is, even if never completely.

Therefore, Andrewes ascribes a meaning to Mary's misleading vision of Christ, where she "mis-knew *Him*, *tooke Him for the Gardiner*."¹³⁶ Rather than dismiss the veracity of sight's claims of knowledge, Andrewes finds excuses for her false vision ("Teares, wil dim the sight"; a gardener "fitted well the time and place") and ultimately claims it was not false at all.¹³⁷ "She did not mistake in taking *Him* for a *Gardiner*: though she might seeme to erre, in some sense, yet in some other she was in the right. For, in a sense, and a good sense, CHRIST may well be said to be a *Gardiner*, and indeed is one."¹³⁸

Andrewes here plays on "sense" as denoting both the sense of sight and "sense" as meaning. Both can be plural, as for Andrewes there are senses of sight just as there are senses of meaning. He brings these out by going through the various ways in which Mary's sight was true: Christ cultivates the garden of paradise, brings Spring to help earthly gardens grow, gardens our souls, and, in the resurrection, makes a seed of life grow to fruition, inducing "a dead body, to shoote foorth alive out of the grave."¹³⁹ All the senses of sight are true apart from the literal sense, as Christ is not literally a gardener. Andrewes shows no interest in refuting the literal, as if he takes it for granted that the listener will see beyond it, with the help of his words.

135. Andrewes, *XCVI. sermons*, 472.

136. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 236.

137. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 236.

138. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 236.

139. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 236.

Sight leads the believer towards God, who is infinite in worth and meaning, even if sight in itself is easily misled and meaningless without the Word. Making the effort to seek through looking guarantees God's response. For "them that *seeke Him*," Christ is "never but found."¹⁴⁰ This is a small phrase, but it acts as a kind of microcosm of Andrewes's attitude to sight, and his Eucharistic theology in general: an exception ("but") is made to a negative absolute ("never"), which creates a positive absolute ("found"). "But" suggests an exception that is contained within a negative. In the case of Christ, however, the exception is universal. He does not raise his own body only, but every body.

Andrewes uses the same syntactic gesture in the first sentence of the 1604 Good Friday sermon, where "there is none but will presently conceive."¹⁴¹ Again, a negative absolute ("there is none") becomes positive and universal (as everyone "will presently conceive") through an exception ("but"). Christ overcomes complete negation, death, by being an exception to it. He then makes this exception universal, opening it to all, "making that pertaine to us, which pertained to him only."¹⁴² Across his career as a Jacobean court preacher, from his first sermon to James, to one overshadowed by the king's mortality (in 1620 Andrewes refers to how "little *joy* there was" the previous Easter, when James was seriously ill and Andrewes preached by his sickbed), Andrewes's use of this syntactic gesture is consistent.¹⁴³ It is consistent because it shares a structure with the Eucharist, which takes ordinary, profane material and makes something sacred out of it, makes an exception. For Andrewes, sight also participates in this process. An extraordinary sight, the sight of Christ on the cross, or the empty tomb, or an unfamiliar gardener, makes an exception to the eye's usually mundane, even deceptive, perception. These sights are worthless, in a way, but they lead to something precious beyond what words can say, or the mind conceive.

140. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 235.

141. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 2 (of 22).

142. Andrewes, *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday*, 19 (of 22).

143. Andrewes, *Selected Sermons and Lectures*, 238.

Works Cited

- Andrewes, Lancelot. 1604. *The copie of a sermon preached on good Friday last before the Kings Maiestie, by D. Andrewes Deane of Westminster*. 6. April 1604. London: Printed by R. Barker, printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie. Early English Books Online. Accessed 29 September 2021. proquest.com/eebo/docview/2264213900/fulltextPDF/AE1184E2A5DE4656PQ/1.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. 1659. *The form of consecration of a church or chappel. And of the place of Christian buriall. / Exemplified by the R.R.F. in God, Lancelot late lord-bishop of Winchester, in the consecration of the Chappel of Jesus in the foresaid diocess*. London: Sold by T. Garthwait at the little North-door of S. Pauls. Early English Books Online. Accessed 29 September 2021. proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240881135/fulltextPDF/BC8A30E3CB7496EPQ/1.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. 1629. *XCVI. sermons by the Right Honorable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late Lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by His Majesties speciall command*. London: Printed by George Miller, for Richard Badger. Early English Books Online. Accessed 29 September 2021. proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240858450/fulltextPDF/A6B58C1DF0BD491FPQ/3.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. 2005. *Selected Sermons and Lectures*. Edited by Peter E. McCullough. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. 1967. *Sermons*. Edited by G. M. Story. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. 1627. *Seven sermons on, the wonderfull combate (for Gods glorie and mans saluation) betweene Christ and Sathan Delivered by the Reuerend Father in God, Doct. Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, lately deceased*. London: Printed [by Dorothy Jaggard] for I. Jaggard, and Michael Sparke. Early English Books Online. Accessed 29 September 2021. proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240899211/fulltextPDF/2C29963ED6A44975PQ/1.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 1920. *The Summa Theologiæ*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne.
- Aristotle. 1989. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Aristotle. 1984. "On Memory." In *Complete Works of Aristotle*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, translated by J. I. Beare, 1:714–20. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Aston, Margaret. 2015. *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139032834.
- Berry, Boyd M. 1976. *Process of Speech: Puritan Religious Writing and Paradise Lost*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brown, Georgia E. 2004. *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511483462.
- Bulwer, John. 1973. *Chirologia: Or, The Natural Language of the Hand, and Chironomia: Or, The Art of Manual Rhetoric*. Edited by James W. Cleary. Landmarks in Rhetoric and Public Address. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Carlson, Eric Joseph. 2001. "The Boring of the Ear: Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540–1640." In *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*, edited by Larissa Taylor, 249–96. Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/9789047400301_009.
- Chambers, D. D. C. 1970. "A Catalogue of the Library of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626)." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 5 (2):99–121.
- Clare, Janet, ed. 2014. *Four Revenge Tragedies*. New Mermaids Anthologies. London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.
- Clark, Stuart. 2007. *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Colebrook, Claire, 2002. *Irony in the Work of Philosophy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Collinson, Patrick. 1982. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625*. The Ford Lectures, 1979. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Copeland, Rita, and Ineke Sluiter, eds. 2009. *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199653782.001.0001.
- Crawforth, Hannah. 2013. *Etymology and the Invention of English in Early Modern Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107300750.
- Davies, Horton. 1986. *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588–1645*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library.

- Donne, John. 2010. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by Robin Hugh A. Robbins. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Donne, John. 2015. *The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne*, Vol. 5: *Sermons Preached at Lincoln's Inn, 1620–23*. Edited by Katrin Ettenhuber. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780199563258.book.1.
- Donne, John. 1984. *The Sermons of John Donne*. Edited by George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson. Reissued. 10 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Duffy, Eamon. 1992. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Eliot, T. S. 1970. *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*. London, UK: Faber.
- Enterline, Lynn. 2016. "Schooling in the English Renaissance." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935338.013.76.
- Evans, G. R. 1998. *Getting It Wrong: The Mediaeval Epistemology of Error*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne. 1996. "Kneeling and the Body Politic." In *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688*, edited by Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier, 70–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511518928.005.
- Fish, Stanley E. 1972. *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fish, Stanley E. 1976. "Structuralist Homiletics." *MLN* 91 (6):1208–21. doi.org/10.2307/2907132.
- Fisher, John. 2002. *English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (1469–1535): Sermons and Other Writings, 1520–1535*. Edited by Cecilia A. Hatt. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hakewill, George. 1615. *The Vanitie of the Eye First Beganne for the Comfort of a Gentlewoman Bereaved of Her Sight, and since Vpon Occasion Enlarged & Published for the Common Good*. Oxford, UK: Joseph Barnes. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership. Accessed 31 December 2019. name.umdl.umich.edu/A02493.0001.001.

- Hamilton, Sarah, and Andrew Spicer. 2005. "Defining the Holy: The Delineation of Sacred Space." In *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, 1–23. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Herbert, George. 1941. *Works*. Edited by F. E. Hutchinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Houston, R. A. 2010. "What Did the Royal Almoner Do in Britain and Ireland, c.1450–1700?" *The English Historical Review* 125 (513):279–313. doi.org/10.1093/ehr/ceq046.
- Hunt, Arnold. 2010. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klemp, P. J. 1995. "'Betwixt the Hammer and the Anvill': Lancelot Andrewes' Revision Techniques in the Manuscript of His 1620 Easter Sermon." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 89 (2):149–82. doi.org/10.1086/pbsa.89.2.24304247.
- Lake, Peter. 1991. "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by Linda Levy Peck, 113–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Latimer, Hugh. 1562. *27 sermons preached by the ryght Reuerende father in God and constant matir [sic] of Iesus Christe, Maister Hugh Latimer, as well such as in tymes past haue bene printed, as certayne other commyng to our handes of late, whych were yet neuer set forth in print. Faithfully perused [and] allowed accordyng to the order appoynted in the Quenes Maiesties iniunctions. 1. Hys sermon Ad clerum. 2. Hys fourth sermon vpon the plough. 3. Hys. 7. sermons before kyng Edward. 4 Hys sermon at Stamforde. 5. Hys last sermon before kyng Edward. 6. Hys. 7. sermons vpon the Lordes prayer. 7. Hys other. 9. sermons vpon certayne Gospels and Epistles*. London: By Iohn Day, dwelling ouer Aldersgate. Cum gratia & priuilegio Regi[a]e Maiestatis, per septennium. Early English Books Online. Accessed 29 September 2021. proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240888532/fulltextPDF/4D1D8D1B43524F34PQ/1.
- Lossky, Nicolas. 1991. *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555–1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. Translated by Andrew Louth. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 2004. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided; 1490–1700*. London: Penguin.
- Mack, Peter. 2002. *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490620.
- McCullough, Peter E. 2012. "Absent Presence: Lancelot Andrewes and 1662." In *Comfortable Words: Polity, Piety and the Book of Common Prayer*, edited by Stephen Platten and Christopher Woods, 49–68. London: SCM Press, 2012.
- McCullough, Peter E. 2008. "Lancelot Andrewes's Transforming Passions." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71 (4):573–89. doi.org/10.1525/hlq.2008.71.4.573.
- McCullough, Peter E. 1998. "Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626–1642." *The Historical Journal* 41 (2):401–24. doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X9800781X.
- McCullough, Peter E. 1998. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morel, Anne-Françoise. 2012. "Church Consecration in England 1549–1715: An Unestablished Ceremony." In *Foundation, Dedication, and Consecration in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Maarten Delbeke and Minou Schraven, 297–308. *Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture* 22. Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/9789004222083_014.
- Moshenska, Joseph. 2014. *Feeling Pleasures: The Sense of Touch in Renaissance England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198712947.001.0001.
- Mozley, J. B. 1842. "Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes, Sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester: Part of the Anglo-Catholic Library, Oxford: J. H. Parker." *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review* 31:169–205.
- OED Online. 2021. Oxford University Press. Accessed 29 September 2021. oed.com.
- Opie, B. J. 1976. "The Devil, Science, and Subjectivity." *English Literary Renaissance* 6 (3):430–52. doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1976.tb01355.x.
- Packman, Zola M., and John N. Wall. 2012. "Worship at Trinity Chapel, Lincoln's Inn, London, 22 May 1623." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 81 (2):113–210.

- Perkins, William. 1607. *The Arte of Prophecying, or, A Treatise Concerning the Sacred and Onely True Manner and Methode of Preaching*. Translated by Thomas Tuke. London: Felix Kyngston. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership. Accessed 31 December 2019. name.umdl.umich.edu/A09449.0001.001.
- Perkins, William. 1606. *The Combat Betveene Christ and the Diuell Displayed: Or A Commentarie Vpon the Temptations of Christ: Preached in Cambridge by That Reuerend and Iudicious Diuine M. William Perkins*. London, UK: Melchisedech Bradwood. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership. Accessed 31 December 2019. name.umdl.umich.edu/A09463.0001.001.
- Quintilian. 1922. *Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by Harold Edgeworth Butler. 4 vols. London: Heinemann.
- Read, Sophie. 2007. "Lancelot Andrewes's Sacramental Wordplay." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 36 (1):11–31. doi.org/10.1093/camqtly/bfl032.
- Read, Sophie. 2018. "What the Nose Knew: Renaissance Theologies of Smell." In *Literature, Belief and Knowledge in Early Modern England: Knowing Faith*, edited by Subha Mukherji and Tim Stuart-Buttle, 175–93. London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71359-5_8.
- Reisner, Noam. 2007. "Textual Sacraments: Capturing the Numinous in the Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes." *Renaissance Studies* 21 (5):662–78. doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-4658.2007.00457.x.
- Rhatigan, Emma. 2011. "Preaching Venues: Architecture and Auditories." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 87–119. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237531.013.0006.
- Santmire, H. Paul, and John B. Cobb. 2006. "The World of Nature According to the Protestant Tradition." In *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Ecology*, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, 115–43. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195178722.003.0005.
- Shuger, Debora Kuller. 1988. *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shuger, Debora Kuller. 1997. *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Spenser, Edmund. 2013. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by Albert C. Hamilton, Hiroshi Yamashita, and Toshiyuki Suzuki. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Spicer, Andrew. 2005. "‘God Will Have a House’: Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth-Century England." In *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Sarah Hamilton, 207–27. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate. doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cem441.
- Targoff, Ramie. 2001. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tilmouth, Christopher. 2007. *Passion's Triumph over Reason: A History of the Moral Imagination from Spenser to Rochester*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199212378.001.0001.
- Trimpi, Wesley. 1983. *Muses of One Mind: The Literary Analysis of Experience and Its Continuity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. 2000. "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560–1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier, 5–33. Studies in Modern British Religious History 2. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Webber, Joan. 1965. "Celebration of Word and World in Lancelot Andrewes' Style." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 64 (2):255–69.
- Wesley, John. 2009. "Acting and *Actio* in the Sermons of Lancelot Andrewes." *Renaissance Studies* 23 (5):678–93. doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-4658.2009.00598.x.