

THE EXEGETICAL METHODS OF SOME SIXTEENTH-CENTURY  
ANGLICAN PREACHERS: LATIMER, JEWEL, HOOKER,  
AND ANDREWES  
PART II\*

ERWIN R. GANE  
Pacific Union College  
Angwin, California

In Part I of this series, I provided a brief overview of the preaching careers of the four Anglican preachers here under consideration—Hugh Latimer, John Jewel, Richard Hooker, and Lancelot Andrewes—plus giving brief attention to the variations in their homiletical techniques. I also analyzed their concept of the Bible, which concept is fundamental to their exegetical methods. Herein I will continue the analysis of these methods under the subheadings of “Allegory,” “Typology,” “Literal Exposition of Scripture,” “Other Exegetical Practices,” “Use of the Church Fathers,” and “Attitudes to Antiquity.”

3. *Allegory*

Allegory is very rare in the sermons of our four Anglican preachers, but it does occur incidentally. Latimer, e.g. preaching at Stamford in 1550, likened false doctrine to the fire of the burning bush of Moses' day and to the fiery furnace of Nebuchadnezzar. Just as the fire which Moses saw did not burn the bush and the fire of the fiery furnace did not consume the three Hebrew worthies, so the fires of false doctrine

---

\*Part I was published in *AUSS* 17 (1979): 23-38. The following abbreviated forms are used herein for works already cited in Part I:

Andrewes = Lancelot Andrewes, *Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, Sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester* (Oxford, 1854-1871).

Ayre = John Ayre, ed., *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* (Cambridge, Eng., 1845-1850).

Keble = John Keble, ed., *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Mr. Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton* (Oxford, 1874).

Watkins = John Watkins, ed., *The Sermons and Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, and Constant Martyr of Jesus Christ, Hugh Latimer, Some Time Bishop of Worcester* (London, 1858).

did not destroy God's faithful people.<sup>66</sup> In 1552, Latimer again likened false doctrine to the fire of Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, stating that "even so is it with the popery." The nature of "false doctrine," he continued, "is to consume, to corrupt and bring to everlasting sorrow."<sup>67</sup> Yet he fondly hoped that his forefathers, who were adherents of Roman Catholicism, were not all damned, because they could be protected from false doctrine, even though living in the midst of it, and they could turn to know Christ just before death.

Preaching in 1553, Latimer applied allegorically the gold, frankincense, and myrrh given by the wise men to Christ. Gold, the king of metals, "signified him to be the king above all kings, and that the doctrine of him is the very true doctrine"; frankincense represented the prayers of God's faithful; and myrrh signified the sufferings of Christian believers.<sup>68</sup> On another occasion Latimer applied the gifts of the wise men quite differently. Gold signified Christ's kingdom, myrrh his morality, and frankincense his priesthood.<sup>69</sup> In the process of elucidating the story of Jesus' turning the water into wine at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee, Latimer declared that "water signifieth all such anguishes, calamities and miseries as may happen by marriages." But just as Jesus turned the "sour water" into wine, so he sends his Spirit to sweeten the bitter experiences of married life, to comfort the heart and keep it from desperation.<sup>70</sup>

Jewel and Hooker very rarely resorted to allegory. Jewel made metaphorical or "spiritual" applications which were not medieval-type allegory, but rather a "literal" kind of application of the text. For instance, using the imagery employed by Christ with respect to the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood (John 6), Jewel quoted the interpretation of Chrysostom, Cyprian, Bernard, and Ambrose, which happened to agree with his own; namely, that to "eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood, is not the part of the body: it is rather a work of our mind."<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>Watkins, 1: 290.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 2: 197.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., 2: 359.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 2: 381.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., 2: 392.

<sup>71</sup>Ayre, 2: 1042-1043.

Hooker, quoting Hag 1:4, used the temple built after the Jews' restoration from the Babylonian captivity as a symbol of the soul temple which is indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Hooker's point is that just as the Jewish temple needed to be rebuilt for the indwelling of God, so the spiritual lives of his listeners needed to be revived.<sup>72</sup> That he allegorized is undoubted; yet there are NT passages to which he could have appealed, such as I Cor 3:16 and 6:19, which use temple imagery in substantially the same way.

As for Andrewes, it is quite inaccurate to assert, as does J. W. Blench, that he "favours the old allegoric method."<sup>73</sup> In fact, the vast majority of Andrewes's interpretations are determined by context, language, and comparison with other Bible passages. His expertise in Greek and Hebrew, as well as his overall knowledge of biblical literature, renders possible a more profound conformity to nuances of meaning which are thoroughly germane to the text. The allegorical applications which do occur are usually for the purpose of sermon illustration, rather than for doctrinal substantiation. Andrewes occasionally falls into the trap which confronts all homileticians of illustrating spiritual messages with substantially unrelated Bible examples.

For instance, Andrewes illustrates the characteristics of the three members of the Trinity by the three parts of the song sung by the angel choir at the birth of Jesus (Luke 2:14).<sup>74</sup> Again, he reads his two pillars of government into Ps 75:3, "The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: but I will establish the pillars of it." In context, "the pillars" are in no way a reference to the pillars of government, but Andrewes applies them so. The two "pillars" which he identifies are (1) the worship of God, and (2) the execution of justice.<sup>75</sup> Thus, the text has become a convenient stepping-off place for the discussion of good secular government. The same two aspects of government Andrewes has further illustrated by the two likenesses of cherubim on either end of the ark of the covenant in the wilderness tabernacle.<sup>76</sup> Such allegorical

---

<sup>72</sup> Keble, 3: 686.

<sup>73</sup> J. W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York, 1964), p. 66.

<sup>74</sup> Andrewes, 1: 217.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 3.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 32.

applications would have done justice to a fifteenth-century sermon, but it is not characteristic of Andrewes's style. Nor was his assertion that the three spears with which Absalom was slain represent the three parties whom he offended; namely, God, the State, and the Church.<sup>77</sup>

#### 4. *Typology*

Typology is an exegetical technique sometimes used by Latimer, Jewel, and Andrewes. Latimer repeats John's application of the wilderness brazen serpent to Christ's death on the Cross (John 3); the death pangs endured by Christ, he illustrates by the OT sufferings of David, Jonah, and Hezekiah; and the Pharisees are likened to the papists of Latimer's day, whom he regarded as "enemies to Christ and his doctrine."<sup>78</sup> The last application, however, is really more allegorical than typological.

Jewel employs typology somewhat more frequently. The rock which gave water to the Israelites in the wilderness represented Christ, the manna symbolized the body of Christ, the brazen serpent typified Christ upon the cross, and the lamb offered in connection with the OT sanctuary service pointed forward to Christ as the lamb of God (John 1:29).<sup>79</sup> Jericho represented the power of evil, the falsehood and darkness which God overthrows "with the breath of his mouth and with the blast of his word."<sup>80</sup> Joshua commanded his people to march around Jericho without using any weapon, while the strong men of the city manned the walls. "Thus it fareth oftentimes in spiritual warfares: falsehood is armed; and truth goeth naked: falsehood maketh outcries; and truth saith little: falsehood is bold; and truth is outfaced."<sup>81</sup> This is typology bordering on allegory.

So also is the case with Jewel's reference to the power of ancient Babylon and Egypt to represent the power of falsehood. Just as God was strong to save from political enemies in ancient times, so is his truth strong today.<sup>82</sup> And the restoration of true religion in David's

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 4: 17.

<sup>78</sup> Watkins, 1: 71, 204, 270.

<sup>79</sup> Ayre, 2: 969.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 970.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 971.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 971-973.

day was used by Jewel as a type of the success of the Gospel in Paul's day.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, the history of ancient Israel, Jewel indicated, has been repeated in the history of the Christian Church.<sup>84</sup>

Andrewes employs typological interpretation to a limited extent. The Paschal Lamb typified Christ, who was crucified at Passover season; the sour herbs eaten at Passover time represented the "fruits of repentance"; and the Passover season itself represented the Christian Easter.<sup>85</sup> The Paschal lamb also represented the Eucharist: "Look how soon the Paschal lamb eaten, presently the holy Eucharist instituted, to succeed in the place of it for ever."<sup>86</sup>

Andrewes cites John 3:14 as authority for applying the wilderness brazen serpent to Christ.<sup>87</sup> The exodus of the Jews from Egypt represents "spiritually" our deliverance "from the servitude and the power of darkness," and the antitypical land of promise is "Heaven itself, where is all joy and happiness for evermore."<sup>88</sup> To a lesser extent than in Roman Catholic sermons of the times, the typology used by these Anglican preachers merges into allegory.

### 5. *Literal Exposition of Scripture*

"Literal" or "normal" interpretation is by far the most common method used in the sermons of Latimer, Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes. To provide an exhaustive account of the use of this mode of exegesis by our four preachers would involve some discussion of every one of their extant sermons. The plan here is to provide examples from the sermons of these preachers to illustrate their characteristic method of using the Bible text.

Our four Anglican preachers rejected, for the most part, the medieval approach to the Bible and attempted to present the message of Scripture substantially as it was written. However, we would be naive to imagine that all of their "literal" interpretations are completely sound exegetically. The preachers were influenced by their local historical environment and by those religious, social, political, and economic mores

---

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 1005.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 1044.

<sup>85</sup> Andrewes, 1: 441; 2: 291-292.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 299.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 133.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

which they valued. Nevertheless, they attempted to be true to the text and, thereby, arrived at a world view which took them beyond the religious beliefs and practices of the Middle Ages. Whether literal exegesis of the Bible resulted in the changed historical situation within the Church of England, or the changing historical situation engendered literal exposition, is a nice question. Evidently there was an inextricable relationship between the historical setting of the preachers, the methods they adopted in Bible study, and the meanings they drew from the Scriptures.<sup>89</sup>

Indeed, there is an undoubted relationship between the literary methods of Renaissance humanism and the biblical exegesis of these Anglican preachers. First, they sought the most authentic ancient sources on which to build their Christian philosophy, just as the humanists resorted to classical philosophic or literary sources to provide the foundation of their novel commitments. Second, like the humanists, they saw the need to read these sources in the languages in which they were written. They were not satisfied with Latin translations. The Vulgate was recognized to be inferior to the Greek and Hebrew texts. Third, they labored to exegete their sources in a manner respectful of the writers' original meanings and intentions. This loyalty to the literary integrity of ancient documents was learned from the humanists. Fourth, they made a greater attempt than their medieval predecessors to view the original sources of the Christian faith in their historical environment. Hence, Church history, as well as secular history, became a tool for the correct interpretation of the text. This approach was also characteristic of humanism. The training of these Anglicans, particularly Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes, was humanistic, and the result was a mode of homiletical biblical exegesis which differed sharply from that of traditional Roman Catholicism.

Latimer in his 1529 "Sermons of the Card" furnishes a splendid

---

<sup>89</sup> To say, e.g., that Latimer and Cranmer would have rejected transubstantiation without a new approach to the biblical material, solely in reaction to the papal Church of their era, would seem to ignore the undoubted impact of Renaissance and Reformation biblical scholarship upon them. But to argue, on the contrary, that the only influence in their rejection of transubstantiation was their study of the scriptures, in the absence of external pressures, whether religious, political, or social, would probably be to credit too much to their scholarly objectivity. Great movements of thought are usually associated with great changes in the practical world of affairs. So the biblical methods and understandings of our four Anglican preachers are not to be viewed as independent from the world of affairs in which they found themselves.

example of literal interpretation of John 1:19 with an application to meet a local spiritual need. The text as Latimer translates it reads, "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" First, Latimer puts the text into its context by referring to the circumstances under which the Pharisees asked John the Baptist the question. Second, the preacher gives John's answer that he was not the Christ. Third, Latimer makes a spiritual application which, however hackneyed it may seem, was quite consistent with a literal exposition of the verse: "So likewise it shall be necessary unto all men and women of this world, not to ascribe unto themselves any goodness of themselves, but all unto our Lord God."<sup>90</sup>

Later in the same sermon Latimer quotes Matt 5:21, 22 and divides the passage into four parts:

You have heard what was spoken to men of the old law, "Thou shalt not kill; whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his neighbour Racha—that is to say, brainless, or any other like word of rebuking, shall be in danger of a council; and whosoever shall say unto his neighbour, fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." This card was made and spoken by Christ, as appeareth in the 5th chapter of St. Matthew.<sup>91</sup>

The first part of this card, says Latimer, presents one of the commandments of the "old law," which also applies to us. The following three parts are Christ's exposition of the OT commandment showing how it might be broken. A man who harbors anger against another, even though it is not expressed, is breaking the commandment and in danger of judgment. A person who expresses his anger by name-calling is "in danger of a council," and an individual who calls his brother a fool has gone one step farther and is in danger of hell-fire.<sup>92</sup>

Latimer next uses the three latter applications of the passage as analogous to three parts of English legal procedure. The judgment, council, and hell-fire, he says, "may be likened unto three terms which we have common and usual amongst us—that is to say, the session of inquirance or inquest, the sessions of deliverance, and the execution day."<sup>93</sup> In this, he is not allegorizing, but is using analogy, a method which occurs frequently in the sermons of each of the four Anglican preachers. These preachers provide a modern analogy to illustrate the

<sup>90</sup>Watkins, 1: 1-2.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., 1: 7.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., 1: 8-9.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., 1: 10.

text, or they use a Bible story as analogous to a modern situation. In the case before us, Latimer does not say that Matt 5 refers to the three aspects of England's legal procedure, but rather that the passage refers to matters that are somewhat analogous.

The "card" which Latimer explains in his development of Matt 2:21, 22 is the positive instruction that the Christian, far from manifesting a bitter or angry attitude to his neighbors, wins the spiritual game of life when he displays forgiveness and love.<sup>94</sup> The ethical and spiritual application grows naturally and consistently out of the Gospel pericope. So also does Latimer's application of the story of the feast in the house of Simon the ex-leper (Luke 7:36-50).<sup>95</sup> There were in Latimer's day counterparts of the proud Pharisee who was willing to condemn the penitent woman.<sup>96</sup>

Latimer's "Sermon of the Plough" was based on an interpretation of the parable of the sower (Mark 4:1-9, 13-20), with the seed being the word of God and the sower or ploughman being the preacher.<sup>97</sup> This sermon dwelt upon the great importance of preaching, and the reason for such an emphasis is obvious. In 1548, early in the reign of Edward VI, when the sermon was preached, an attempt was being made by divines with Protestant leanings to disseminate their teachings. Resistance to papal doctrine and practice could only be achieved by changing the opinions of the people in general, and preaching was an important medium through which this result was to be achieved.

The foregoing are but a few of the many examples which could be given to illustrate Latimer's method.<sup>98</sup> The Bible, literally applied, became a weapon for attack on the papal system as it was previously practiced in England, a tool for the erection of new ecclesiastical and State structures, and the basis for dissemination of an ethical system and doctrinal formulations acceptable to Protestantism.

Jewel's method was somewhat similar, except that each of his sermons followed a particular theme more consistently than did Latimer's, and his knowledge of biblical literature was more profound. His 1560 Paul's Cross sermon was based on 1 Cor 11:23, "I have received of the

---

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 11.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 13.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 14.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 55-73.

<sup>98</sup> See also *ibid.*, 1: 23-24, 80, 83, 85-96, 98-103, 114-116, 132-133.



Lord that thing which I also have delivered unto you; that is, that the Lord Jesus, in the night that he was betrayed, took bread, &c." Jewel began by putting the text into its Scriptural context. Paul's work among the Corinthians was designed "to instruct the people, to draw them from the follies and errors that they and their fathers had long lived in aforetime, and to lead them to the gospel of Christ." Consistent with this aim, Paul gave them "the sacrament or holy mystery of Christ's last supper, to be practised and continued amongst them, as a most certain pledge and testimony of the same." After Paul's departure from Corinth, certain false teachers, "men full of pride and vain-glory," had led the Corinthian Christians away from the Gospel and had confused them in regard to the true nature of the sacraments.<sup>99</sup> One reason that Paul wrote 1 Corinthians was to call these Christians back to the supper as Christ had instituted it:

For I, saith he, being amongst you delivered you none other thing than that I had received of the Lord. That thing he thought meetest for you: and therefore with the same ought you also to be contented. Thus, whensoever any order given by God is broken or abused, the best redress thereof is to restore it again into the state that it first was in at the beginning.<sup>100</sup>

This concept of restoration is the basis for Jewel's overall emphasis in his sermons. His purpose is to demonstrate from the Bible the correct mode of religious belief and practice as taught by Christ and the apostles. The Fathers of the early centuries are cited to support interpretations of the Scriptures which Jewel believes to have been consistent with the teachings of the earliest Christian church. His predilection for original Christianity is neatly summarized on the title page of the 1560 edition of the Paul's Cross sermon by a quotation from Tertullian: "This is a prejudice against all heresies: that that thinge is true, whatsoever was first: that is corrupt, whatsoever came after."<sup>101</sup>

The sermon illustrates the principle. When the Jews defiled the Jerusalem temple, Christ "called them back again to the first erection of the temple." When questioned about divorce, Christ presented the original intention that marriage should last forever. Similarly Paul called the Corinthians back to the first institution of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, since "in this last age of the world the same holy sacrament or mystery of Christ's last supper hath been likewise stained with

---

<sup>99</sup> Ayre, 1: 3.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 1: 3-4.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 1: i.

divers foul abuses," Jewel is under a compelling obligation to call his contemporaries back to "the first institution of the holy sacrament." And he continues with other examples of matters wherein he felt true doctrine to have been perverted.<sup>102</sup>

In future sermons Jewel tended to select Bible passages which dealt with a problem or a need in either OT or NT times. The problem in the original setting was spelled out in some detail and then used as a pertinent analogy of the difficulties, whether practical or theoretical, present in the various branches of the Church of the Elizabethan era. For instance, Jewel preached a sermon based on Matt 9:37, 38, "Then said he to his disciples, Surely the harvest is great; but the labourers are few. Wherefore pray the Lord of the harvest, that he would send labourers forth into his harvest." Jewel began by explaining why Christ made the statement. The problem in the original setting was not lack of scribes and Pharisees, nor was it lack of schools or learning. The problem was the paucity of genuinely committed teachers of the will of God. Jewel's day was parallel. The lengthy explication of the problem in Christ's day is for the express purpose of exposing the need in Jewel's own day.<sup>103</sup>

Hooker's method is different. He looks searchingly into Bible statements to discover any possible philosophical problems and solutions which may throw light on the issues of concern for individuals and for the Church of his day. The Scripture text becomes a source of questions and answers which are designed to relate the contemporary Church to its historical tradition, and to reconcile currently divisive religious concepts and forces. Hooker's sermon "The Certainty, and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect" is a case in point. His text is Hab 1:4, "Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth." The question which the text poses for Hooker is "Whether the Prophet Habakkuk, by admitting this cogitation into his mind, 'The law doth fail,' did thereby shew himself an unbeliever."<sup>104</sup> Hooker is concerned to show that there is for the Christian an experience of legitimate doubt which in no way nullifies the genuineness of his faith. Habakkuk's remark about the apparent predominance of evil in his day reveals a doubt as to the activity of God, but it does not imply that the prophet had lost faith in God. The presupposition upon which Hooker bases his argument

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 4-6.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 1016-1024.

<sup>104</sup> Keble, 3: 469.

he expresses as follows: "In this we know we are not deceived, neither can we deceive you, when we teach that the faith whereby ye are sanctified cannot fail; it did not in the Prophet, it shall not in you."<sup>105</sup>

This is not, in my view, intended to be merely another way of expressing Calvinist determinism. Hooker is not saying that, despite his doubts, Habakkuk had no choice but to be one of the elect. The point seems to be that as long as genuine faith remains in the mind of the individual, his doubts cannot be regarded as a nullification of the grace which God has given him. Intellectual, psychological, and spiritual confusion do not amount to a rejection of God by the believer, nor do they result in God's withdrawal from him. Weakness is not "utter want of faith." Lack of "sugared joy and delight" is not evidence of faithlessness. "A grieved spirit therefore is no argument of a faithless mind," nor are the presence of "the distrustful suggestions of the flesh."<sup>106</sup> Hooker uses Bible examples. The Galatians and Ephesians of Paul's day had problems but were not rejected. Sarah doubted in regard to the promise of a son, but still believed. The prayer of Christ for Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," is the basis of Christian assurance, even though it does not "exclude our labour."<sup>107</sup> Thus, Hooker in expounding on Hab 1:4 has used a most unlikely passage of Scripture, given its literal interpretation, as the basis for his discussion of Christian assurance.

Andrewes's characteristic exegetical method may be effectively illustrated from his 1609 Christmas-day sermon.<sup>108</sup> This particular nativity sermon is based on the passage Gal 4:4, 5, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law. That He might redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Andrewes commences by giving in detail the four-part outline of his sermon:

1. The fullness of time. Under this heading he plans four points: (1) Time has a fullness. (2) The fullness comes by steps and degrees. (3) There is a specific time when this fullness comes. (4) The specific time is when God sent the Son. At this point Andrewes reminds his

---

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 473.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 474-475.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 476-477, 480. For other examples from Hooker's sermons, see 3: 483-484, 502-504.

<sup>108</sup> Andrewes, 1: 45-63.

audience that there are such texts that "the right way to consider them is to take them in pieces, and this is of that kind."<sup>109</sup>

2. Of that wherewith the time is filled. In this part he takes the text phrase by phrase: (1) God sent. (2) Sent His Son. (3) His Son who was made. (4) The Son was twice made; the second time made of a woman. (5) The Son was made under the law. (6) The double benefit: (i) redemption, and (ii) translation of believers into "the state of adopted children of God."

3. There is a double fullness: God sends as much as he can and man receives as much as he desires.

4. Man receives from God "the fulness of his bounty" and God receives from man "the fulness of our duty."

At this point the sermon proper begins.<sup>110</sup> "First there is a fullness in time." God has made the measure of time, and there is a point which may be regarded as the fullness of it. By degrees time passes "till at last it come to the brim." There is a specific time when the fullness comes: "As in the day, when the sun cometh to the meridian line; in the month, when it cometh to the point of opposition with the moon."<sup>111</sup> Under Moses and the prophets there were certain important times of the year, but time was not full "till God sent That than Which a more full could not be sent." With the coming of Christ "time was at the top, that was the *quando venit*, then it was *plenitudo temporis* indeed."<sup>112</sup> There are seven degrees, Andrewes says, by which the fullness of the time is filled, and he proceeds to explicate them.<sup>113</sup>

This sermon is representative of the vast majority of Andrewes's sermons. For the most part, he chose topics which were of central concern to the Christian faith, and his sermons were rarely controversial. He dissected his texts phrase by phrase or word by word, even though that meant dwelling on obvious and apparently unimportant issues which were not essential to the conveyance of his spiritual message. He made considerable use of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. His sermons were usually introduced by a lengthy breakdown of the points to be covered, in which the English construction was pithy, abbreviated, and anything

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 1: 46.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 1: 47.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 1: 47-48.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 1: 49.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 1: 51-61.

but attractive. The substance of the sermon was characterized by a diffuse, pedantic style which, nevertheless, adequately expounded the literal meaning of the Bible text. Wordplay, suggested by the words of the text, was quite common in Andrewes's sermons. This habit resulted in the presentation of ideas which were not contained in the passage he was discussing, but which could be substantiated from other passages of Scripture.

The biblical languages, Greek and Hebrew, were quite commonly used by Andrewes. In contrast, there was little or no use of these languages in the sermons of Latimer, Jewel, and Hooker, even though the latter two preachers were very competent to use them, and undoubtedly did so in their private Bible study. Like his predecessors, Andrewes made considerable use of the Latin Vulgate too, but he often gave the Greek and Hebrew words with their exact English meanings when he was seeking further insight into a particular passage. An example or two may be given.

Preaching on the resurrection of Christ in 1606, Andrewes made the point that although Christ raised himself from the dead, the Father was active in calling him forth from the grave: "The Apostle's word ἐγερθεῖς, in the native force doth more properly signify, 'raised by another,' than risen by himself, and is so used, to shew it was done, not only by the power of the Son, but by the will, consent, and co-operation of the Father."<sup>114</sup> Andrewes's use of ἐγερθεῖς was quite correct. The word is a first aorist, passive participle of ἐγείρω, which in the passive may have the sense of "raised" by another, or "to stir or raise oneself."<sup>115</sup>

Also correct was Andrewes's use of Greek meanings in a sermon preached in 1609; "And when we have thus passed ourselves away, by this 'selling ourselves under sin,' the Law seizeth on us, and under it we are συγκεκλεισμένοι, even 'locked up' as it were in a dungeon, 'tied fast with the cords of our sins.'"<sup>116</sup> The phrase "selling ourselves under sin" is a literal translation of the phrase in Rom 7:14, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. The word συγκεκλεισμένοι comes from Gal 3:23. It is a perfect participle from συγκλείω which means "to close up to-

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 2: 197.

<sup>115</sup> See "ἐγείρω" in W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1957), and in *TDNT*.

<sup>116</sup> Andrewes, 1: 57.

gether," "hem in," "enclose," "confine," "imprison."<sup>117</sup> Even though modern textual criticism prefers the form *συγκλειόμενοι* in Gal 3:23, Andrewes's understanding of the word, as it occurred in the Greek text available to him, was quite correct.<sup>118</sup>

There are literally dozens of such examples in Andrewes's sermons, demonstrating his accurate knowledge of the Greek NT. And he did not hesitate to use the LXX, as in reference to the Persian king's chamberlains in the time of Esther.<sup>119</sup> He also quite frequently cited the Hebrew of the OT.<sup>120</sup>

### 6. Other Exegetical Practices

Any other approaches to the Bible text by our four Anglican preachers, apart from those already described, are purely incidental. There are, e.g., a few examples of redaction or homiletical embellishment. Commenting on the case of incest in the Corinthian Church of Paul's day, Latimer explains:

In the city of Corinth one had married his step-mother, his father's wife; and he was a jolly fellow, a great rich man, an alderman of the city, and therefore they winked at, they would not meddle in the matter, they had nothing to do with it; and he was one of the head men, of such rule and authority, that they durst not, many of them.<sup>121</sup>

There is nothing in the Pauline account about the wealth, position, or authority of the guilty party. Latimer's additions are obviously homiletical embellishment.

Jewel, in his discussion of the woman of Samaria (John 4), said: "When the woman of Samaria saw the miracles that Christ had done, and heard some men doubt whether he were Messias or no: 'Why (quoth she), when Messias shall come, shall he do more signs than this man hath shewed?'"<sup>122</sup> The words which Jewel put into the mouth of the woman of Samaria occur in John 7:31 and have no relationship to the John 4 account. The words that the woman actually spoke were,

<sup>117</sup> See, e.g., "*συγκλείω*" in Arndt and Gingrich.

<sup>118</sup> See Gal 3:23 in *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 25th ed., edited by Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland (Stuttgart, 1963).

<sup>119</sup> Andrewes, 4: 136.

<sup>120</sup> Cf., e.g., *ibid.*, 1: 354; 4: 6, 135, 140.

<sup>121</sup> Watkins, 1: 240.

<sup>122</sup> Ayre, 2: 992.

“Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?” (John 4:29, KJV). This kind of incidental error could hardly be regarded as intentional.

Miracle-stories were not used by these preachers as an extension of the Bible account, but were told as fables for the purpose of sermon illustration. Latimer occasionally used such a story. Wishing to illustrate the idea “that worldly prosperity maketh us to forget God,” he told the story of a bishop who came to a rich man’s house where he found lack of nothing. The bishop, thinking that God could not be in such a place, left the house. “When he came a little far off from the house, he sendeth his man back again to fetch a book, which was forgotten behind; when the servant came, the house was sunk.”<sup>123</sup>

Illustrating the virtue of humility, Jewel told a story of St. Anthony which he introduced as follows: “There is a story, or rather a fable, written of St. Anthony—whether you take it as a story or a fable I much reckon not, but it serveth well for this purpose.”<sup>124</sup> Clearly, Jewel was not concerned that his hearers should believe such a miracle-story. His obvious intent was to illustrate a point in his sermon. In any case, such stories are very rare in these sermons.

### 7. Use of the Fathers

Latimer accepted or rejected the interpretations of the Fathers, depending on whether or not he judged them to be consistent with Scripture. Commenting in 1549 on the statement that Christ “began to be sorrowful and very heavy” (Matt 26:37), Latimer said, “I like not Origen’s playing with this word *coepit*; it was a perfect heaviness: it was such a one as was never seen the greater, it was not merely the beginning of a sorrow.”<sup>125</sup> This led him to make a brief digression for the purpose of explaining his attitude to the Fathers generally:

These Doctors, we have great cause to thank God for them, but yet I would not have them always to be allowed. They have handled many points of our faith very godly; and we may have a great stay in them in many things; we might not well lack them: but yet I would not have men to be sworn to them; and so addict, as to take hand over head whatsoever they say: it were a great inconvenience to do so.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>123</sup>Watkins, 2: 155; cf. pp. 376-377.

<sup>124</sup>Ayre, 2: 1094.

<sup>125</sup>Watkins, 1: 201.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid.

The Fathers were treated as mere commentators whose word was tested by the Bible account. They were in no sense inspired by God, and their concepts were not necessarily representative of the official teaching of the Church. This attitude placed tradition, insofar as it emerged from the Fathers, in a decidedly subordinate position. Tradition could now be tested by the Bible-centered faith, and rejected if it failed the test. Nevertheless, as Latimer pointed out in 1552, the school doctors, "as bad as they were," had some good things to say.<sup>127</sup> He often quoted them, especially Augustine and Chrysostom.<sup>128</sup>

As explained above, Jewel's attitude to the Fathers of the first six Christian centuries was somewhat more positive. He did not treat them as inspired authors, nor did he allow them equal status with the Bible in matters of religious authority, but he did consider that they represented a tradition which was consistent with Bible teaching. On the question of holy communion, he lumped together Christ, Paul, Gregory, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Leo I, Dionysius, Anacletus, and Sixtus.<sup>129</sup> He challenged his hearers to demonstrate the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass from the Bible, or any of the Fathers who wrote "for the space of six hundred years after Christ."<sup>130</sup> He maintained that he taught nothing "but that hath been taught before by Christ himself, set abroad by his apostles, continued in the primitive church, and maintained by the old and ancient doctors."<sup>131</sup> Hence, Jewel's Roman Catholic contemporaries, he argued, were out of line with the Church of the first six or seven centuries. The Anglican Church was truly Catholic because of its basic conformity to the Scriptures and the early Fathers.<sup>132</sup>

Hooker's sermons quote the Fathers relatively frequently, but not with any suggestion that their authority equals that of the Bible in religious issues. When he finds the Fathers disagreeing with Scripture as he understands it, he opposes their interpretation. He rejects, e.g., Origen's idea that mercy will be extended "unto devils and damned

---

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., 2: 93.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., 1: 92, 144, 162, 184, 186, 192, 234, 250, 277; 2: 13, 38, 60, 64, 135, 152, 159, 174, 186, 209, 376, 392, 397.

<sup>129</sup>Ayre, 1: 20.

<sup>130</sup>Ibid.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., 2: 1030.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid., 2: 1029-1031.



spirits."<sup>133</sup> In fact, Hooker freely acknowledges that the Fathers, like other mortals, were subject to error. He takes to task "the ancient Fathers of the Church" who "have had their sundry perilous opinions; and among sundry of their opinions this, that they hoped to make God some part of amends for their sins, by the voluntary punishments which they laid upon themselves."<sup>134</sup> But when he finds a Father who supports his particular emphasis, Hooker quotes him.<sup>135</sup>

Andrewes recognized first the authority of the Bible, secondly that of the councils, and thirdly that of the Fathers. Stressing the concept that the paternal rulership function of patriarchs was bestowed upon the kings who followed them, he said:

Now, that as in other things, so in this term of *Christi Domini*, Kings do succeed the Patriarchs, we have, first, our warrant from the Holy Ghost applying this term here, after, to Saul, to David, to Solomon, to Hezekiah, to Josiah, to Cyrus: Kings all. Secondly, from the Councils: the third general Council of Ephesus; the great Council of Toledo, the fourth; the great western Council of Frankfort. Thirdly, from the consent of Fathers.<sup>136</sup>

The "warrant from the Holy Ghost" refers to the evidence from the Bible. Ecclesiastical tradition, whether determined from councils or Fathers, is corroborative evidence, but not primarily authoritative. It is when the Fathers agree that they are especially credible to Andrewes. He first presents Bible evidence and then turns to the consensus of the Fathers. If we judge by the number of references to Augustine, he is Andrewes's favorite Father.<sup>137</sup>

### 8. *Attitudes to Antiquity*

Latimer's sermons make little use of the literature and history of antiquity, aside from Scripture. What references and allusions there are do not reveal any real concern to revive the mores and literary methods of the ancient world. Latimer's interest is NT-type Christianity. Where a story from antiquity can be effectively inserted to illustrate a point, Latimer uses it. In his third sermon before Edward VI in 1549, he compares the king to the Persian emperor Cambyses who punished the

---

<sup>133</sup>Keble, 3: 500.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., 3: 540.

<sup>135</sup>E.g., *ibid.*, 3: 607-608, 484, 533, 536, 609, 612.

<sup>136</sup>Andrewes, 4: 49.

<sup>137</sup>See *ibid.*, 1: 350, 427, 430-431; 2: 3, 27, 37.

unjust judge Sisamnes. Latimer has obviously forgotten some of the details of the story, and virtually admits as much when he says, "It is a great while ago since I read the history."<sup>138</sup> But the point is well-illustrated, that the responsibility of the king is to maintain justice in the land. This kind of sermon illustration from antiquity occurs very occasionally in Latimer's sermons.<sup>139</sup>

Of our four Anglican preachers, Jewel makes the most frequent references to the history of antiquity. Occasionally he tells a story by way of sermon illustration. In one sermon he briefly describes the siege of Cyzicum by Mithridates of Pontus. When Lucullus arrived with an army to raise the siege, Mithridates released the false report to the town's people that the new contingent of soldiers had come to support him. But the citizens held out and Lucullus was successful in raising the siege. Jewel uses the story as an allegory thus:

Even so, good people, is there now a siege laid to your walls: an army of doctors and councils shew themselves upon an hill: the adversary, that would have you yield, beareth you in hand that they are their soldiers, and stand on their side. But keep you hold: the doctors and old catholic fathers, in the points that I have spoken of, are yours: ye shall see the siege raised, ye shall see your adversaries discomfited and put to flight.<sup>140</sup>

This one example illustrates Jewel's characteristic manner of using the history of antiquity in his sermons.<sup>141</sup> Very occasionally Hooker uses it likewise. He illustrates by reference to the senators of Rome in one sermon, Heteroclitus in another, and to the Grecian practice of disposing of tyrants in a third; and once he quotes Plotinus.<sup>142</sup> Andrewes makes little use of antiquity. In passing, he mentions Augustus' peace; and he cites Socrates and Josephus.<sup>143</sup> Despite his great learning, his concern is the message of the Bible, not the lessons to be learned from other ancient sources.

### *9. Summary and Conclusion*

We are now in a position to summarize the findings of our analysis regarding the exegetical methods of Latimer, Jewel, Hooker and An-

---

<sup>138</sup>Watkins, 1: 131-132.

<sup>139</sup>Ibid., 2: 24, 129, 300-301, 357.

<sup>140</sup>Ayre, 1: 22.

<sup>141</sup>For further examples, see *ibid.*, 2: 976-978, 996, 1028, 1031, 1089, 1094.

<sup>142</sup>Hooker, 3: 48, 605, 621, 636.

<sup>143</sup>Andrewes, 1: 222; 4: 16, 247.

drewes. All of these preachers regarded the Bible as the ultimate authority in religious matters. None of them took the view that the preferred interpretation was that of the Church or the ancient Fathers. Scripture, according to them, is to be interpreted by Scripture and by the Holy Spirit. The Fathers are to be used as secondary sources, but not treated as authorities in any way on the same level with Bible writers. Even Jewel, who saw the church of the first six or seven centuries as consistent with the teachings of the NT, did not attempt to give to the early Fathers any recognition as being primary authorities. He accepted them because of their apparent consistency with the Bible. And Andrewes used evidence from the early Councils and the Fathers to corroborate his Bible applications.

Allegory as an exegetical method is very rare in these Anglican sermons; but it is present, nevertheless, to a limited extent. It is not correct to say, however, that Andrewes favored the allegorical method. Typology was sometimes used by these preachers, being more frequent in Jewel than Latimer, and was occasionally used by Hooker and Andrewes. The most common method of interpretation was the "literal" or "normal," by which the preacher attempted to represent the true meaning of the literature. The analogical method, which is sometimes mistaken for allegory, is very much in evidence in the sermons.

Latimer only very occasionally used stories from antiquity for illustrative purposes, and Hooker and Andrewes did not use many classical allusions. Jewel made more frequent reference to ancient sources and stories, but he did so usually only in the form of sermon illustrations. None of these preachers used philosophy or other classical literature for the purpose of throwing greater light on the Scripture passages themselves.

Although it has not been our primary purpose to deal with the subject matter or content of the sermons (rather we have treated the exegetical methods of the preachers), it will be appropriate here, in closing, to make at least brief mention of this matter.<sup>144</sup> For instance, in respect to the concept of the Church, all four preachers attacked papal ecclesiastical primacy and papal claims to secular dominance. They reinterpreted the Bible texts used by Catholic theologians to

---

<sup>144</sup>Some points have already appeared in our previous discussion. It will not be possible here to furnish documentation for, or a comprehensive review of, these and other items that will be noted below, but I hope in the future to elaborate more fully this aspect of the sermons of our four Anglican preachers.

establish the primacy of Peter, and even applied Bible prophecies regarding antichrist, the man of sin, etc., to the papal system. All four preachers accepted or condoned the episcopal system of church polity and the monarch's supreme governorship of the church. They did not consider the bishops or the monarch as authoritative in terms of doctrine; all men, whatever their status, were to be guided by the doctrines and laws of Scripture. However, they deplored the lack of hierarchical levels of ecclesiastical control in the Anabaptist and Puritan systems. Furthermore, they did not see a contradiction between a confessional church, in which membership is on the basis of belief and commitment, and an episcopal church governed by bishops and the monarch. They wanted both. Their sermons were full of injunctions to faith and personal Christian life, while at the same time enjoining loyalty to the monarchical and episcopal leadership of the church.

Regarding the structure of society, all four preachers were reconciled to monarchical government of the kind which existed in England. The monarch was to be armed with both "swords," the civil and the religious. As for ethics, these preachers applied Bible teaching to the practical situations in the lives of their hearers and attempted to eliminate immorality in the broad sense. Religion, they felt, was to govern every area of human life. Doctrinally, these preachers opposed much of the papal system: the doctrine of the immaculate conception and Mariology, the sacrament of penance and the idea of meritorious works on which it depended, the doctrine of transubstantiation and the concept of the Mass as a sacrifice, the celebration of private Masses, the celibacy of the priesthood, and the doctrine of purgatory. In fact, the concept of the Church held by these preachers and their doctrinal differences with Rome involved a complete transformation of the Church in England.

Our analysis has led us to the conclusion that these preachers were not humanists, although they were influenced by humanistic interests and literary and philological methods. Their whole world view was biblically oriented. The church, society, ethics, and doctrine were to be determined by the Scriptures. They were not willing to acknowledge other sources of primary authority whether they be tradition, the Fathers, or the Pope. Their exegesis and their world-view amounted to a revolution in thought which was bound to result in calamity for them when those in authority held to the medieval tradition, and in a drastically altered society when the monarch chose to see things their way.