

## **LANCELOT ANDREWES: SCHOLAR BISHOP OF CHICHESTER**

by

**GRAHAM PARRY**

I'd like to offer you some idea of the career and character of Lancelot Andrewes, who became bishop of Chichester in November 1605. This event brought to Chichester the most distinguished man in the Church of England, at the height of his powers, at an exceptionally interesting time.

I hope to persuade you to share my belief that Chichester was unusually fortunate to have Andrewes as its bishop, and you might come to imagine that some residual glory from this man, who had such a reputation for sanctity and scholarship, still lingers in this cathedral. However, one shouldn't have too elevated an admiration for him, for he had his failings and his shortcomings too, as I shall not omit to mention. But initially, some introduction to this eminent churchman, whom King James called, with a slight touch of exaggeration, the most eloquent man since the days of the Apostles, seems desirable, for although his name may sound familiar to you, his course of life and his achievements may be little known.

He was born in London, near the Tower of London, in 1555, the son of a merchant mariner. His given name, Lancelot, belongs to the world of Arthurian romance, and suggests the persistent popularity of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* in mid-Tudor times. As a name it suggested adventurousness and boldness, and amorous success. You might remember that Lancelot was the lover of Queen Guenevere, and the knight who had a sight of the holy grail, but was denied communion therefrom because of his sin. He was the noblest of Arthur's knights, but marked by a taint that kept him back from

perfection. Lancelot was a name that had ambiguous implications for a man who sought his career in the Church.

He was educated at Merchant Taylors School, and was a beneficiary of the transformational powers of the Elizabethan Grammar School system. His father was a mariner, but he became a bishop several times over. At school, he had a good grounding in Greek, Latin and Hebrew, the biblical languages. He then moved on to Cambridge, to Pembroke Hall, now Pembroke College, which was notable in those days for the number of outstanding churchmen and controversialists it produced. He remained at Pembroke for thirty-four years, as undergraduate, fellow and eventually, Master. As an immensely assiduous and scrupulous scholar, who seems by several accounts to have divided his days between study, teaching and prayer, year after year, Andrewes developed into a man perfectly suited to become prominent in the university and the Church in Elizabethan and Jacobean times. He belonged to that post-Reformation elite who specialised in close discussion of biblical texts and the works of the church fathers in order to define the doctrines of the Church of England, and the practices that it employed in its worship. He was also able to defend these doctrines and practices against the attacks by Roman Catholic controversialists in Europe. Scholarship in England could be enlisted in no greater causes than these. You have to remember how precarious the existence of the youthful Church of England seemed to many of its members, how it was under threat of division by the puritans, and how Catholic enemies sought to discredit it. You also have to remember how eager so many people were to hear sermons, that elucidated biblical texts, expounded doctrine, and taught Christian behaviour in a reformed society. It was not uncommon for a preacher to a responsive congregation to turn over his hour-glass and run on for a second hour. You have to remember that ninety per cent of the output of

printing houses in this country consisted of religious material. In such a profoundly religious world, Lancelot Andrewes was a golden man.

It's helpful, I think, to reflect briefly on his Cambridge days, to understand how some of his distinctive mental habits were formed. Cambridge in mid-Elizabethan times was a stronghold of puritanism, with many voices clamouring for a greater reform of the Church, for simpler services, for the abolition of bishops and church hierarchies in favour of a presbyterian system of government. The presence of bishops in the Church was highly contested, because there was no biblical authority for bishops. In the frequent formal disputations, in the sermons in college chapels, and in the University church, in private debates, the arguments in favour of more extensive reform or for the status quo were rehearsed, often with passionate intensity and with plentiful scholarship. Andrewes matured in this ethos, without becoming embittered by it. As a highly effective preacher, he packed the college chapel with avid listeners to his enthralling exposition of scripture. 'No one in Cambridge could call himself a man of learning and piety unless he had made himself a disciple of Mr Andrewes by a diligent resorting to his lectures' said a contemporary.

His exceptional qualities brought him recognition far beyond Cambridge. He was appointed vicar of St Giles Cripplegate in London, by Sir Francis Walsingham, in 1589. The same patron had secured him a prebend at St Paul's and another at Southwell Minster. (A prebend is a cathedral benefice, which entitled the holder to an income from the cathedral estates, often a substantial one – and in Elizabethan times, one did not have to do much work for it.) He became a chaplain to Queen Elizabeth – though she may have had as many as 24 chaplains who were expected to preach on a rota basis. He also became a chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift. In 1601, he was appointed Dean of Westminster Abbey by Sir Robert Cecil,

who was effectively Q. Elizabeth's prime minister. (It's worth remarking, *en passant*, that contemporaries observed that Andrewes had never petitioned for any of these posts – he had always been appointed on his merits, a fairly unusual situation in the sixteenth century.) He still remained Master of Pembroke. He retained all these new offices as they accumulated, for he was a serial pluralist, but it evident that towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, the focus of his life was shifting to London. As Dean of Westminster, he had considerable influence, and because the Abbey is a royal foundation, he now had an *entrée* into court circles. He developed a considerable reputation as a preacher in London, and it wouldn't be long before he became a bishop.

By the end of Elizabeth's reign, then, Lancelot Andrewes was established as an admirable preacher with a reputation in Cambridge and London, and he preaching regularly before the Queen. Though he had been educated amongst puritans, he had developed into a middle of the road churchman, rather conservative in his views, deeply respectful of ancient practices, supportive of the Elizabethan settlement of the Church, with its hierarchies of bishops, archbishops, and the monarch as head of the Church. He believed in decent and well ordered services, regulated by the Prayer Book, and he had a high veneration for the sacraments, especially the eucharist or holy communion, which he regarded as the principal source of grace, essential to redemption. He disapproved of the puritans' obsession with sermons as the centre of services, and in particular of their habit of turning up in church just for the sermon, and ignoring the rest of the service. His views were very close to those of his friend Richard Hooker, the principal theologian of the Church of England, who wrote his great book on the doctrines and organisation of the Church to defend it against puritan attack. The puritans, you might recall, were in effect the radical left wing of the

Church of England, who were always agitating for greater reform, wanting simpler services, dismantling of the hierarchy, closer conformity to the doctrines of John Calvin. All English people were members of the Church of England by law, but the puritan wing had a strong desire to separate itself if it could not gain the reforms it wanted. Andrewes became increasingly concerned at the troublesome nature of the puritans, and the divisiveness they threatened to cause.

Queen Elizabeth thought well enough of Lancelot Andrewes to offer him two bishoprics in the 1590s: Salisbury and Ely. But Andrewes refused both offers, because the Queen was in the habit of helping herself to episcopal lands after the death of a bishop, as a kind of fee for the appointment of his successor. The crown had steadily helped itself to lands belonging to the Church in Elizabeth's reign, but Andrewes strongly disapproved of this practice of alienating land from the Church, and refused to go along with it. So he resisted promotion, not wishing to be a party to the impoverishment of the Church.

In 1603, when Elizabeth died, the world changed. As one can tell from the literature of the time, and from memoirs and diaries, the mood in the country changed from the frustration and negativity that had been so noticeable in the last years of her reign. Her conservative rule had oppressed so many of her most able subjects, and the country seemed full of well-educated men who found no adequate outlet for their talents. Promotion within the aristocracy had almost ceased. There was widespread anxiety about the succession. Parliament and the Queen were often on strained terms. The future of the Church was uncertain: would the bishops survive, or would the puritans prevail? All of these discontents were dispersed by the peaceful succession of King James of Scotland, and the national mood was transformed by the hopes that always attend a new beginning.

King James was full of hope and good intentions when he came to England. He was happy to escape from Scotland, where he was oppressed by Presbyterian lords and the Kirk, to England, where he became head of the Church, and where he could appoint the bishops who ruled the Church. He knew how troublesome it was to have divisions in the Church, and it was his sincere desire to heal them – personally. His chosen motto was ‘Beati Pacifici’ – Blessed are the peacemakers. It was a motto he tried hard to enact. His first speeches to Parliament were about creating a political union between England and Scotland, two nations that for centuries had been hostile to and suspicious of each other. Eventually, his peacemaking ambitions would extend to Europe, where Catholic and Protestant powers faced each other as enemies. By marrying his children to Protestant and Catholic partners, he hoped to bind the nations of Europe together in amity. But the most immediate place of discord, where he could apply his healing touch, was the Church of England. James did not want his reign to be shaken by the constant quarrels between the puritan and Anglican wings of the Church which had so disturbed the reign of Queen Elizabeth. So he determined to make the settlement of the Church his first priority. To do this, he convened a conference at Hampton Court in January 1604 to which he invited representatives of the two factions in order to discuss the matters of contention between them.

There was much to be debated about doctrines and church government, ceremonies and services. There was also the question of the Bible. In 1604, the two wings of the Church had their own bibles. There was the Bishops Bible, translated by a group of bishops at the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign, which was approved by the church establishment, and which was appointed to be read in churches. Every parish church possessed a copy. Then there was the Geneva Bible, that had been translated by a group of religious exiles in the reign of Queen Mary, when England had reverted to

Catholicism. This version was favoured not only by the puritan faction in the Church, but was also broadly popular across the nation for private reading. The reasons are understandable. The Geneva Bible was printed in clear Roman type, with some illustrations to liven up the text, it came in a convenient size, and importantly, it had marginal notes that provided a helpful commentary on the text, a commentary that made slighting remarks about earthly kings, and sympathised with puritan notions of worship. The translation was more fluent and expressive than the Bishops Bible, I would say. The Bishops Bible was large and cumbersome, and printed in old black-letter type, dense on the page.

The existence of two translations of the Bible in current use did not encourage unity in the Church, and the issue was raised at the Hampton Court Conference. There, the King presided over a group of bishops and deans and puritan representatives, along with some privy councillors. Lancelot Andrewes was present as Dean of Westminster. The King wanted to be personally in charge of settling the disputes of the Church, and he would have agreed with those contemporary flatterers in pulpit and pamphlet who compared him to the Emperor Constantine, who presided over the Council of Nicea in 325 AD to settle the disputes, especially those about the nature of the Trinity, that divided the early Church. King James enjoyed religious controversy, and he was himself an amateur theologian. As the conference got under way, disagreements over ceremonies in the Church and over the sacrament of baptism were aired, the use of the cross in services and of the ring in marriage were debated, and there were arguments over the way the Church should be governed. The puritans were not making much headway. Fairly late in the proceedings, John Reynolds, the President of Corpus Christ College, Oxford, and a leading puritan, requested that a new translation of the bible be undertaken, because of the unsatisfactory situation of

two competing versions. No doubt he hoped that the Geneva Bible would be used as the basis for a new translation, as it was the more popular version. But one should not discount his commitment to scholarly impartiality, for educated people knew that skills in the biblical languages had greatly improved since the previous translations, so greater accuracy could be expected.

King James responded positively to this suggestion. He saw it as an excellent way of bringing about unity in the Church, when all members would be drawing spiritual nourishment from the same bible. But he was quick to bring in qualifications. The new translation would use the Bishops' Bible as its starting point, and there would be no marginal notes – only cross references to other relevant verses in the scriptures. The King gave the new project a good deal of attention, and I think one can say that the King James Bible is the only enduring product of the Hampton Court Conference. The King chose the translators in consultation with Bishop Richard Bancroft, who had been the most active senior churchman at the conference, as Bishop of London. He would be promoted to Canterbury in the spring of 1604. Bancroft was a hard man one 178<sup>th</sup> century history I have read describes him as 'a man of rough temper, a stout football player'. He was severe against the puritans, and at first had argued against the need for a new translation, but once the king decided in favour, then he threw himself into the project with vigour, for Bancroft, like the king, as enjoying a new phase of life, and wanted favourable results. Later that year he would also draw up new canons – or rules – for the Church, to put his stamp on that institution. In the matter of the Bible, he recruited professors of Hebrew, Greek and Latin from Oxford and Cambridge, and the most learned bishop, and some skilled linguists in the clergy as the translators, forty-seven seven in all. Bancroft and the King, in selecting the translators, were remarkably fair-minded. For all their dislike of the puritan party,

they included several of its members in the team. The scholars were divided up into companies, six in all. Two companies were based at Westminster, two at Oxford and two at Cambridge.

The very choice of the word ‘company’ for the groups is interesting. It suggests a modern project, purposeful and up to date. In late Elizabethan times there was the emergence of the theatrical companies, and trading companies were multiplying at this time too. Think of the East India Company, the Muscovy Company, and the Virginia Company. Now we have the translation companies – this was business-like, and the term indicates the well-organised nature of the new project.

The Bible was divided up between the companies, into six large blocks of books. Lancelot Andrewes was appointed Director of the First Westminster Company, which was assigned the books from Genesis to II Kings, twelve books in all. Andrewes seems to have been regarded as the senior translator, because of his great reputation in Hebrew and Greek, and skill in other biblical languages such as Syriack and Aramaick. In addition, he was probably the most learned man in the country in patristic studies, the writings of the church fathers, and the practices of the early church. Andrewes’ company included two professors of divinity, and a professor of Hebrew, and the polylingual figure William Bedwell, whose knowledge of the oriental languages was remarkable. I have to say that it is remarkable how many excellent linguists there were in England at this time – and all this skill was acquired in the interests of biblical scholarship. Greek and Latin were taught in the grammar schools, and Hebrew was often offered as well. Hebrew was proficiently taught at Oxford and Cambridge as well. But there was a growing interest in what were called the oriental languages – Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Samaritan and even Ethopic. A few bold linguists explored these obscure languages, with much help from grammars from

the Netherlands. Always the aim was to get new angles on any material that might bear on early versions of the Scriptures, and on the writings of the early church fathers. Andrewes dominated the translators, with the depth and breadth of his knowledge. His qualifications in three areas: academic, as Master of Pembroke Hall; ecclesiastical, as Dean of Westminster, and linguistic. When translation got under way, however, he was not well pleased with the way things were progressing. Although surprisingly little detail has survived of the actual process of translation once the companies had been set up, we do have a note from Lancelot Andrewes in November 1604 that he wrote to the Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries to say that he could not come to a meeting that day, 'because this afternoon is our translation time'. 'Most of our company are negligent', he continued. This sounds like a serious complaint, and suggests that Andrewes was carrying a lot of the work himself. Indeed, Adam Nicolson in his recent book on the King James Bible goes so far as to ask the question: 'was Lancelot Andrewes himself the translator of Genesis and the opening books of the Bible'? We can't know of course, because there is no evidence, but the fact that the question can be asked indicates that Andrewes' contribution might have been very substantial.

We do know that Andrewes company met in the Jerusalem Chamber in Westminster, which was part of his deanery. This was the room where Henry IV had died, as Shakespeare had recently reminded his London audiences. It was certainly an appropriately named setting for the translation of the Bible. The routine that was followed was probably along these lines. Individuals would work on their assigned sections on their own, and then meet together to read over the versions, discuss them, correct and improve them. Vast numbers of books aided the endeavour: earlier versions of the bible in English, European editions of the bible in Greek and Latin,

and the polyglot bibles of the continent that printed the text in several columns, in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Syriack. Early manuscripts were consulted, as were the innumerable commentaries on the books of the bible that had accumulated over the centuries. Fidelity to the earliest texts was *so* important. An immense amount of scholarship went into the production of the verses that are so familiar to us.

Since Andrewes' company was entrusted with the first twelve books of the Old Testament, the question arises, how good was Lancelot Andrewes' Hebrew? In his published sermons and theological writings, occasional words in Hebrew occur, and are then explicated or discoursed upon, but their infrequency indicates that the language was not part of his public persona. Yet, he was sufficiently familiar with the language to pray in it. Of Andrewes' private life of prayer I have said nothing, but, of course, to him it was the most precious part of his life. He composed a lengthy collection of private devotions, with many prayers for daily use that he wrote in Latin, Greek – and Hebrew. He used this manuscript collection of prayers constantly. It has been described as 'a mosaic of quotations, in which the author draws freely on the Bible, the church fathers, early Christian liturgies and Jewish writings'. He was particularly attracted to the prayers of the Synagogue. Whenever he quotes from post-biblical Jewish literature, he preserves the original language, and Hebrew was for evidently him a powerful spiritual medium. Prayer was, for Lancelot Andrewes, the most serious activity of a Christian, and to pray in the biblical languages was intensely important to him. Certainly prayer shaped his daily life to a remarkable degree. According to his chaplain Henry Isaacson, who wrote his biography, he spent about five hours a day in prayer. Many of his prayers were penitential, and the manuscript he used was famously stained with tears. This exceptional commitment to prayer helped to create a considerable reputation for sanctity for Lancelot Andrewes –

but this reputation may have told against him when the post of Archbishop of Canterbury came vacant on Bancroft's death in 1610. Andrewes was perhaps considered too unworldly to run the Church of England in strenuous times, and being closeted in prayer for five hours a day was somewhat inconvenient for a major public figure. I suspect also that he was not a stout football player.

Well, in 1605, this colossus of learning, this miracle of holiness, came to Chichester. King James offered him the bishopric, and he accepted. Unlike Elizabeth, James believed in strengthening the Church. He wanted learned bishops, and he wanted the Church to be economically strong, and a pillar of the monarchy. At the beginning of his reign, he had given up the royal entitlement to deprive bishoprics of land when a see fell vacant. So Andrewes was willing to step up. He was at the height of his powers when he came here, with a long experience of authority from his time as Master of Pembroke, and as Dean of Westminster, both of which posts he now had to resign. He came with the reputation of an outstanding preacher, and he was the leading translator of the Bible. He also had good connections at court. Since Chichester was quite a poor bishopric, people here must have been astonished when a star like Lancelot Andrewes fell into their midst.

Why was Andrewes offered Chichester? Since the beginning of James's reign, six bishoprics had fallen vacant: London, Oxford, Bristol, Peterborough, St Asaph's and Rochester. (St Asaph's always seemed to be vacant, perhaps because no one could find it!). But why the King did not appoint Andrewes to one of the other sees is something of a mystery. London was too grand for a first appointment as a bishop. With the exception of Bristol, which went to the Dean of York, the other sees went to lesser men. Perhaps King James wanted to keep Andrewes in London? But there seems to have been a connection between Pembroke College, Cambridge and

Chichester, and that may be the explanation for his coming here. The previous bishop, Anthony Watson, had been a fellow at the college, and Andrewes' successor, Samuel Harsnett, had followed Andrewes as Master of Pembroke College. Watson had been a bit of a dead loss at Chichester. He seems to have done very little here, but bedded down comfortably in the close. He didn't even want to be a bishop, and he had even offered his patron the Earl of Leicester £200 on condition that he was never made a bishop. There was too much business, too much responsibility for him, for he was an unambitious man. But Queen Elizabeth promoted him nonetheless, for she liked compliant bishops, and she obviously found him acceptable. He was present at her deathbed – a momentous occasion – so she must have found him a reassuring presence. He was also present at the Hampton Court Conference where the Bible translation was agreed, but he said nothing. So after Bishop Watson, Bishop Andrewes must have seemed an awesome figure.

Chichester was quite a poor bishopric because Queen Elizabeth had greatly impoverished it, by taking away for the Crown eight of the thirteen manors that supported this bishopric by their rents. In Andrewes' view, this stripping away of church property was a form of sacrilege, and sacrilege was a matter that was very close to his heart. He had preached his doctoral sermon on the theme of sacrilege. (You had to preach a sermon as part of the process of gaining the degree of Doctor of Divinity). There he had denounced sacrilege as one of the prevailing sins of the age, and without mentioning names he had criticized this practice of seizing on Church lands for secular benefit. He would always feel strongly about the sin of sacrilege, and do what he could to defend church property.

Andrewes arrived in Chichester as a miracle of preservation, for he had just escaped destruction by the most violent means. He was consecrated bishop in Lambeth Palace

on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 1605, just in time for him to attend the opening of the new session of Parliament and take his seat in the Lords, where he would have been blown to pieces if Guy Fawkes's plot had succeeded. No wonder he preached so feelingly on the Gunpowder Plot for the rest of his life. King James instituted an annual sermon on the 5<sup>th</sup> November, when the mysterious ways of God's providence could be explored, and the Catholics condemned. Andrewes gave nearly all these Gunpowder Sermons before the King, throughout the reign, just as he gave many of the major sermons of the court year. These included the 5<sup>th</sup> November sermon, the Epiphany sermon on the 6<sup>th</sup> January, and the annual commemoration of another failed plot against the King, the Gowrie sermon, on the 5<sup>th</sup> August. These were highlights of the royal year, and James's satisfaction was complete when he had Andrewes in the pulpit, being learned, shrewd, and insightful. The style he developed for these occasions was terse and sharp. His genius lay in a spectroscopic analysis of biblical texts, identifying the minutest atoms of meaning that lay hidden in the sacred words. He exploited his philological talents to the full in the pulpit, and more than any of his contemporaries he demonstrated that the language of the Bible could yield inexhaustible significance. Time after time he circles back to a word, a phrase, a syllable in the text, to press out yet more spiritual wine for his congregation. His sermons are so tightly argued and so tautly phrased that they demand the utmost concentration for their understanding, yet Andrewes remained one of the most valued preachers at court throughout his life, a measure perhaps of the intellectuality of the court in religious matters.

His sermons at court were intellectually demanding, and I feel that he must have developed another style for Chichester, one that was more accessible, with something of a popular touch. But none of his sermons at Chichester were published, so we can only speculate.

When he took up his post at Chichester, he entered in a mood of humility, for he chose to add a motto to the seal of his bishopric, his coat of arms as it were, the words of St Paul, 'And who is sufficient for these things'. This sense of being unworthy of the responsibilities of spiritual leadership chimes in with many of his private prayers, where he frequently expresses his sense of unworthiness and sinfulness in the conduct of his life and in the presence of his God. This humility, and the need to bear it in mind constantly, daily, by means of a personal motto, was a spiritual condition that he passed on to his great admirer and friend, the poet George Herbert, who chose for his motto, 'less than the least of all thy mercies'. Such confessions were characteristic of sensitive and inward-looking Jacobean religious figures.

The kind of services that Lancelot Andrewes would have instituted at Chichester were most likely of a formal, ceremonious kind, for by the time he came here, he was moving towards his ideal of 'the beauty of holiness' in church services. One of the reasons why Andrewes is important in the history of the CoE is that he was in the forefront of the movement to develop what we would now call a High Anglican mode of worship. He liked to use the full liturgy of the prayer-book, he approved of the accompaniment of music to services – something the puritans were strongly opposed to – so the use of the organ and the choral singing of anthems would be required. Changes of vestments throughout the liturgical year would also be expected. Communion would be celebrated more frequently, for Andrewes became a sacramentalist, holding the sacraments of baptism and communion in high reverence. For him, the sacraments were the means by which the grace of God reached the individual, and they were much more important than sermons. The puritans in the church believed that sermons were the main agency of salvation, that one might be moved to repent, and experience the mercy of God, and feel called to join the elect

who would be saved - through a sermon. But Andrewes was sceptical of the redemptive powers of sermons. For him, participation in the eucharist was the summit of felicity. Later in his career, he would become especially attentive to the furnishing of the altar, honouring it with fine cloths and silver accessories – candlesticks, a cross, containers for the bread and wine – and he would rail off the altar as a sacred space that only the minister could access. But at this stage, here, he was only moving towards this larger appreciation of ritual. Always his practices were conditioned by his knowledge of Christian antiquity.

But there were more immediate things to be done in Chichester than enquire into the remote past. Buildings needed repairing, and Andrewes was active on that front, often paying from his own purse for the work, as at the Bishop's Palace. There was all the administration of the diocese to oversee. He held a visitation of part of the diocese in 1606, to check that services were being decently conducted, that churches were in good shape, structurally, and adequately furnished, that church festivals were being properly observed, that attendance was being enforced, that Catholics were being fined for absence, etc. There was the church court to oversee too. The records show that parishioners were being brought before the court for carrying coals on a Sunday, cutting corn and making stooks on a Sunday – remember stooks? – or for fighting in church or sleeping during service. Occasionally ministers were presented before the court for drunkenness or immorality. The usual sort of thing. Andrewes investigated a complaint that the church at Rye was being desecrated by being used as an arsenal, a prison, and a place of punishment and execution. Here, he did not move to stop the offence, in spite of his declared commitment to protecting the sanctity of church property. He discovered that the King approved this use, and Lancelot Andrewes was never one to contradict his King.

If this denial of his religious principles out of respect for worldly authority does not show him to advantage, we should also remember another of his failings: nepotism. Andrewes had a disagreeable habit throughout his life of giving his unworthy brother Roger offices in the Church. Here at Chichester, Lancelot gave Roger the living of West-Wittering and a prebend in the cathedral, then another living at Cocking, and soon he made Roger the Chancellor of the cathedral. All these posts brought in good stipends, and Roger, who was idle, overbearing and quarrelsome, did nothing in return for all these benefactions. When Lancelot moved to Ely, he made Roger Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, a position in his gift, but Roger overreached himself, and was eventually sacked by the Fellows for embezzling college funds. One should remember that Lancelot Andrewes was not all sweetness and light.

All during his time at Chichester, the translation of the Bible was being carried on. Andrewes would have been up and down to London a great deal, probably spending long periods in town. We know very little of the circumstances in which the translation went forward. Obscurity descends on the project. Some translators died, and were presumably replaced. The man who had first proposed the project, John Reynolds of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, died in 1607. He was part of the First Oxford Company, which was responsible for the Old Testament prophets – Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel & Co – and he was still translating on his deathbed. Seventeenth-century biographies of religious men usually culminated in an exemplary deathbed scene, and Thomas Fuller's *Life & Death of John Reynolds* describes how the First Oxford Company would meet in his college rooms while he was dying, with Reynolds assisting from his pallet bed. His last days were spent in prayer, in hearing treatises of devotion and books of controversy read to him, and in translating. As Fuller concludes: 'in the very translation of the Book of Life, Reynolds was translated

to a better life'. Lancelot Andrewes would have desired a similar end – minus the books of controversy.

Only the closing stages of the translation are recorded, thanks to some notes left by John Bois, a Greek scholar of St John's College, Cambridge, who was part of the Second Cambridge Company, which worked on the Apocrypha. He tells how, when all the companies had completed their tasks, two members from each company were chosen for a final committee of review. For nine months they met, maybe daily, at Stationers Hall in the City of London, to harmonise the whole text. For the first time, in 1609, the translators got paid. The twelve fortunate men received thirty shillings a week, a decent sum, for their final stint. King James was unable to pay any money, because he had emptied his treasury on profligate court entertainments, so this money was extracted from the Barker family, who had the monopoly of publishing bibles in England, and who would eventually bring out the Authorized Version. Some of the translators were clergymen in small stipends, who had beavered away for years, unpaid. The twelve men met together, one man read the submitted text, while the others sat with various versions of the bible in English and other languages in their hands. If they had any objections, they spoke up, if not, the reading continued. It was important that the final version was read aloud, and tested for rhythm and cadence, for the Bible was appointed to be read in churches, and its vocal power was critical. Bois' notes record one of the reviewers saying 'if the words are arranged in this way, the statement will be more majestic', and this is a significant note that is struck here, for it indicates that one of the stylistic effects that the translators aspired to was Majesty. Hardly surprising, given that the patron of the enterprise was the King. Certainly, many of the Old Testament passages we are familiar with have a characteristic slow, measured rhythm, aided by heavy punctuation. The stately tread

of the verses does have a majestic quality. But majesty of style is not particularly appropriate for the New Testament, for the N.T. Greek of the Gospels is characteristically plain, and sometimes rough, making use of a popular idiom. The beauty of phrasing and musicality we associate with the gospel narratives are not there in the original. They originate with Tyndale's translations in the 1520s and were improved in the Geneva version of 1560. These enhancements are part of the process of translation, whereby the character of the original is changed to suit a new audience, and the expectations that audience had of a sacred text.

This observation leads on to another: that the King James Bible was not so much a translation as a revision of existing translations. The Geneva Bible and the Bishops' Bible, with Tyndale in the background, provide much of the familiar phrasing. It is true that Hebrew, Greek and Latin texts were always consulted by the scholars of 1604, and the significance of the original meaning was constantly discussed. Innumerable alterations and refinements were made, and no one would question what an improvement over its predecessors the final version was in the matter of eloquence and authority, and in the almost miraculous shaping of language to idea. But we should not forget that the English framework for the 1611 Bible already existed, and what was offered to the people of England in 1611 was a magnificent revision.

We do not know if Lancelot Andrewes was one of the final revisers of the Bible. I would think not, for the time required was too demanding for a man of so much church business. He left Chichester in 1609, when he was promoted to Ely. We hear no more of his involvement with the new Bible, and he merges into the broad anonymity of the translators.

Obscurity clouds the details of the publication process. We do not know exactly when the new bible was published in 1611, and we don't know how many copies

were printed, or how much it cost. The folio edition was printed in black letter type, as the Bishops' Bible had been, but the quarto edition that followed was in Roman type. The new version made no great stir in the world, and it took a long time to be accepted as the standard version. It is worth noting that Lancelot Andrewes himself continued to use the Geneva Bible for the texts in his sermons. What are we to make of that? Probably that one stays with what one is familiar with, and Andrewes had been using that version all his life.

Andrewes career continued to flourish. After Ely he went to Winchester, and the High Church mode of worship that he evolved became extremely influential in the 1620s and 1630s. This ceremonial mode of worship was experienced by many churchmen in his chapel at Winchester House in London, a place of much resort by avant-garde clergymen. He died in 1626, and is buried in what is now Southwark Cathedral. Chichester was extremely fortunate to be the setting for part of his career, and it is good that we remember his this evening, for he was one of the great English churchmen.

*University of York.*