

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. III.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT ENGLISH DIVINES.

II. BISHOP ANDREWES.

BISHOP ANDREWES and Archbishop Laud are the two divines of the seventeenth century generally selected by medievalists of the present day as their patrons and protectors. They justify their own extravagances by claiming the authority of these learned theologians for them. The reason of this, in the case of Bishop Andrewes, probably is that most of his anti-papal polemics were written in Latin, not in the form of treatises, but unsystematically, in reply to Cardinal Bellarmine, and consequently they have not been studied or reproduced with care. They have never been translated into English, and are chiefly known by a few passages which, taken alone, may appear to bear an ambiguous sense. It will be the purpose of this paper to show, by his own words and teachings, that if the Bishop was profoundly catholic he was as profoundly Protestant, and that, being a man of the gentlest and most loving and devout spirit (as proved by his "Devotions"), he, nevertheless, had no sympathy and no tenderness for the medieval and modern Roman corruptions which were repudiated at the Reformation. Here and there the Bishop's arguments will be abridged, but never in such a way as to make an alteration in his meaning. The only difficulty is to know how to omit or abridge without injury to the cogency of the arguments which in their full form would be too long for these pages. We will begin by showing what was Andrewes' estimate of the Catholic faith, which was recovered by the Church of England at the Reformation, as opposed to Popery; and for the present we shall confine ourselves to extracts from his "Responsio ad Bellarminum."

Whether Papists or Protestants are the better Catholics.

"Right to reject the Catholic faith? The Cardinal would be glad enough to hear us say that; but he will never do so. It may be right, however, to reject the Papal faith. It were a vile thing to reject the Catholic faith unless you add the word 'Roman,' and so corrupt the term 'catholic.' The Catholic faith has suffered sore injury at your hands in Rome, and has contracted grievous defilements. It is no vile thing to reject these in order to cling to the Catholic faith, while repudiating your uncatholic corruptions" ("Responsio ad Bellarminum," p. 159, Oxford, 1856).

"We declare aloud that we are catholic, but not Roman,

the last of which words destroys the meaning of the first. We will never confine a word of so wide an import within the narrow limits of one city or one man's breast. The more that a man refuses to do that, the more catholic is he. What is sound we retain; what is old we restore; what is new, whether it comes from Rome or Trent, we refuse to acknowledge as catholic" (*ibid.*, p. 163).

"There is no part of the Catholic faith that we do not hold: those tenets of yours are patches on the faith, not parts of it" (*ibid.*, p. 485).

"Prayers in a tongue not understood of the people, the refusal of the cup to the laity, the celebration of the Eucharist without any communicants, kneeling to images, the right of the Roman Bishop to free subjects from their fidelity and obedience to their sovereign, and so on, were rejected and condemned by the ancient Church, and are rejected and condemned by us. For the first five hundred years there was no Christian Church or man who believed what you now believe in Rome, or acknowledged and accepted what you acknowledge and accept as your chief doctrines; nay, the greatest part of your dogmas were rejected by the Fathers in the very sense that you attach to them; if there are any that they accepted, it was quite in a different sense from yours. There is no important doctrine on which we are not at one with the Fathers and the Fathers with us. Wherever you differ from us, you differ from the Fathers" (*ibid.*, p. 69).

"We accept without hesitation Vincentius Lirinensis' definition: 'That which has prevailed always and everywhere and among all, that which has been believed always, everywhere, and by all,' let that be catholic. That rule of itself is the death of all your opinions which have crept in surreptitiously. Your transubstantiation is not 'always,' for it did not exist for twelve centuries. Your primacy is not 'everywhere,' for it is not throughout the East. But, says the Cardinal, the very name of Protestant was not heard for 1,500 years. Well, the name of Jesuit is still more modern. Circumstances gave us the name of Protestants. For we protested that we would not any longer endure errors and abuses, but would remove them. If you would allow those things to be reformed in your churches in which you differ from us (and there are very many in which we agree) peace would return to the world. We retort the argument: How can transubstantiation be catholic—that is, always believed? and concomitance? and one kind? I refrain with difficulty from asking this 'how' regarding a number more of your novelties" (*ibid.*, p. 25).

"'The Roman Church,' says the Cardinal, 'has got the

name of "Catholic." What! a part got the name of the whole—an individual got the name of the species? Let him tell that to his own *idiota*! For anyone who has the least smattering of learning recognises this claim at once as having a sound of Donatus, who said that Christ had deserted the rest of the world, and was not to be found anywhere except in Donatus' party. Donatus' assertion, however, is the least objectionable of the two, for he did leave a whole quarter of the globe to Christ, and did not thrust Him into one ruined city. The Cardinal is the worst, in so far as Rome is smaller than Africa" (*ibid.*, p. 163).

"It is contrary to the faith to make 'Roman' equal to 'catholic,' and contrary to reason not to acknowledge that the whole is greater than its part" (*ibid.*, p. 218).

Holy Scripture.

"Our savour is of the Scriptures alone, but everything with you is full of the fabricated opinions of men, out of which your faith is formed; so that what you cry up as a Rock is nothing but a heap of sand; they are only human opinions that you cling to as your Rock" (*ibid.*, p. 452).

"You never dreamed of translating the Holy Bible till we undertook the task. You resisted long; you fought with fire. Wherever you can and dare, you keep back the people from the sacred books. But why, when Moses, Paul, the Fathers, and especially Chrysostom, so earnestly and frequently urged their diligent reading, not only in church, but at home? Ay, let them read, let them understand as much as God enables them to comprehend, and if they are in difficulty let them have recourse to theologians!" (*ibid.*, p. 369).

"Don't accuse us for rejecting the Apocrypha from the canon of Scripture! We have received our canon from the Fathers of the Council of Laodicea. It is the same as that of Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Nazianzen, Amphidochius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome, Ruffinus, Damascene" (*ibid.*, p. 356).

The Sacraments.

"For more than a thousand years the number of Seven Sacraments was never heard of. How, then, can the belief in Seven Sacraments be catholic, which means, always believed?" (*ibid.*, p. 72).

The Eucharist.

"We are willing enough to grant that there is a memory of the Sacrifice in it; but we will never grant that your Christ,

made of bread, is sacrificed in it. The King knows that the Fathers used the word 'sacrifice,' and doesn't count that a novelty, but he ventures so to regard, and does so regard, your 'Sacrifice of the Mass.' Private masses he asserts to have been unknown to the Fathers—ay, and masses not private, in which you worship transubstantiated bread" (*ibid.*, p. 250).

"It would have been better for you, as many think, if you held the same faith that we hold regarding the Sacrament, and had not touched the giddy opinion of transubstantiation. For ever since you introduced it into Christianity so many thorny and knotty questions have been every day occupying you and your school, and their treatment has met with such ill-success, that it would have been very well for Christendom if, as the Fathers (by the acknowledgment of our English Jesuits) knew nothing of it, so their successors had never heard its name. Such are questions about the quantity of Christ when in the bread: 'Whether Christ is there in His own quantity or in the quantity of the bread' (Thomas Aquinas); 'Supposing He is there in His own quantity, whether it be in a manner that is not quantitative' (*ibid.*); 'Whether Christ's substance be there in the accidents without inherence' (*ibid.*), which is contrary to logic; 'Whether the word *frangitur* (is broken) is to be regarded as not in the passive voice, because Christ's body cannot be broken' (*ibid.*), which is contrary to grammar; 'Whether mice can live upon accidents' (*ibid.*); and 'whether worms can be generated from accidents' (*ibid.*), which is contrary to physics; 'Whether Christ is at the same moment resting still in the pyx in one place and is moving on elevation in another place;' and 'whether at the same moment He goes up when elevated by one priest and comes down when another lowers Him' (*ibid.*); and I don't know how many more questions. We may say about the whole matter: God made His Sacrament simple, 'but they have sought out many inventions' (Eccles. vii. 29). All this is, in fact, the Tridentine, not the Christian, faith; Christianity existed long before it was preached or believed" (*ibid.*, p. 14).

One Kind.

"On this point error begets error on error. Christ, says the Cardinal, instituted the Eucharist in so far as it is a sacrifice in both elements—in so far as it is a Sacrament in either of the two. For the essence of a sacrifice, he says, both are required, neither can be absent; if one be absent, the sacrifice is mutilated. For the essence of a Sacrament either of them is enough; which you please of the two is sufficient; either one or the other may be away, and yet the

Sacrament is not mutilated. This is magisterial enough, but it is the arbitrary dictum of the Cardinal. What Father says so? Where is the appeal to the first five hundred years?

“Under the species of bread, says the Cardinal, the Sacrament is entire; under the species of wine the Sacrament is also entire; and yet these two entire Sacraments are *not* two entire Sacraments, but only one entire Sacrament! Nay, more surprising still, under the species of bread there is the Sacrament, and under the species of wine there is the Sacrament, and yet they are *not* two Sacraments, and nevertheless they *are* two Sacraments! They are not two, but one, if haste is used—if a man takes them together at one time; they are not one, but two, if there is delay—if a man takes them at two separate times, or if two people take them at one time! When they are taken together, they are two parts of a whole; neither of them is itself a whole. When they are taken separately, they are two wholes, neither of them is a part—and so a part is equal to the whole! He receives as much who takes either element by itself as he who takes both at the same time! Who can understand this? ‘One not one,’ ‘two not two,’ ‘two wholes taken together are not two,’ ‘two are one if taken together,’ ‘two are not two unless taken separately.’ Why should the Sacrament be affected so much by time, when it is not affected by place?

“Then I have this inquiry to make: Why, on the theory that the blood is always with the body and the body with the blood, should the sacrifice be regarded as mutilated unless both kinds are present, and the Sacrament not? What becomes of the Cardinal’s doctrine of concomitance? In the sacrifice he rejects it; let him reject it, therefore, in the Sacrament! But he will not do so in the Sacrament. ‘*There,*’ he says, ‘either one of the two is sufficient’; just as if concomitance were kept at the door while the Cardinal was offering the sacrifice, and called in as soon as it had been finished. How can these things hold together?

“The Apostle finds the symbol of the body in ‘the bread which we break’; of the blood in ‘the cup which we bless.’ Reception of the bread is partaking of the body; the cup is the communication of the blood. A little below he says, ‘Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils,’ regarding the drinking of the cup with as great solicitude as the eating of the bread.

“But if the Sacrament is perfect, as you say, under the species of bread, why is the priest, when he comes to taking the Sacrament, not contented with that which is perfect? Why should he take more than that which is already perfect?

Why should that not be perfect for him which is perfect for the people? Or, why should he not be contented himself with what he desires them to be contented with?

“There is no analogy between this case and single or trine immersion. There is but one act of immersion in Baptism, but there are two acts in the Eucharist—of eating and drinking; and there are two subjects—bread and wine. Besides, here there is a positive command; there there is none. Christ gave no command about the number of immersions in baptism—whether it should be one or three; but He did give a command about both kinds in the Eucharist. He gave an express command—a command expressly obligatory on all. He said ‘Drink,’ as well as ‘Eat’; and when He said ‘Drink’ He added ‘all of you.’ If the Saviour had used that word ‘all’ after ‘eat,’ it would have been a great help to the Cardinal’s argument. But when Christ gives a command and uses the words of injunction, there is no room for the Church’s legislation, but only in cases where, as in immersion, He leaves it undecided. For if He had said ‘Dip once only,’ or if He had said, ‘Dip three times,’ I suppose the Church could not have changed the rule, nor would the Cardinal maintain that it would have a right to change it. But He did say, ‘Eat,’ and He said also ‘Drink,’ and ‘in like manner’; and He said, ‘Do this’ in regard both to one act and the other. By saying that, Christ closed the question; nor has the Church the right of leaving open that which Christ has closed; nor of ordering that one kind only be received when Christ twice ordered both kinds; nor when Christ enjoined, ‘Do this,’ in respect of both, expunging His Words in respect to one, and forbidding men to ‘do it.’ We may act as we please where no command has been given; but when He gives the command, ‘Drink,’ ‘Drink ye all,’ ‘Do this,’ it is no longer permissible or justifiable to disobey” (*ibid.*, p. 251).

Reservation.

“That carrying about of yours is against Christ’s command, and Scripture nowhere favours it. It is contrary to the purpose of the institution. A sacrifice has to be consumed; a Sacrament to be taken and eaten, not laid up and carried about. Let that be done which Christ desired when He said ‘Do this,’ and there will be nothing left for the priest to expose, or the people to worship, in the pyx” (*ibid.*, p. 267).

Purgatory.

“Let those who believe in purgatory take very good heed that they do not miss their road and find themselves in hell

instead of purgatory. 'For they are places near one another,' if we are to believe the Cardinal. The Pope, with his indulgences, has landed many of you in hell, while duping you with the hope of only getting to purgatory; perhaps if they had had only the fear of hell (and they would have had if they had not been deluded by that hope) they might have escaped hell" (*ibid.*, p. 222).

Supererogation.

"Unless a man has done all that God commands him and has paid the whole debt (and who has ever done that or can do it, when the Apostles themselves pray daily that their trespasses may be forgiven?) he is super-arrogant when he dreams of supererogation" (*ibid.*, p. 268).

Saint-Worship.

"'Come to Me,' says the Saviour—that is, according to Cardinal Bellarmine: 'Stay where you are, and send some go-between to Me; that is all that is wanted, though you don't come yourselves.' So 'Come' means: 'Don't come, let others come.' You make approach to the saints when you pray to them, the saints make approach to Christ, and Christ to God. This would be quite right if Christ had said: 'Go to the saints; let them come in your place; don't yourselves come to Me; it is just as good whether you come yourselves or the saints come for you.' But now, as He has said: 'Come to Me; come all of you, and I will refresh you' (by Myself surely, not by My ministers), why do we not go straight to Him, without a go-between, and ask of Him, but turn off to them and ask of them that they would be good enough to ask? Are there any of the saintly spirits with whom we can converse with greater safety and joy than with our Jesus? Is access to them easier? Have they more indulgent moments for speaking? Do the saints know more of our needs? Are their bowels of mercy more enlarged than Christ's? Is their goodwill towards us greater than His, so that our confidence should be greater when we are with them? Should any grace of theirs be more precious to us than Christ's promise, 'I will refresh you'? Should any nearness to them be dearer to us than Christ's instruction, 'Come to Me'? When you thus invoke the saints, you give them Christ's place; if you go to them, you put them in the place of Christ, for them to refresh you instead of Him. You take them as mediators with God, to obtain His pardon for you by their prayers. Paul and John never made themselves that, and had they done so, faithful Christians would not

have endured it, as St. Augustine (*Contra Parmen.*, ii. 8, 15) teaches" (*ibid.*, p. 242).

Angel-worship.

"Chrysostom points out that there were some who, from a spurious humility, said that we ought not to draw nigh to God by Christ but by angels, for it was too great a thing for us to go straight to Christ without the intervention of the angels; it was too much beneath the majesty of Christ that we should be brought nigh by Himself, and more suitable to our littleness that angels should perform that task for us. It was for this reason, says Chrysostom, that the Apostle occupied himself from beginning to end in the Epistle to the Colossians with Christ, dwelling upon the blood of His Cross, His passion, His love, in order to drive out that vicious humility and show that we might have access to Christ immediately and without angelic intervention" (*ibid.*, p. 245).

Image-worship.

"Both are wrong—to worship the creature either *for* or *with* the Creator. We say plainly that images are not to be worshipped, whether of false gods or of holy men. Why, holy men themselves are not to be worshipped, much less their images! The word 'worship' is taken from the second commandment, and Christ Himself has taught us that God alone may be worshipped. Let the Cardinal explain to us how it is that he gives to his images what the Law confines to God alone. Images become idols if they are worshipped, and the worship of idols is idolatry. The Law says nothing about an 'idol,' but forbids any 'likeness,' which covers both images and idols. Religious worship is due to God only. The Cardinal says that the worshipper does not worship the image, but kneels before the image and worships the saint whose image it is. The Cardinal, being learned in metaphysics, may do so, but what of the people? And, after all, what is this but the excuse of the heathen man in Augustine (in *Psa.* cxiii.) who said that he did not worship the image, but looked at the sign of that which he had to worship? Which of the ancient Christians ever practised image-worship? Which of them has allowed that it ought to be practised? Which of them has said that an image is not a 'likeness'? But God's Law prohibits 'every likeness'; be it an idol, be it an image, if it is a 'likeness' it is forbidden. 'Thou shalt not worship them' is prohibition, and there is no restriction nor distinction about this or that manner. Worship is declared proper to God alone. 'Thou shalt not worship any likeness.' Oh yes, 'thou shalt worship some likeness,' provided that thou

dost not worship it 'as God,' or that thou worshippest it 'as a likeness, not as an idol'—are not these precepts absolutely contrary the one to the other? Gregory I. says, 'Thou shalt not worship,' but what his piety forbade won its way by the devil's deceit, and prevailed two hundred years afterwards" (*ibid.*, p. 274).

"Certainly the images of the saints are not idols, but you make them idols by worshipping them and offering incense to them, as was done of old to the brazen serpent and is being done by you every day" (*ibid.*, p. 392).

Relics.

"The saints themselves are not to be worshipped, much less their relics. Not the saints—'God alone is to be worshipped'; so says Origen in so many words ('Contra Cels.,' viii. 26). 'We have learnt to worship God alone,' says Eusebius ('Præp. Evan.,' iv. 5). 'The nature of the Godhead is singular, and that alone may be worshipped,' says Cyril Alex. ('Thesaur.,' ii. 1). 'None, we read, may be worshipped except God,' says Ambrose ('De Spir.,' iii. 12). 'If it is an object of worship, how is it not God?' says Nazianzen (Orat. XXXVII.). Hardly would these Fathers worship the saints, with the Cardinal; still more hardly would they have worshipped their relics. Jerome says: 'We don't worship or adore, I will not say the relics of saints, but not even the sun or the moon, nor angels nor archangels, nor cherubim nor seraphim' (Ep. cix.). What can the Cardinal say when the old Fathers of the Church cry out, 'We don't worship the relics of the martyrs'? He is caught and held fast so that he cannot escape. Angels and saints stand on the same footing, and relics cannot be in better case than those whose relics they are" (*ibid.*, p. 61).

"The Cardinal will not allow the relics to remain quietly in their coffin; he disturbs them, brings them out, exhibits them, carries them about, pulls them asunder for the profit of the priest and for the cajoling of the people. What Fathers did that for five hundred years?" (*ibid.*, p. 274).

Worship of the Cross.

"Worship of the Cross is a Pagan, not a Christian practice, as stated in Minutius Felix's 'Octavius,' c. xxix." (*ibid.*, p. 270).

Vicar of Christ.

"Our desire is that the Holy Spirit should occupy the post that belongs to Him, and the Pontiffs come down from it and give up their lying title, which fourteen hundred years ago

Tertullian ascribed to the Holy Ghost ('De Præscript.,' xxviii.), and the Pontiff, with a few others, ascribes to himself. Perhaps he won't quarrel with Tertullian if he is granted the title of Vicar of God (which he has long been aiming at) instead of Vicar of Christ, so as to be able to dominate not only Churches, but empires" (*ibid.*, p. 292).

Papal Supremacy.

"The Fathers understand by 'Feed My sheep' 'Receive again from My hands the office of feeding: be one of the shepherds, though you have not deserved to be, after denying Me so often.' But your interpretation is a dream of your own, your gloss, not theirs. You say 'Feed'—that is, 'Be Supreme Pontiff and Ordinary Ruler'—'My sheep'—that is, 'over Apostles.' Or, 'Feed'—that is, 'Be the visible Head in My place'—'My sheep'—that is, 'Over the visible body of the Church.' Christ did not say *that* to Peter; much less to Linus, or Cletus, or Clement did He say: 'Feed My sheep'—that is, 'Let John, My beloved Apostle and Evangelist, be subject to you, Linus, or Cletus, or Clement; you are to be his visible head; he is to recognise you as his superior and pay you reverence; he must yield himself to you to feed him'" (*ibid.*, p. 295).

"Any primacy that Rome has come from the Fathers, not from Christ; and because Rome was the seat of the Emperor, not of Peter" (*ibid.*, p. 231).

"Gregory I. said: 'I confidently declare that whosoever calls himself Universal Bishop is worse (*præcurrit*) in his pride than Antichrist.' Now the name of Universal Bishop belongs to the Pontiff, and that by the gift of Phocas" (*ibid.*, p. 386).

"And who is more covetous and thirsty for gold than your Pontiff, by his indulgences, his jubilees, his tax-book of the apostolic chancery? Who is more elated at being carried, not on the back of an animal, but on the shoulders of men? Who prouder, trampling on emperors and telling them to lick the dust from his feet? Who equals him in pride, allowing himself to be written down, 'Lord God' ('Extrav. Joan,' xxii. 14), and not having the words deleted; admitting the titles 'divine' and 'omnipotent' as his own (Marta, 'In Ded. Tract. ad Paul. V.')

"Peter did not try to deprive Nero of his dominions, for it was difficult for him to believe that 'feed' meant 'deprive of his dominions.' Nor did his successors deprive of their dominions Domitian, Trajan, Decius, Diocletian. That is Thomas Aquinas's teaching, and Hildebrand first introduced

the practice. Let who will follow Thomas's teaching and Hildebrand's practice; we follow the teaching of Paul and the practice of Peter, and with them the teaching and practice of the whole primitive Church" (*ibid.*, p. 101).

Regicide.

"Did not the monk who took off Henry III., King of France, inquire of your theologians, and was not he sent away with the answer that it might rightly be done? Is not he praised for his act in your books and letters? And did not the last most monstrous assassin, the murderer of Henry IV., act purely from conscientious motives, his conscience being informed by your books? Why else were Mariana's books publicly burnt? Why else did the Sorbonne condemn them for heresy, and the Paris Court for treason? These things teach us not only that such assassinations take place among you, but that they are committed by your counsel and with your approbation" (*ibid.*, p. 392).

Old and New "Catholics."

The Cardinal having expressed a hope that James I. would return to the faith of his ancestor Donald I., the Bishop writes:

"It is very well that the Cardinal has named Donald I. For Donald was a Catholic of the old faith, and nothing could be more unlike these new Catholics of yours. Donald never believed that Pope Victor had any supreme right over things temporal; why, he might have heard that Victor was reprov'd by Irenæus, not so far from here, in France, for arrogating to himself more than was right, even in things spiritual, by uttering too hasty a sentence against the Orientals. I will venture to say that Donald never worshipped painted or sculptured images of wood or stone. He did not offer his prayers to God in a tongue that he did not understand. He was not robbed of the holy Cup. He would have shuddered at transubstantiation, concomitance, quantitative manner, indulgences, supererogations, as so many spectres. He never heard mention of the fire of Purgatory. He was not fed on accidents. He did not ever see the Sacrament carried about. These things of yours which now make a 'Catholic' (themselves un-catholic) he was totally ignorant of. The King sought back to the footsteps of his ancestors, and therefore especially of Donald; he has returned to them, he is earnestly entreating all others to return with him. He has become altogether like what Donald was, and what the kings his predecessors for many ages after Donald were. It is

certain that what things the King rejects now were then unknown to them, and that if any one had so much as named them, they would at once have been amazed at what they heard. The King believes and confesses everything that made them Catholics. For it is quite certain that the Kings of Scotland, and not the Kings of Scotland only, but all the other Christian kings in succession for some centuries, were Catholics by the singular blessing of God without these modern inventions of yours, introduced so long afterwards. At length, indeed, but after an interval of many years, owing to the sin of Christians, those novelties were superinduced by the craft of the Pontiff, and were sown while men slept in evil times, and so men turned aside from the way of their ancestors. Now the King has returned into that way, and is inviting all the rest to return with him. He hopes that they will take care to have that which was from the beginning preached to them; for those things were not so from the beginning which have been corrected by the King and the others. And from the piety and charity of his father and grandfather he has a confident presumption that, if they had seen and known what he now sees and knows, they would agree with him, and be of the same mind, and stand in the same steps. And what he assures himself respecting his ancestors, if they were still alive, he does not refuse to hope will be the case with the monarchs and princes his brothers and cousins now existing; but he desires and longs and prays God that they may take these things into serious consideration, and bring about on the first opportunity what he trusts they are really in their hearts intending; so that they, too, may go back to the steps of their ancestors, as the King has to his, and standing firmly in them in this life, may come in the future to where they have gone, crowned, together with them, both here and in heaven, and enjoy a blissful reign and everlasting life in heaven in company with those first Christian kings who were truly Catholics" (*ibid.*, p. 461).

Is it possible that the man who penned the above extracts (specimens of numberless others) can be justly appealed to as favouring a modern school of Medievalists that aims at bringing back tenets and practices which it is plain that the Bishop from his soul abhorred?

F. MEYRICK.

