# *Redire ad principia*: The Dance of Apophatic and Kataphatic theology in Lancelot Andrewes

*David Curry*
Rector of Windsor and Chaplain of King's-Edgehill Collegiate

T.S. Eliot's *For Lancelot Andrewes* brought Andrewes to modern attention beyond the insular confines of England.[1] Admired for his learning in his own time, Andrewes was forgotten in England until the nineteenth century when he was (re)discovered by the Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic divines. A celebrated preacher at the courts of Elizabeth and James, Andrewes stands in the moments of transition between the medieval world and the early modern world.

While Eliot's book is subtitled *"Essays on style and order"*, the essay on Andrewes is more than an affirmation of his literary accomplishments. Recognizing that his sermons "rank with the finest English prose of their time, of any time" (Eliot, 11), he notes that "the achievement of Hooker and Andrewes was to make the English Church more worthy of intellectual assent" (14), while discounting much in the way of "metaphysics" in the seventeenth century in general or "speculative philosophy" in the "writings of fathers of the English Church" in particular (13).

The linking together of Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes marks the beginnings of a wider appreciation of their thought. Eliot's essay on Andrewes led Nicolas Lossky, a Russian Orthodox scholar writing in French, to do for Andrewes what Olivier Loyer, a French Roman Catholic scholar did for Hooker.[2] The subtitle of Lossky's *Lancelot Andrewes, The Preacher (1555–1626)*, published in

1 Eliot, Thomas Stearns, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on style and order* (London: Faber & Faber, 1971). Though published in 1928, a version of the essay *"Lancelot Andrewes"* first appeared in the Times Literary Supplement on Sept. 23rd, 1926.

2 Loyer, Olivier, *L'Anglicanisme de Richard Hooker*, 2 vols. (Lille: Atelier Reproduction des Thèses, 1979).

1991, illustrates the intellectual and spiritual character of Andrewes' work, *"The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England"*.[3] That feature of Andrewes' thought complements Hooker's. The sermons express the mystical theology of early English divinity. Lossky affirms that "the best reflection on Andrewes the mystic is that by T.S. Eliot in his essay 'For Lancelot Andrewes'" (Lossky, 336, n.11). Yet their assessment of Andrewes' mystical theology does little justice to the Neoplatonic features of his sermons.

Eliot, commenting on Andrewes' "extraordinary prose", notes that "he is wholly in his subject, unaware of anything else" and that his emotion grows as he penetrates more deeply into his subject" (Eliot, 22). But in suggesting "that he is finally 'alone with the Alone' with the mystery which he is seeking more and more firmly" (24), referencing a commonplace associated with Plotinus,[4] he reveals an individualistic view of mysticism that does little justice to Andrewes' mystical theology which is resolutely corporate in its constant emphasis "that we are living members of his mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people" (Cdn. Book of Common Prayer, 1962, p. 85).

That emphasis is critical to the essential Catholicism of the English Church in its reformed character which Andrewes seeks to uphold. It conflicts, too, with Eliot's view that Andrewes has the *"goût pour la vie spirituelle"* (Eliot, 25), and that he is "one of the community of the born spiritual" (16). Eliot observes that in Andrewes "intellect and sensibility were in harmony" (16), the very thing which Eliot sought for himself in his poetic verse: a quality of integrity and comprehensiveness; a way of gathering into a fullness and a unity the fragments of modernity. Andrewes provides for Eliot the possibilities of a counter to the "disassociation of sensibility", which he argues occurred after Andrewes and Donne and "from which we have never recovered".[5]

3 Lossky, Nicholas, *Lancelot Andrewes, The Preacher (1555–1626), The Origins of the Mystical Theology of The Church of England*, trans. Andrew Louth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

4 Perhaps derived from Evelyn Underhill's *Mysticism* (1911).

5 Eliot, Thomas Stearns, review of *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century: Donne to Butler.* Selected and edited, with an Essay, by

Eliot's remark about the flight of 'the alone to the Alone' reveals a serious misconception about Neoplatonism. Lossky offers a magisterial and comprehensive analysis of Andrewes' sermons, but is critical of the term Neoplatonism, not only with respect to Andrewes, but also the Greek Fathers whose influence on Andrewes he wants to highlight. He claims that with the Greek Fathers "there has long been a tendency to emphasize strongly – too strongly sometimes – their debt to the Platonic school of thought", though defending the Greek Fathers as "never leav[ing] the Christian, biblical mystery shut up in a closed system" (Lossky, 344). Neoplatonism is seen as a closed system. In this he follows his father, Vladimir Lossky, who argues that the Fathers seek to transform "the theology of concepts into contemplation, dogmas into experience of ineffable mysteries" (344). This antipathy overlooks the ways Neoplatonism contributes to the shaping of theological life and thought in both eastern and western modalities.

The ordered and architectonic structure of Andrewes' sermons recall Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* as well as suggesting something of the character of Baroque fugues, themselves a kind of circling around a musical theme. The sermons draw us more and more into the mystery of God. They end almost invariably upon a sacramental note. The interplay of apophatic and kataphatic theology is kept in a perfect balance. The mystery of God is something which we can only come to through a kind of circling dance, each according to one's own capacities of beholding, and yet all participating in the mystery, all being drawn around and around and into the wonder of God. It is all in the turning.

Andrewes' sermons offer an intense journey into the mystery of God, a going forth and a return of the *principia* to us, with us, and in us. That they do so through "the idiom of Scripture", as Andrewes styles it, does not take away from the Neoplatonic features of his thought in the *exitus-reditus* structure

Herbert J. C. Grierson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921) in the *Times Literary Supplement*, October 1921.

of the sermons themselves and in the dance of apophatic and kataphatic theology which the sermons present, a kind of circling.

T.S. Eliot's poem, *Ash-Wednesday*,[6] shows the influence of a number of sources including Lancelot Andrewes' Ash-Wednesday sermon of 1619.[7] That sermon concerns repentance as an essential feature of mystical theology. "Repentance itself is nothing else but *redire ad principia*, 'a kind of circling'," Andrewes observes, "to return to Him by repentance from Whom by sin we have turned away" (Sermon IV, 358).[8] The text from Joel is about "turning unto the Lord with fasting, with weeping, and with mourning". Eliot's poem is shaped by that idea of turning.

The eight Ash-Wednesday sermons focus on the themes of repentance and fasting. The last four emphasize the importance of fasting for the English Church in the face of Puritan and Roman Catholic criticisms. But Andrewes' interest is more pastoral than polemical. While providing a kind of *apologia* for the English Church, his concern is about our being drawn more fully and completely into the mysteries of God revealed in Christ through the witness of the Scriptures and in the living tradition and life of the Christian Church, a tradition that embraces both East and West, both Latin and Greek.

> [That] which we call the Sacrament; the Greeks hath no other word for it but Μυστήριον, whereby the Church offereth to initiate us into the fellowship of this day's mystery. Nothing sorteth better than these two mysteries one with the other; the dispensation of a mystery with the mystery of dispensation. It doth manifestly represent, it doth mystically impart what it representeth (Sermon III, *Of the Nativity*, 43).

"The lessons which this day have been, and yearly as upon this day are read in our ears, do all speak to us of fasting", he

6 Eliot, Thomas Stearns, *Ash Wednesday* in *The Complete Poems and Plays, 1909–1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1971), 60.

7 See *The Annotated Text: The Poems of T.S. Eliot, Volume I, Collected & Uncollected Poems*, ed. Christopher Ricks, Jim McGue (London: Faber & Faber, 2015), 734.

8 For all references to Andrewes, see Andrewes, Lancelot, *Works*, ed. J.P. Wilson, James Bliss, 11 vols, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: J. Parker and Co., 1841–54).

says in Sermon V, *Of Repentance and Fasting* (375). The eight sermons comprise a comprehensive treatment of the meaning of Ash-Wednesday, doctrinally and devotionally considered.

The 3rd Ash-Wednesday Sermon preached before Elizabeth I in 1602 takes as its text Jeremiah 8, 4–7 on the question "Shall they fall and not arise? Shall he turn away and not turn again?" It focuses on the theme of turning and on the ways in which God turns us back to himself "when He calleth us to repentance" (339). The motive passion is sorrow, the idea of God's sorrowing for us which requires Andrewes to explain how one can speak of sorrow in relation to God. He observes that "sorrow many times worketh us to that, by a melting compassion, which the more rough and violent passions cannot get at our hands" (340). God's sorrow is expressed in terms of divine complaint. "That he complains of is not that we fall and err, but that we rise not and return not; that is, still delay, still put off our repentance", which is contrary, he says, to God's will and "to the very light of nature" (340). How are we to be moved and what does divine sorrow mean?

God entreats us in three ways. "The first by a gentle yet forcible expostulation, Will you not? Why will ye not?"(340). Andrewes' use of interrogative phrases has a personal effect, a form of rhetorical engagement as well as a dialectical dynamic that moves us more fully into the mystery being expounded. Andrewes, Eliot notes, is "the master of the short sentence" (Eliot, 21), of what we might call 'strong lines' which "seize the attention and impress the memory" (22), qualities that belong to his own poetry.

The second form of entreaty is "by an earnest protestation, how greatly He doth hearken after it" (340). The third is "by a passionate apostrophe, by turning Him away to the fowls of the air, that do that naturally every year which we cannot be got to all our life long" (340). Humans fail to do spiritually and rationally what the birds do naturally and instinctually in their cycles of migratory turnings.

What about the attribution of passions to God? "It is certain, the immutable constancy of the Divine nature is not subject to them, howsoever here or elsewhere He presenteth Himself in them. I add, that as it is not proper, so neither it is not fitting for God thus to express Himself" (340). This is the dance of apophatic and kataphatic theology. God is at once utterly and essentially distinguished from all and everything that belongs to the created order and yet God is also associated with the things of creation in one way or another. The distinction is critical. "That He, not respecting what best may become Him, but what may best seem to move us and do us most good, chooseth of purpose that dialect, that character, those terms, which are most meet and most likely to affect us" (340). It does not affect God; it is meant to affect us. God remains unchanged while he seeks to change us. Andrewes' Nativity Sermon of 1607 notes: "how or wheresoever it may be with men, with God it is not; He is not like to us; and howsoever, not here in this. For first, it is not in the shadow, show, or shape of flesh, but in the very flesh itself" (Sermon III, *Of the Nativity*, 38).

Negation and affirmation are more forcibly explicated in Sermon VI, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost* on the text, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God" (Eph. 4.30).

> But God forbid it should lie in the power of the flesh to work any grief in God; or that we should once admit this conceit, the Deity to be subject to this or the like perturbations that we be. And yet both this passion of grief and divers other, as anger, repentance, jealousy, we read them ascribed to God in Scripture; and as ascribed in one place, so denied as flatly in another…[9]
>
> How is it then? How are we to understand this? Thus; that when they are denied, that is to set out unto us the perfect steadiness of the nature Divine, no ways obnoxious to these our imperfection. And that is the true sound Divinity. But when they are ascribed, it is for no other end but even *humanum dicere*, for our "infirmity", to speak to us our own language, and in our own terms, so to work with us the better (213).

9 One where it is said, "it repenteth God He had made Saul king": in the same place by and by after, "the strength of Israel is not a man, that He can repent". One where, "God was touched with grief of heart"; another, "there is with Him the fullness of all joy for ever", which excludeth all grief quite. Sermon VI, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 213.

> By this time, we know how to conceive of this phrase aright [*"grieve not the Holy Spirit"*]. Now, how to have use of it. And of this *humanum dicit*, this use we may have. First, upon these places where we thus find affections attributed to God, our rule is ever to reflect the same affection upon ourselves which is put upon Him; to be jealous over ourselves, to be angry or grieved with ourselves for that, which is said to anger or to grieve God (214).

Repentance is a major and critical theme. Andrewes notes in his Ash-Wednesday Sermon preached before King James in 1619 – a sermon which particularly influenced Eliot – that repentance takes different forms but the idea of turning is the greatest. "Scripture", he says, "set[s] forth unto us the nature of repentance. Of renewing, as from a decay; of refining, as from a dross; of recovering, as from a malady; of cleansing, as from soil; of rising, as from a fall; in no one, either for sense more full, or for use more often than in this of turning" (360). The turning is about being moved by God and turning to him from whom we have turned away. That turning involves the whole of our being. Following his text from Joel, he develops how we are to turn "with the whole heart", "with fasting", "with weeping", "with mourning", and "with the rending of our hearts".

It means conversion and contrition, confession and satisfaction. Again, it is all a kind of circling. "For, as in a circle, I return to the first word 'now', which giveth us our time when we should enter our first degree; 'now therefore'". And when all is done we shall have somewhat to do to bring this to a *nunc*, to a time present. But besides that "now" at this time, it is the time that all things turn, now is the only sure part of our time. That which is past is come and gone, that which is to come may peradventure never come" (373). As in a circle, we are turned back to God from whom we have turned away.

The turning involves our whole being as the 7th and 8th of the Ash-Wednesday Sermons on the text from Matthew 3. 7, 8 about "bring[ing] forth fruits worthy of amendment of life, or repentance" show. The sermons argue for three fruits: prayer, fasting, and almsgiving. These works of repentance pertain to the three aspects of our humanity: spirit or soul, thus prayer; our bodies, thus fasting; and our worldly actions, thus almsgiving. The latter underscores the corporate nature of the spiritual life; it can never be

a solitary or individualistic pursuit. The sermons seek to move us more fully into the corporate mystery of our life together in Christ.

Christian life is about our comings and goings to God through God's comings and goings to us. Such divine motions are at once external and internal, temporal and eternal. The intent is that we be drawn more and more into the mystery of the triune God whose engagement with our humanity belongs entirely to the mystery of the divine life in itself.

Eliot's words in *Burnt Norton*, the first of his *Four Quartets,* about "time past and time future"[10] echo Andrewes' Ash-Wednesday sermon yet again. The gathering of time into eternity is an essential feature of Andrewes' sermons. Each mystery reflects and turns upon every other.

> The Holy Spirit is the Alpha and Omega of all our solemnities. In His coming down all the feasts begin; at His Annunciation, when He descended on the Blessed Virgin, whereby the Son of God did take our nature, the nature of man. And in the Holy Ghost's coming they end, even in His descending this day upon the sons of men, whereby they actually become "partakers", θείας φύσεως, "of His nature, the nature of God" (Sermon III, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 145).

While each sermon illustrates a kind of *exitus-reditus* structure, there are also moments when that structure is explicit within a sermon, such as the Whitsunday Sermon of 1611 which illustrates the interplay of the creedal mysteries, in this case, Ascension and Descent of the Holy Ghost.

> Which two feasts are both in the text, and the two main points of it. Here is an *abeam*, a going, and here is a *veniet*, a coming; Christ's going, that is the Ascension; the Holy Ghost's coming, that is Pentecost, the day which we now celebrate, as it were ἀντιβαλλόμενα, one to make amends for the other. And ye shall observe it is usual. Anon after Christmas-day, and the poor estate of Christ's birth, there cometh Epiphany with a star, and great men's oblations, as by way of compensation. Presently after Good-Friday and the sorrow of His passion, Easter-day followeth straight, the day of His triumph, to revive us again. And even so here, upon His Ascension or going from us, there ensueth Whit-Sunday, the mends together withal. No *impedit* without an *expedit*, no *abeam*

10 'Burnt Norton', in *Complete Poems and Plays*, 118.

> but a *mittam*; no going away to bring a loss, but a coming too to make a supply (Sermon IV, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 164).

The sense of coming full circle appears frequently in terms of Christ as "the author and finisher" of all things. It is the kind of circling whereby everything that goes forth from God returns not empty but complete and full.

> "Author and Finisher" are two titles, wherein the Holy Ghost oft setteth Him forth, and wherein He seemeth to take special delight. In the very letters, He taketh to Him the name of "Alpha", the Author, and again of "Omega" the Finisher of the Alphabet. From letters go to words: there is He *Verbum in principio*, "the Word at the beginning". And He is "Amen" too, the word at the end. From words to books, *In capite libri scriptum est de Me*, in the very "front of the book" He is; and He is Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, "the Recapitulation", or conclusion of it too. And so, go to persons: there He is *Primus* and *novissimus*, "the first and the last". And from persons to things: and there He is, "the beginning and the end"; whereof ἀρχή, "the beginning", is in Ἀρχηγός, the Author; and τέλος, "the end", is in Τελειωτής, the Finisher. The first beginning *a Quo*, He "by whom all things are made"; and the last end He, *per* or *propter Quem*, "by, for, or through Whom" all things are made perfect (Sermon III, *Of the Passion,* 162).

Eliot and Lossky are reluctant to acknowledge the reformed character of Andrewes' theology. Eliot contrasts, for instance, the sermons of Andrewes and Hugh Latimer. He regards Latimer as "merely a Protestant" whereas "Andrewes is the first great preacher of the English Catholic Church" (Eliot, 15),[11] claiming that between them, lies "the difference of negative and positive" (15). Latimer is Protestant and negative; Andrewes, Catholic and positive.

Lossky avoids the term 'Protestant' and seeks to disassociate Andrewes from Puritan sensibilities, particularly with respect to predestination. The argument is by way of the evidence of absence. Andrewes does not preach very much about predestination, which Lossky seems to assume is the *sine qua non* of Protestantism. After the Synod of Dort and in the face of theological and political pressures, Andrewes advised against any further addition of

11 Eliot found in Andrewes what Peter McCullough calls *"the fantasy of an 'English Catholic Church'". Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons & Lectures*, ed. Peter McCullough (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), xiii.

articles on predestination in *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*, content with the modest Calvinism of Article XVII. As he puts it in his Whit-Sunday Sermon of 1619, just after the Synod of Dort,

> "I speak it for this, that even some that are far enough from Rome, yet with their new perspective they think they perceive all God's secret decrees, the number and order of them clearly; are indeed too bold and too busy with them. Luther said well that every one of us hath by nature a Pope in his belly, and thinks he perceives great matters"(Sermon XII, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 328).

His Sermon *Of Justification in Christ's Name* (1600) complements Hooker's *Learned Discourse on Justification* emphasizing the differences between infused and imputed righteousness while insisting on the reformed concept that there is no inherent righteousness in us; it is all in Christ. The text is Jeremiah 24.6, "This is His Name whereby He shall be called, The Lord our righteousness" and the sermon examines the significance of this name, *Jehova justitia nostra*. A name peculiar to God, unique and not common with others at all, it has a unique application to us, our righteousness. This requires a clear distinction between human and divine reasoning.

"Because with men there be nominals and there be reals, names and things are many times two… but the names of God's imposition are not so. They ever carry truth in them … the perfection in His nature is such, as it can from us receive nothing" (*Of Justification*, 105). That becomes the basis of our being made righteousness. It is about what we receive from God alone and about our incorporation into God. Our own righteousness is less than nothing.

This shows the interplay of apophatic and kataphatic theology. Distinguishing between the divine and the human is altogether crucial but equally critical is the matter of distinguishing the different names of God himself. The name *Jehova* is unlike the other names of God such as those that have *El* or *Jah* in them. "The other Names of God are communicated to creatures. As the name of *El* to Angels, for their Names end in it, Michael, Gabriel, etc. And the name of *Jah* to Saints and their names end in it. Esaiah, Jeremiah, Zachariah" (109). But this is something

of another order that negates those relations. "To certify us therefore that it is neither the righteousness of Saints nor Angels that will serve the turn, but the righteousness of God, and very God, he useth that Name which is proper to God alone; ever reserved to Him only, and never imparted by any occasion to Angel or Saint, or any creature in heaven or earth"(109). With God "his nominals be reals" (Sermon IX, *Of the Nativity*, 142).

The sermon works through the terms *Jehova, justitia, Jehova justitia, justitia nostra*, and *nostra* and *justitia* before engaging with other theologians, both catholic and reformed, both Patristic and Medieval, about infused and imputed righteousness. The emphasis is on the absolute and complete form of divine righteousness in itself and then for us. "But if he be righteousness, and not only righteousness but ours too, all is at an end, we have our desires; verily this last, this possessive, this word of application, is all in all" (*Of Justification*, 111). For Andrewes *Deus in se* is always the ground of *Deus pro nobis* and for our participation in the *divinum mysterium*.

While Lossky's irenicism and ecumenism are commendable, they downplay Andrewes' apology for the theological legitimacy of the English Church in its reformed character and the western form of his theological discourse, particularly on the *Filioque*. Again, the argument is from the evidence of absence. Andrewes, Lossky notes, does not make reference to Augustine's *On the Trinity* when discussing the interpersonal relations of the Trinity (Lossky, 348).

Two points may suffice. First, Andrewes uses sources rather sparingly and only as they are integral to the specific arguments of the Sermons.[12] Secondly, for Andrewes the doctrine of the *Filioque* is fully part of his Scriptural exegesis and his way of thinking the Trinity. What is essential is the divinity of the Holy Spirit; each way of thinking the divine relations is to be granted legitimacy without forcing the East to follow the West or vice-versa.

12 As Peter McCullough writes, "Andrewes awaits a complete scholarly biography", *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons & Lectures*, xiv, n.9.

Fully aware of the debate about the *Filioque* (Sermon V, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 188), the controversy has no direct bearing upon his thinking while the *Filioque* remains an important feature of his mystical theology.

> Finding the Father giving here [the text is John 14, 15, 16], and the Son giving there, we have the proceeding of the Holy Ghost from both; *Quem mittet Pater*, "Whom the Father shall send", in the twenty-sixth of this [Jn. 14. 26]; *Quem ego mittam*, "Whom I will send", in the twenty-sixth of the next [Jn 15.26]. Called therefore "the Spirit of the Father", and again called "the Spirit of the Son", the Spirit of both, as sent and proceeding from both (Sermon III, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 155).

Lossky recognizes that the overarching logic at work in Andrewes' thought is Trinitarian. The Whit-Sunday Sermons especially illustrate Andrewes' Trinitarianism conveyed consistently in the form of the western discourse of the Trinity, namely the *Filioque*. Like Richard Hooker, he draws upon Basil the Great's treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* with respect to the importance of the doxology in the Liturgy as testament to the essential divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Andrewes is particularly careful about the language of the distinctions within the relations of the Trinity.

> Proceeding from them, and not by way of generation – that is Christ's proper; He is often termed, "The Only begotten", and so none but He – but by way of, *emitte Spiritum*, emission, sending it forth; that is, out of the very body of the word spirit, by spiration, or breathing. One breathing, yet from both; even as the breath, which carrieth the name and resemblance of it, is one, yet from both the nostrils, in the body natural (Sermon V, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 189).

This distinguishes what can be said about God as utterly distinct from anything natural and then allows for an analogy to the natural; in short, the dance of apophatic and kataphatic theology, a negating and affirming which is essential to the forms of our participation in the life of God.

> If "partakers of the Divine nature" we hope to be, as great and precious promises we have that we shall be, that can be no otherwise than by receiving One in whom the Divine nature is. He being received imparts it to us, and so makes us *Consortes Divinae naturae*; and that is the Holy Ghost (Sermon V, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 190).

The Sermons reveal Andrewes' commitment to a western understanding of the Chalcedonian definition and to the careful

unpacking of that teaching with respect to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Lossky speaks of Andrewes' eucharistic theology in terms of "Chalcedonian realism" (Lossky, 344). Thus Andrewes complements Hooker's unpacking of the definition in his preamble to the Sacraments in Book V of his *Lawes*. For Andrewes, the Chalcedonian definition and the *Filioque* are not abstract or dogmatic concepts but belong to the nature of his thinking about the mystery of God with us and about our participation in that mystery. The Nature, Persons, and Offices of Christ are matters which are essential to his preaching and belong to the order and intensity of the Sermons. It is the metaphysical and mystical dance of apophatic and kataphatic theology.

> The reason is, it is nothing here below that we seek, but to heaven we aspire. Then, if to heaven we shall, something from heaven must thither exalt us. If "partakers of the Divine nature" we hope to be, as great and precious promises we have that we shall be, that can be no otherwise than by receiving One in whom the Divine nature is. He being received imparts it to us, and so makes us *Consortes Divinae naturae*; and that is the Holy Ghost (Sermon V, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, 190).

"There is no truth at all in human learning or philosophy that thwarteth any truth in Divinity, but sorteth well with it and serveth it" (Sermon XIV, *Of the Nativity*, 245). All wisdom belongs to God, arises from God and returns to God.

> For look how we do give back that He gave us, even so doth He give back to us that which we gave Him, that which He had of us. This He gave for us in Sacrifice, and this He giveth us in the Sacrament, that the Sacrifice may by the Sacrament be truly applied to us (Sermon II, *Of the Nativity*, 30).