

Contents

EDITORIAL	2
RICHARD HOOKER: DEFENDER OF THE FAITH Roger Clarke	5
'AND LIFE IS GROWTH': THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRAYER BOOK Ian Robinson	17
VISIONS AND VALUES OF ANGLICANISM Tim Thornton	21
PRAYER BOOK PERSPECTIVES: GEORGE HERBERT AND THE PRAYER BOOK George Tolley	26
SCRUTINY (33): THE GENERAL CONFESSION Stanley Ward	29
ON USING THE PRAYER BOOK PSALTER J.A. Thurmer	32
AFTER THE SECOND LESSON AT EVENING PRAYER Courtney Atkin	34
KEEPING AN EYE ON OLD NICK Dewi Hopkins	38
LET ME COUNT THE WAYS C.R. Gregson	43
THE LOSS OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND ITS STRENGTHENED REAPPEARANCE P.M. Criddle	45
REVIEWS Ian Robinson, C.W. Kemp, J.R. Scrivener	48
A GODLY COMPETITON: THE COMMON PRAYER TRADITION IN LIVING USE Peter Toon	59
LETTERS	62
BRANCHES AND BRANCH CONTACTS	64

Editorial

It is a commonplace that older authors ‘speak’ to us not only in the degree that they are close to us chronologically, but in so far as they seem to address concerns which we can recognize as our own. Of course we can develop the ability to appropriate and ‘translate’ insights which seem at first sight very remote, and no one would wish to confine his attention only to writers who, by some narrow criterion of ‘relevance’, appear to be immediately usable. And of course too, it is one of the reasons for reading past literature that it lifts us out of the provincialism of the present, and enlarges our view. But having made these qualifications, most of us would still want to say, not only that some writers come home to us individually more than others, but that some writers speak more directly to our age than others. It sometimes surprises us that they do—you would not necessarily suppose that a book written four hundred years ago and unprepossessingly entitled *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* would be so directly relevant to present-day matters, but, as Roger Clarke unobtrusively brings out in the essay below, it is. Hooker’s intellectual opponents were hostile to ordered liturgy, to Episcopal Ordination, to Confirmation, to bishops, to church order generally as set forth in the Prayer Book: there are precise parallels to be found in our own time, as well as ones involving some extension or interpretation of Hooker’s argument (who doubts, for example, that ‘Lay Presidency at the Eucharist’ will presently become an ‘issue’?).

We may judge Hooker to have won the argument, but the cause itself was very nearly lost during the fifty or so years after his death, and if ‘1662’ represents its triumph, the argument is one that must ever be made anew. For John Selden was surely right in his observation of the opposition at a later stage—it was their distinguishing mark that ‘they would have no forms’.¹ And the dislike or fear of ‘forms’ is, after all, a permanent possibility of the Christian faith—how shall we be bound by rules and outward orders when ‘where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty’? The answer to this requires a complex and extended chain of reasoning:

Albeit therefore much of that we are to speak in this present cause may seem to a number perhaps tedious, perhaps obscure, dark

and intricate; (for many talk of the truth, which never sounded the depth from whence it springeth; and therefore when they are led thereunto they are soon weary, as men drawn from those beaten paths wherewith they have been inured;) yet this may not so far prevail as to cut off that which the matter itself requireth, howsoever the nice humour of some be therewith pleased or no . . . The stateliness of houses, the goodliness of trees, when we behold them delighteth the eye; but that foundation which beareth up the one, that root which ministereth unto the other nourishment and life, is in the bosom of the earth concealed; and if there be at any time occasion to search into it, such labour is then more necessary than pleasant, both to them which undertake it and for the lookers on. In like manner, the use and benefit of good laws all that live under them may enjoy with delight and comfort, albeit the grounds and first original causes from whence they have sprung be unknown, as to the greatest part of men they are.²

Arguing from first principles was never going to be short work.

Hooker died in 1600. The Puritans had their chance in the 1640s, and Selden (who had said of them ‘they would have no forms’) died in 1654, looking for better days. He makes an interesting witness: he was thought of in his own time as anti-clerical, and had been active on the Parliament side, at least in the earlier phase of its struggle with the King. And yet we find this in the *Table Talk*:

If I were a Minister I should think myself most in my office, reading of prayers and dispensing of the Sacraments . . . If a servant that has been fed with good beef goes into that part of England where salmon is plenty, at first he is pleased with his salmon and despises his beef, but after he has been there a while, he grows weary of his salmon and wishes for his good beef again. We have been a while much taken with this praying by the spirit, but in time we may grow weary of it and wish for our Common prayer. ’Tis hoped we may be cured of our extempore prayers, the same way the grocer’s boy is cured of his eating plums, when we have had our belly full of them.³

But doesn’t ‘Common Prayer’ limit the freedom of the Spirit?

Admit the preacher prays by the Spirit, yet that very prayer is Common prayer to the people, they are tied to his words as much as in saying ‘Almighty and most merciful father’. Is it then unlawful in the Minister, but not unlawful in the people?⁴

Doesn’t that apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the ‘choice’ and ‘diversity’

encouraged or consecrated in *Common Worship*? ‘Choice’ and ‘diversity’ have in any case been made a fetish of, as if they were intrinsic goods, even in an age characterized by what some think a ‘chaos of indiscriminate appetites’.⁵ It is an argument to which those who value liturgical worship and especially the Prayer Book must return again and again.

J.R.Scrivener

¹ He is discussing the use of creeds in church: ‘They like not Creeds because they would have no forms; no forms of faith as they have none of prayer though there be more reason for the one than the other.’ See *Table Talk of John Selden*, ed. Sir Frederick Pollock, London, 1927, p.39.

² Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 2 vols, London, Everyman Library, 1907; repr. 1969, I, 148–9 [Chapter 1].

³ *Table Talk*, ppfi.102–4.

⁴ loc. cit.

⁵ Edith Wharton, *The Custom of the Country*, 1913, ed. Stephen Orgel, Oxford, 1995, p.48. Edith Wharton evidently shares the view of her character here.

Richard Hooker: Defender of the Faith

ROGER CLARKE

Every Friday over breakfast I turn to the *Church Times*—perhaps you do too. It puts off for a few minutes the journey to the computer and the sermons that await me, and I tell myself it's good to keep abreast of what's going on in the Church of England.

I turn first to the advertisements of vacant parishes at the back (not that I'm looking for a move, but the grass is always greener on the other side of the hill), and I check through to see the parishes I know (though I have to say that often I don't immediately recognize them from their descriptions—such is the power of 'spin').

Then I turn to the appointments section, which is even more fun. Sometimes there is an appointment about which you say: 'that makes sense'. Sometimes there is one you simply don't understand, and you wonder if the bishop's eye has missed a line in the Diocesan Clergy list and the letter of invitation has been written to the wrong man (believe me, it *has* happened). And sometimes there is the sort of appointment to which your only reaction can be: 'Oh dear, there's going to be trouble there'.

That must have been the reaction of people in the know in 1584 when the appointment of the new Master of the Temple in London was announced. The Temple was and is the place of the lawyers, of the Inns of Court, and in the sixteenth century effectively a specialized university. Since a legal career often shaded into the political, this was a place of great significance, and the role of the Master, who was always in holy orders, was particularly influential. This was a key appointment.

In many ways the situation at the Temple and in the Temple Church was a microcosm of the Elizabethan Church of England. You may remember that the so called 'Elizabethan Settlement' was really a compromise between the Queen and her bishops and clergy. Her first

Archbishop, Matthew Parker, called it 'a golden mediocrity'—which is perhaps not the best phrase to use if you want to commend it to those on fire for the Lord. There was pressure from the radicals, whom we have learned to call Puritans, for further reformation. There were calls for the removal from the Prayer Book of the 'noxious' ceremonies and vesture that smelt of Rome, and some reformers called even for the replacement of the Prayer Book with the Genevan Service-Book (and there is evidence that some parishes even used it to supplement the Prayer Book or dispense with it). There were calls also for the reform or abolition of bishops and the establishment of a Presbyterian system.

All this was focused at the Temple Church. The previous Master, Richard Alvey, though sympathetic to Puritanism, had kept to the 1559 Prayer Book and the ceremonies of the Elizabethan settlement. However, he had been in ill health for years and much of the day-to-day spiritual care of the community of the Temple was in the hands of a man called Walter Travers. Travers was a leading Puritan, who looked to the worship and practice and church organization of Calvin's Geneva rather than Archbishop Whitgift's Canterbury. Travers had written treatises on the Presbyterian system and the necessity of further reform of the Church, and had taken the Puritan part in official debates. He was intelligent, well-read, and a powerful speaker.

Travers' position was that of 'lecturer'. This is a title you still see occasionally as a synonym for a curate in certain ancient parishes (Bolton, for example, or Halifax), but in those days a lecturer was appointed not by the bishop or the incumbent but by a trust, or a guild, or here by the lawyers of the Middle Temple; and inevitably he would be a Puritan. A lecturer was, if you like, a curate—but a curate over whom the incumbent had no control.

Travers had ridden the Temple Church hard towards Geneva during the 'interregnum'. The Prayer Book was hardly used, and if a liturgy was used then it was the Genevan Service-Book. There was an embryonic Presbyterian structure in the congregation since the sidesmen seem to have acted as 'ruling elders', and were of course all Travers supporters. Travers himself had the support of the Lord Chancellor: William Cecil, Lord Burghley.

So when the new Master was announced to be Richard Hooker, a young country parson and former Oxford don, things were going to be, shall we say, interesting. Hooker, though officially appointed by Archbishop Whitgift, seems to have been nominated by the Archbishop of York, Sandys, to whose son he had once been tutor. We know that Archbishop Sandys did not enjoy cordial relations with the Dean of

his Cathedral, a Puritan named Matthew Hutton, and people began to see in Hooker and Travers a re-run of Archbishop versus Dean. In any case, Whitgift had been charged by the Queen with breaking Puritan power in the Church. She had already effectively marginalized his predecessor Archbishop Grindal for being too sympathetic to the Puritan cause and Whitgift was more her sort of man, or at least knew it was politic to be her sort of man. So Hooker arrived as the one who was expected to bring the Temple back to the fold. And there is evidence that Travers had wanted the Mastership for himself and had already moved into the Master's house (rather as if the curate moved himself into the vicarage during the vacancy). You can begin to see, then, why the response to the appointment was the one I suggested earlier: 'Oh dear, there's going to be trouble there'; (Travers was also Hooker's cousin by marriage—and as you know you can choose your friends but you can't choose your in-laws ...).

In early 1585 Richard Hooker arrived at the Temple. Travers was firmly ensconced in the Master's house, and had a great deal of support, so Hooker was accommodated elsewhere, with a family called Churchman, whose daughter Joan he eventually married (so perhaps every cloud *does* have a silver lining).

The two first met in the Temple Church in late March 1585, on the eve of Hooker's first Sunday. Travers did not come alone, but with two men whom Hooker later described as 'collectors'—on the face of it they were sidesmen, but in fact they were lay leaders in the congregation, Presbyterian elders by any other name. There seems to have been a brief exchange about the status of these men, and then Travers moved to his chief suggestion: that Hooker should not take it upon himself to preach or officiate until the congregation had formally issued its 'call' to him to be its minister, which was basic Presbyterian practice. Travers (of course) would be willing to recommend him to the congregation.

To Hooker's credit, he reaffirmed the sufficiency of his appointment by Queen and Archbishop, but allowed Travers to nominate him to the congregation. At this point he desired to preserve the peace on inessentials, but the battle lines were being drawn.

Hooker's responsibility as Master was for the Sunday morning service, which he conducted in accordance with the 1559 Prayer Book—wearing the surplice, and reading the liturgy, which was normally Matins, Litany and Ante-Communion, with the Communion in full probably monthly and on festivals. Travers carried on with his afternoon preaching service, loosely based on the Genevan book—and the lawyers went to both, muttering about the new Master and

his strange ways.

Although we should note that Hooker and Travers maintained a charitable personal relationship, and spoke of each other in temperate terms, on Sundays there was a sort of ritualized warfare. Thomas Fuller, the seventeenth-century historian, tells us that ‘the pulpit spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon’ and that the lawyers were rather more assiduous in taking notes of the sermons than taking instructions from their clients. This was the best show in town.

Now you may think that the lawyers needed to ‘get out more’, as the saying goes, but in the sixteenth century the tasting of sermons was a major recreation. And of course what Hooker said in the morning Travers had the advantage of ‘correcting’ in the afternoon.

Travers had the edge for his hearers. They knew him well, for he had preached to them for several years, and he was, Fuller tells us, a capable and dramatic preacher. Hooker, by contrast, read his manuscript with his face down and ‘where his eye was fixed at the beginning, it was fixed at the end of his sermon’. His sermon style was ‘long and pithy, driving on a whole flock of several clauses before he came to the close of a sentence. The copiousness of his style met not with proportional capacity in his audience’.

The subjects in dispute ranged widely. We need to understand that the two men had common ground. It is a mistake to see Hooker as anything but a reformed theologian. He and Travers were agreed on justification by grace through faith, on God’s election and choice of his people, and therefore on predestination to salvation (although Hooker, unlike Travers, did not speak of double predestination—the doctrine that not only is there predestination to life, but also that some are predestined not to be saved). Where they differed was primarily on how to use Scripture. Does Scripture provide, as Travers and many Puritans would have said, the *sole* authority for the Church and for Christian life? Or is it, as Hooker came to argue, the *supreme* authority, so that in areas where Scripture does not give explicit guidance we may use the witness of tradition and God-given human reason, provided it is not in conflict with Scripture? We will see that this issue continued to be Hooker’s concern long after his Temple days.

It came to a head in the matter of the government of the Church, and how its worship should be ordered. Travers and the Puritans would have said that only what was expressly directed in Scripture was possible. They endeavoured to read Presbyterian practice into the New Testament, and to condemn bishops and the royal supremacy as perversions of the true gospel. Similarly the ceremonies of the

Church, if unscriptural, should be omitted, especially if they had any resemblance to the heresies of Rome.

This struck at the heart of that Elizabethan settlement which it was Hooker's task to defend, for it was he who, in his preaching and writing, turned a compromise into a theological system and a way of being Christian, a convenience into something coherent and full of grace. To be sure, he was not the first to try—his former tutor John Jewel, the late Bishop of Salisbury, had written an *Apology of the Church of England*, defending it against the assaults of Roman Catholic controversialists, and there were other defenders of the Elizabethan Church at this time—but it was Hooker who argued coherently and systematically for that way of being Christian which we now call Anglican.

This is to run ahead a little: when Hooker preached for Canterbury at the Temple his detailed writings were still in the future; but I want to show how the dispute with Travers made him concerned to explain and defend the Church he was part of, and to give it for the first time a structure—to make it not a leaden (or even a golden) mediocrity, but something creative.

Hooker and Travers argued from the pulpit Sunday by Sunday like a pair of homiletic prize-fighters. Things came to a climax in March 1586 when Hooker announced that he would preach on the matter of the Church of Rome. This was a daring thing to do. 'No Popery' was the common cry of the English in the 1580s—remember all this took place just two years before the Spanish Armada. Catholic Spain was a terrible threat, the Pope had excommunicated Elizabeth and absolved her subjects from any obedience to her, and many people had memories of the burnings of Mary's reign. To preach about Catholics was to take a grave risk.

The three sermons Hooker preached in March 1586 were certainly a risk. Ostensibly expositions of the Old Testament prophecy of Habbakuk, they are finely-crafted discussions of the nature of the Church. Hooker starts safely enough: he spends time proving that Rome is in grave error over justification, he reaffirms the teaching of Scripture and the Reformers that we are set right with God by grace through faith, and that works have no part in it. But then he moves on to discuss the salvation of Catholics, of those who are in error. Against the Puritans in general and Travers in particular Hooker affirms that there can be salvation in the Church of Rome, and that the Church of Rome is a true Church although in error. He says

shall I think, because of this only error [adding works to faith], that such a man toucheth not so much as the hem of Christ's

garment? If he do, wherefore should I not have hope, that virtue may proceed from Christ to save him?

Hooker tries to see the whole picture, and takes his stand on the mercy of God, not the beliefs of man, and he recognizes that God has not been rendered impotent by the errors of the Church over the centuries. People like Travers argued effectively that there had been no true Church from apostolic times until the Reformers, and everything in between was apostasy. Hooker's conception of the mercy and grace of God is too great for that—he allows that the Church of God has still existed throughout the thousand or more years of error, and reformation is exactly that: a re-forming of what is already there, not the creation of a new Church.

To be sure, what is contrary to Scripture must be discarded, and Hooker does this, but other practices are things 'indifferent', a phrase he borrows from Martin Luther, who was also happy to maintain some Catholic liturgical practice, provided that the gospel of grace was preached. Hooker's picture of Reformation is similar in places to the Lutheran: you take your stand on justification by faith, and how the Church is governed or how it worships is secondary to that; what has been inherited from the past can still be used, and used fruitfully.

Do you see? From this follows a sense of continuity with the Church of past ages, that same continuity which caused Thomas Cranmer to plunder the liturgical riches of the Catholic past for the common prayer of the Church, and to retain at least some unreformed ceremonies. If you want a scriptural text then it is Matthew 13.52, which is a good expression of our sense of 'tradition': 'therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old'.

Well, the three sermons on the matter of Rome, and their implications, brought matters to a head. Travers and others complained to Bishop, Archbishop and Privy Council that Hooker was preaching treason. Hooker defended himself and accused Travers of undermining his ministry. Somehow, despite Travers having powerful friends in Lord Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's spymaster, Hooker came out on top.

On Sunday 23 March at the afternoon preaching service, as Travers was actually climbing the pulpit steps, a messenger (a 'sorry fellow' Travers called him) arrived from the Archbishop, inhibiting him from preaching and suspending him from his post. Ostensibly this was on the grounds that he had not been ordained by a bishop (he had received Presbyterian ordination in Antwerp), would not be re-

ordained by a bishop, and would not use the Prayer Book, but it still seems amazing, given the climate of the time, that Hooker won.

What seems likely is that the Privy Council, even if they thought Hooker ill-advised, inexpedient, or just plain wrong, could not be seen to be backing such a maverick as Travers. To remove Hooker would be to undermine Episcopal and royal authority—so Travers had to go. Travers, incidentally, stayed on in the Master's house for a year writing polemical tracts, until the men of the Temple reluctantly decided they couldn't afford to sponsor him in this and turned him out. He later became Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, where his anti-Catholic sentiments could be of some use to the government—he died during the Civil War at the great age of ninety-five, and was writing furiously until his eighties.

What is clear is that Hooker's career never developed further after this. On leaving the Temple in 1591 he was appointed to a living in Salisbury diocese, but stayed in London researching and writing, employing a curate (presumably more amenable than Travers had been) to do the work. In 1596 he moved to be Rector of Bishopsbourne in Kent, and died there at the young age of forty-six in 1600. Church and State had defended him, but he had gone a little too far. If sixteenth-century archbishops kept a 'Lambeth list' of clergy who put their foot in it, as we are told twenty-first century ones do, then Hooker was probably on it. But if he never achieved high office in the Elizabethan Church, the last ten years of his life were important for the Church of England way beyond the sixteenth century. Because from 1590 Hooker, if you like, 'writes up' the debates at the Temple in his massive *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

It's sad that the *Laws* are not read now in the way they once were. I have them in two volumes in the Everyman edition, which I bought in the seventies, but I discover they are no longer listed. In fact there is now no easily-accessible edition published in this country. I can recall no mention of Hooker in my training at Cuddesdon twenty years ago (and if he was not mentioned at Cuddesdon where would he be mentioned?), and most clergy of my generation have never heard of him. Admittedly he is not easy to read: the books of the *Laws* are like his sermon—driving a whole flock of clauses before he comes to the end of a sentence—but persevere with them and you find riches and depth and beauty.

Hooker's *Laws* give the Elizabethan settlement a foundation it otherwise did not have, for they turn it from a compromise, at best grudgingly accepted, into a way of being Christian, and draw out the riches that many did not recognize or accept to be there. They write

up the content of the debates at the Temple, but are also replying to the writings of Travers and of Thomas Cartwright, the other major Presbyterian and Puritan leader.

Some scholars think that the *Laws* were occasioned by the infamous Marprelate Tracts of 1589—a sort of ecclesiastical *Private Eye*, pillorying the bishops, and published by underground presses that moved around just one step ahead of the authorities. They are extremely funny, and potentially very damaging (the difference from *Private Eye* is that John Penry, the supposed author of the Tracts, was hanged, whereas Ian Hislop just appears on *Have I Got News for You*).

As the title *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* suggests, Hooker was writing about the structure of the Church and its forms of worship, and there is great detail, chiefly because of the great detail the Puritan critics went into. There is material about the role of bishops; unlike some later writers such as Lancelot Andrewes, Hooker doesn't regard bishops as essential to the Church and acknowledges the validity of Presbyterian ordination (he had no problem in principle with Travers' ministry). His lucid comment on Presbyterian and Episcopal government is essentially that 'silver be good, but gold be better'. There is copious detail about the Prayer Book, and a defence of common prayer (Travers' Puritan services tended to be ministerial monologues) and of the concept of liturgy itself.

Many Puritans departed even from the forms of the Genevan Service-Book in favour of spontaneous prayer or material composed by the minister. You can see the outcome of that in the Westminster Directory of Public Worship with which Parliament replaced the Prayer Book in 1645. It is simply a book of guidelines for composing and leading worship, not texts. Hooker spends much time arguing the importance of common prayer—prayer that is not dependent on the whims and feelings of the minister, but is the prayer of the whole Church. Doesn't that need to be said and listened to now? And Hooker makes his defence, and indeed exposes the weaknesses of his opponents, in a gentle, reasoned and balanced way. It is rarely passionate but it is sane, and is supported by copious references to the Scriptures, the early Fathers and Reformers, including Travers' beloved Calvin. And there is a delicate humour too, so delicate and ironic that his opponents did not always realize they were being teased.

For example, Hooker addresses the complaint that the Prayer Book services were too long. We might agree with the complaint since Matins, Ante-Communion and sermon add up to about two hours (more, if sung), but the Puritans were hardly given to excessive brevity themselves, and it was a bit rich to speak as if the length of

Prayer Book services was a sin crying out to heaven for vengeance. Hooker writes:

Do we then continue as Ezra did in reading the Law from morning to midday? Or as the Apostle St Paul did in prayer and preaching, till men through weariness be taken up dead at our feet? [Note the allusion to Eutychus falling out of the window when Paul preached at Troas in Acts 20] The huge length whereof they make such complaint is but this, that if our whole form of prayer be read ... we spend ordinarily more time than they do by half an hour (*Laws*, V.xxxii.4)

Time and again Hooker pricks the pomposity of his opponents, and cuts them down to size.

But there is far more to Hooker than good knockabout stuff, or even detail with which to defend Prayer Book principles. Though there is attention to minutiae, the value of the *Laws* is the broader canvas. Hooker has a sense of proportion. He identifies what the real issues are, and their theological basis.

We've seen how the interpretation of Scripture was a key issue. Did the Scriptures provide minutely detailed guidance for the Church and its worship, so much so that if a thing was not in Scripture it shouldn't be tolerated? That was the extreme Puritan line. In addressing this issue, Hooker doesn't just refute and gently ridicule the lengths people go to in reading their particular preferences into the Bible—he refuses to play the game of bandying texts around at all.

No, he makes the point again and again that Scripture, as the sixth Article has it, 'containeth all things necessary to salvation', but that it doesn't claim to provide warrants for everything. There are areas where there is no clear warrant—in that case, provided it doesn't contradict Scripture, a practice can be tolerated or even valued (in fact Hooker is probably closer here to Calvin than either Cartwright or Travers, as David Atkinson, an Evangelical scholar, has demonstrated in a recent book).

For Hooker the Church can live with variety and development (isn't Article XXXIV, 'Of the Traditions of the Church' saying the same thing? And the Preface to the 1662 Prayer Book written by Bishop Sanderson?). It doesn't have to be a slavish imitation of the Apostolic Church—the centuries between their time and Hooker's have something to contribute. He goes to the heart of the matter when he says:

The glory of God and the good of his Church was the thing which the Apostles aimed at, and therefore ought to be the mark whereat

we also level ... the faith, zeal, and godliness of former times is worthily had in honour; but doth this prove that the orders of the Church of Christ must be still the selfsame with theirs, that nothing may be which was not then, or that nothing which then was may lawfully since have ceased? (*Laws*, IV.ii.3)

And so the axe is put to the root of the arguments of those who try to transplant the whole of the first century into the sixteenth: first century zeal and saving faith, yes; first century practice, not necessarily.

Hooker's vision of the Church is one in which Scripture is primary for essentials, but where there is freedom to draw on the richness of tradition and where Christians are able to use their minds on matters 'indifferent'. Tradition, if it be in keeping with Scripture, has its place, as does human reason—not some dry intellectual exercise, but something implanted by God.

Hooker's vision is one of breadth, and one which can tolerate variety and live with diversity. The much misunderstood '*via media*', the middle way, is about an ability to live with variety and to know what is really important. In essentials unity, in non-essentials diversity, in all things charity—that is Hooker's vision. And it is a vision that is aware of the mystery of God (not mystery in the detective story sense, but in its technical, theological sense), aware that language and words cannot finally encompass the nature of God and the faith revealed to the saints, but are ways into the mystery, or, as Augustine has it, 'alternatives to silence'.

Right at the start of Book I of the *Laws* (and there are seven books) he sets out his sense of the mystery of God, and the limitation of human words and ability. It stands as a preface to all that follows:

Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High; whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of his name; yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know him not as indeed he is ... his glory is inexplicable, his greatness above our capacity and reach. (*Laws*, I.ii.2)

Prayer and worship and theology approach the mystery but will never exhaust or evacuate it.

Hooker is not a man for ideology; he does not feel the need to be unnecessarily stiff and dogmatic. He will not, in the words of the Welsh poet Euros Bowen, allow 'the word of Grace to become an ideology of Christ'. He is firm on the essentials, but lives with what we might call a reverent agnosticism in other areas, and knows that

there is yet more to be said and that even when it be said the mystery of God's love in Christ is not exhausted.

This is above all true when he speaks of the Eucharist—and here I want to draw to a close. People have wanted to read into Hooker their own position about the nature of the presence of Christ at the sacrament. At times Hooker sounds like a Receptionist: the real presence of Christ's body and blood, he says, is not 'to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' (Laws, V.lxvii.6.). At other times he talks of the objectivity of the gift and the fact that the consecrated elements are instruments of what they signify, although as a theologian indebted to Calvin he holds off from Lutheran consubstantiation or any too close definition. Hooker holds together two approaches to the sacrament—the objectivity of God's gift there, prior to human faith, and the necessity of faithful reception. And what did the words of administration in the 1559 Prayer Book do, but exactly that? 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' There's the objective gift: no doubt. 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.' There's the faithful reception: essential.

Beyond that Hooker won't define. He confesses a real participation of Christ, but confesses that the full meaning is beyond him. Perhaps you know the rhyme attributed to Elizabeth I?

'Twas God the word that spake it,
He took the Bread and brake it;
And what the word did make it;
That I believe and take it.

Hooker says that too, but says it better and with devotion:

This bread hath in it more than the substance that our eyes behold,
this cup . . . availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and
body . . . with touching it sanctifieth . . . it truly conformeth us unto
the image of Jesus Christ; what these elements are in themselves it
skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the
body and blood of Christ . . . why should any cogitation possess the
mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God thou art true,
O my soul thou art happy! (Laws, V.lxvii.12)

Theology, worship, word and sacrament lead into the mystery and wonder of God and you cannot say that about every piece of theology, least of all from the sixteenth century.

So what is the importance of Richard Hooker? Clearly his story

ought to be better known, but it is more than that: Hooker provided a rationale for a Church that was just becoming aware of itself as more than a mere compromise or convenience; he provided a defence, an apologia, for a Church Catholic and Reformed, expounding its liturgy and worship as an expression of that; he demonstrated a way of doing theology that allowed mind and heart to engage, open to the richness of the past and recognizing the hand of God in the tradition of the Church and in other Christian bodies; and he showed us a theology that was done humbly, in awareness of the glory of God.

There is a need for people like Hooker now within our Church of England, when Church history is often ignored, when tradition is misunderstood and despised, when liturgy (any liturgy, sometimes) is disparaged, when common prayer has so often broken down, and when so much in Christian life and worship has evacuated a sense of the mystery of God.

It is said that John Henry Newman wrote in his journal on the eve of his submission to Rome: 'Dear Church of England—you first taught me to love my Saviour, but you did not teach me to love you'. We have need of those who will teach us to love our Church and that rich and fruitful way of being a Christian that is Anglican, and who will enable us to help others find the Saviour there.

Hooker begins the *Laws* by saying 'our safest eloquence ... is our silence ... therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few' (*Laws*, I.ii.2) So I will take a leaf out of his book, and end there.

TEXTS AND STUDIES

The first five books of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* were available in the Everyman series, Nos. 201 & 202 (London, 1965).

An accessible recent study of Hooker's life and work is *Richard Hooker: Prophet of Anglicanism*, by Philip B. Secor (Tunbridge Wells, 1999), although it tends a little too much to creative reconstruction. There are however useful quotations of a number of the Temple sermons.

Nigel Atkinson's *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason* (Carlisle, 1997) is a useful exploration of Hooker's reformed credentials, stressing that in a number of areas he was closer to Calvin and the other continental reformers than was Travers.

There is a useful exposition of Hooker's Eucharistic theology in *Covenant of Grace Renewed* by Kenneth Stevenson (London, 1994), a study of classical Anglican sacramental theology that deserves to be better known and more widely read.

(The Revd Roger Clarke is Rector of St Bridget's, West Kirby. This paper was originally addressed to the Manchester Branch of the Prayer Book Society, and published in the Manchester Papers series.)

‘And Life is Growth’: the Development of the Prayer Book

IAN ROBINSON

Some of the most archaic features of language are also the most everyday. I cannot think of a new strong verb (the sort that forms the past tense by vowel change, not the addition of –ed) introduced into English in the last five hundred years, but strong verbs are still used, quite possibly more frequently by word-count than weak ones. The vainglorious actors who offer to bring Hamlet or Macbeth to life, then get in the way of the superabundant life they already have, are not to be emulated; the Prayer Book, however great its antiquity, is alive and kicking as long as it is allowed to be. When the ordinary daily papers want a religious phrase they take it from the King James Bible or the Book of Common Prayer. Nevertheless life, as Leavis used to say, is growth.

The Prayer Book Society, committed to allowing the continued life of the Book of Common Prayer, should be doing more to allow its language to grow.

One of the most serious disservices of the new liturgies of the last half century has been to put a stopper on the native tradition of religious English. Since the most recent revision of the Prayer Book in 1662, there have been several important developments in worship. Rightly or wrongly, for instance, harvest festivals have made their way into the calendar. We have an excellent form for the comparatively recent Nine Lessons and Carols, in a style in evident concord with that of the Prayer Book. That service was possible because it preceded the liturgical ferments by a few years: it was begun at Truro in the late nineteenth century and developed by Eric Milner-White at King’s College, Cambridge in the early twentieth. But there is no version of

harvest festival fit for the Prayer Book.

Hymns have become, since 1662, generally accepted in the worship of the Church of England, and we have a great (if quite unregulated) body of hymnody, for the most part in the ordinary style of religious English, the best-known sign of which is the use of the second person singular. The disgraceful decision of the editors of *Common Praise*, the new edition of *Hymns Ancient & Modern*, either to suppress any such hymn of the late twentieth century, or to rewrite it in the 'modern' idiom, is a direct inhibition on the natural growth of the language. It is simply not true that all new hymns are in the 'modern' style. When I floated the idea a couple of years ago of the Prayer Book Society having its own hymn book I was offered some good new hymns almost at once. On the other hand I doubt whether there can be such a thing as a good new hymn in the idiom, for instance, of the drastically simplified new alternative collects. What amounts to censorship by the dominant 'modernizing' faction means that good new hymns will never be heard, and the language for writing them will seem more and more remote, without being replaced.

Being composed out of a long tradition and a good sense of what human life and the divine both are, the Litany has stood the test of time, a remarkable example of how perennial the Prayer Book is, and it needs little to bring it up to date. All the same, there are some circumstances of modern life not envisaged in 1544, which could find a place there. The 1928 inclusion of 'air' in means of travel, for instance, seems uncontroversial.

The 1662 collects, for the most part Cranmer's, are not all equally wonderful, though many are unequalled: but we are unlikely to improve on them and should probably let well alone. There is, though, a constant demand for occasional prayers both local and national. At St John's, Cambridge the last prayer in every Evensong is for the College itself, for love of the brethren and sound learning, and what could be better? When the other year the royal yacht *Britannia* succumbed to national parsimony, a decommissioning service was held, with well-composed occasional prayers in the ordinary, traditional idiom. Should not the Society be active in setting standards for new work in prayer?

Some of the Homilies need revision and there is a need for some new ones. Anyone who thinks that sexual laxity was less of a threat in Cranmer's day than it is now should read 'Against Whoredom and Adultery', which is bang up-to-date. But in the nature of human change we have moral concerns that did not arise in the sixteenth century. The use of money is a perennial problem (and opportunity)

but it takes different forms. A homily appropriate to our world is called for.¹ The proper use of sound learning was hardly a problem for the sixteenth-century minority of the educated, but now that education is compulsory and 'tertiary' education increasingly obligatory, there is a clear need for explanation of how education belongs to the Kingdom of Christ, and how it does not. Etcetera.

The original Homilies were set forth by authority, conspicuous by its absence in our time. But would not a church in even a moderate state of spiritual health see the necessity for bringing out a supplementary volume?

Then the Prayer Book itself. It is an important fact that in all the multivolume outpourings of new 'worship material' of the last quarter of a century, no new catechism has been attempted in the Church of England. One cannot help suspecting that the reason for this, and for the absence of new homilies, is that there is no longer sufficient agreement within the Church about what the Christian life consists in to make a catechism possible; in fact the notion of instruction in the faith has a rather unfashionable sound, as limiting the freedom of the individual. Myself, I am happy with the Prayer Book Catechism. We are very unlikely to improve, for instance, either on its doctrine of the sacraments or its formulation of how we are called to lead a Christian life. But though the Catechism has elements that seem eternal, it was nevertheless, naturally, a product of its age, and embodies a picture of social life which, though some of us may still accept it, is not a necessary part of Christianity. The plight of the Church today is that the authorities could not be trusted to make the adjustments which may be thought desirable without wrecking the beautifully pithy writing, and at the same time incorporating unscriptural social ideas that are unlikely to last as long as the ones the Catechism already has. That is our dilemma; but is it not one that should be faced by a society committed to allowing the Book of Common Prayer to go on living?

Realities of politics have changed since the seventeenth century. It is easy enough to make 'all that are put in authority under her' embrace the Government and Parliament, but there is still a case for the wording of the state prayers to be closer to the present. If a precedent is required it is to be found in the modifications of the Prayer Book for nations where the Church is not established, for instance the Republic of Ireland and the United States of America. 'We are taught by thy holy Word that the hearts of Kings are in thy rule and governance.' Perhaps also, though it may sound a taller story, the hearts of presidents and prime ministers? As a member of a party committed to extricating the United Kingdom from the European Union I might privately pray for

their knavish tricks to be frustrated, but while the reality is that 80% (measured in kilometres) of English law is made in Brussels, should not a contemporary prayer book recognize the reality?—though at least as long as the Church of England is by law established, prayers for the Monarch should continue, and not be left disused as in a number of cathedrals and churches.

We advertise ourselves as not being Prayer Book fundamentalists, though in the sense of believing that the Prayer Book is fundamentally right I myself would gladly embrace the title. But we can admit that there are occasional errors. For instance the Visitation of the Sick: is not the doctrine that sickness is always ‘fatherly correction’ sent to individuals for a particular cause at least in need of refinement? Perhaps this is one of the rare cases where scientific development can affect Christian doctrine: if we can avoid plagues by inoculation does not that alter the old view of plagues as providential correction? The Prayer Book is magnificently scriptural, but how, in any case, does the doctrine here square with Luke 13.4? That we should pray for grace to suffer patiently and be ready for death is another matter, strongly present in the Prayer Book form, which perhaps should be given more prominence.

As for more drastic revision, the experience of the last century strongly suggests that without royal authority to enforce conformity any large innovations such as the ones proposed in 1928 will only divide the Church. As a political and historical judgement it seems to me that no important doctrinal modification of the Prayer Book, for instance the optional reinstatement of doctrines of transubstantiation, prayer to the saints, or prayer for the dead, could succeed within anything at all like the historic book.

I do think, though, that within the Prayer Book Society all these matters should be under serious consideration.

The hostility to religious style from the 1960s onwards and the accompanying misunderstanding of the importance of style have been fatal to ‘modern’ liturgical work. We need to recognize that for genuine development we have to start, gratefully, with what we have. But that is not to say there must be no development.

¹ The recent *Being Human*, published on the authority of the Church of England Doctrine Commission, offers, self-consciously, ‘wisdom’, which (setting aside questions about whether the target has been hit) is not quite the same thing as authoritative moral teaching.

Visions and Values of Anglicanism

TIM THORNTON

Collect for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity

O God, the protector of all that trust in thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy: Increase and multiply upon us thy mercy; that, thou being our ruler and guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal: Grant this, O heavenly Father, for Jesus Christ's sake our Lord. Amen.

The Book of Common Prayer has played, does play, and will continue to play, a central role in the life of the Church of England and the Anglican Church. I was asked to talk about the Visions and Values of Anglicanism. I would like to spend some time considering the question of context, and noting the inevitable and ever-present limitations of 'events' (as Harold Macmillan called them), and then to try and draw out some of the key values of Anglicanism and give a few pointers about the future as I see it. Inevitably, in talking to such a gathering as this, I am nervous; partly because I am aware of the concern of many that the Book of Common Prayer is under threat, and that therefore as a Bishop you may listen to my words even more carefully than usual, to see if I am, in your view, undermining it; and partly because I am increasingly aware of how complicated life is, and that when you make public statements they are open to misinterpretation. I am, however, very happy to take questions and to continue a dialogue. In fact, that is the first point I want to stress. As many of you will know, the very first words of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer are these: 'it hath been the wisdom of the Church of England ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it'. In other words, there is an acceptance that, in the Church of England, we will

always have a debate, a dialogue, a range of opinion, and thank God for that, say I. The Church of England was not created by a committee which drafted a carefully worded constitution. The Church of England as by law established means settled not founded. The Church of England originated in compromise, and through its history has tried to lead a way between extremes. This then leads me to note that the Church of England will always be involved in movement and—yes, I dare to use the word—change. For the reality is that implicit in upholding the middle way is an assumption that there is movement and dynamism, and that, as I will try to demonstrate, the two extremes will be and are always changing themselves. One of the reasons why I chose that Collect for prayer at the beginning is that it makes the point that our task is to concentrate on the things eternal and not get caught up or distracted by the things temporal. One value of Anglicanism, therefore, is that we should strive to sit light to the things of this world so that we can point people to the things of God.

I made an assertion about our role being one that inevitably involves movement, change and dynamism, and I therefore need to give evidence for that, and there is no better place to start than the Book of Common Prayer, or better person than Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556). There are many ironies in life, and one of them is that I was given this title by the Prayer Book Society: *The Visions and Values of Anglicanism*. I could point out that ‘Anglicanism’ is not a word that Cranmer would have recognized. Even more of an irony is that the Book of Common Prayer is dated 1662, so long after Cranmer’s martyrdom. And more than that, the Prayer Book is the result of a long process of revision and significant change—I need only mention 1549, 1552 and 1662. So there is evidence of change, and the need to recognize a process rather than a static, once-for-all statement. More than this, I want to remind you that one of the great influences on Cranmer was the early church, the Fathers, Patristics; he was a member of the *ad fontes* movement, which can be translated ‘back to basics’. He saw his role as trying to help the church rediscover its roots and in public worship to place again before people much of the thinking and work of some of the key early church Fathers. Thus it seems clear that the Prayer Book is real work in progress, noting the provisional nature of the world in which we live. It ought not to be seen or used as a static ‘pickled in aspic’ document. It gives us courage and permission—indeed it urges us—both to look to our past, note our present and all the while keep our focus on God—the things eternal.

The fact that we do so often use the term ‘1662’ to speak of the Book of Common Prayer is important and I want to look at the context and

what that says about vision and values.

First of all, to repeat, 1662 is a long time after the first Book of Common Prayer. It is impossible to sum up in a few sentences over a hundred very complex and dense years of history. However, one important point is that this was a very different time from now. I say that especially in trying to understand what the *via media*, this holding the two extremes, might be about. I would like to quote some words of William Lamont relating to Richard Baxter, in the same period:

The world where the King is equated with God and the Pope with Antichrist, where witches fly in the night and women give birth to monsters, where Jesuits peddle lies and the Apocalypse conveys truths—this is the world of Richard Baxter.

That for me makes a crucial point very graphically. Here we sit thinking about the role of America as the superpower, the secular nature of the country, the cult of celebrity, the throwaway nature of our consumer society, or whatever. Our mind-set, the values, if you like, that are in common today, are very different from those of the fifteenth, sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. Indeed, further than that, the mind-set of the 1530s was very different from that of the 1560s, and entirely different from that of the 1660s. If that is a fair point to make, I wonder what implications it has for the word ‘common’ in the Book of Common Prayer. Prayers written and used in public then were inevitably and rightly to some extent shaped by and a result of the context of the time. I would give two examples, which I hope are relatively clear and fairly non-controversial. First, the third Collect for Good Friday in the Book of Common Prayer contains this phrase: ‘Have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels and Hereticks’. That list is there because of the historical context; understandably, many would feel uncomfortable about using that prayer in public today. Then in the Articles, Article XVII, Of Predestination and Election: I suggest that the idea of predestination (not to mention double predestination, infra- and supra-lapsarianism and the damnable lump) is not being discussed in the public bar of the Pig and Whistle on a Friday night. But these things were being discussed during the time of the formation of the Book of Common Prayer. That leads me back to the point about the middle way. For we cannot really understand the thrust of much of the worship and language in the Book of Common Prayer if we don’t understand who, as you might say, were the enemies, or the extremes, that were around. One extreme were the Puritans and the extreme Reformers, a group, or collection of groups, who are hardly in evidence at all today. The other extreme were the Roman Catholics,

but not necessarily perceived as doctrinally so distinct so much as politically real enemies. What is it that it says in the Articles? 'The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm'. It is a political point, not a doctrinal one.

All I have tried to do so far is to state that the Book of Common Prayer was written in history and comes out of a context, or a series of contexts. We have to note that and know something of it if we are to try and distil the vision and values of Anglicanism.

Let me then try and do that. I am clear that the Book of Common Prayer is alive and well in the Church of England and will remain. It is good that it has been given a proper centrality in the life of our church and I do think that *Common Worship* has given the Book of Common Prayer a higher profile. My view is that the *Alternative Service Book* was a dangerous time for the Book of Common Prayer. In other words, the 1980s saw the Book of Common Prayer under threat, whereas now I do not see it so. I think there are theological values which relate to this. In the 80s and 90s there was a prevailing ethos emphasizing the individual and the immediate. This penetrated into church life—look at the hymns written: 'I like Jesus—Jesus likes me'. In technical terms, there was a concentration on the immanence of God, as opposed to God's transcendence. In such a context, the Book of Common Prayer would be under threat because a key value of Anglicanism which is evident throughout the Prayer Book is the transcendence, the otherness of God. I am delighted to say that the context has changed and I perceive a mood increasingly abroad for people to search for 'the other', to look again for the majesty, the awesome wonder of God. So people are not unwilling to be stretched in worship. A complete failure of the *Alternative Service Book* was to have any poetry or rhythm. It was written by committee and it is interesting to note that perhaps the only prayer which is surviving, the post-Communion prayer 'Father of all', was, I understand, written by one person.

A second value of Anglicanism is again seen in the idea of the middle between two extremes, or, as the Preface puts it, the work of the Church of England is to try and keep the two extremes together. This work of reconciliation is very difficult and leads to potential conflict. We see it in parishes and at a national level. I take this to mean that there is an acceptance that different people like different things and that the church can and should incorporate these differences. Indeed, a key value and a vision of Anglicanism ought to be living with difference. The history of the Book of Common Prayer has examples of both good and bad practice in these terms. However, I would suggest that the wording of the Communion service, and especially

the consecration prayer, does in fact allow, and deliberately allow, for different interpretations. I do not find such a book as that by Colin Buchanan entitled *What Cranmer Really Meant* very helpful. I certainly believe that Cranmer meant to mean different things. He tried to keep it broad and succeeded. I am not quite old enough to remember the time when very different churches of differing traditions, be it high or low, would all have used the Book of Common Prayer words and yet placed very different emphases on them.

A third key value, and part of the view of Anglicanism that I see in the Book of Common Prayer, is very different for us today. We live in an increasingly secular age when Christianity is pushed (and sadly often, in my view, leads the way) to the margins. There is a gulf between 'society' and 'church', or there is in people's minds. At the time of the Book of Common Prayer this was not the case. Christendom was still a real state. So in the Book of Common Prayer the language underpins the essential link between church and world, or, even more, there is no distinction between church and world. So, for example, the introduction to prayer in the Communion service is with the words: 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth'. What do we get when we come to the *Alternative Service Book*? 'Let us pray for the church and the world'. Such dualism is wrong and is not there in the Book of Common Prayer. It makes the Book of Common Prayer difficult for some in our modern day, when we are all too willing to accept that there is a distinction between world and church.

I am an optimist; I do not see an end to the use of the Book of Common Prayer—rather I see it being used in many, many churches; but not as a static, museum-like object. I see the theological values and views which underpin the Book of Common Prayer at the heart of the Church of England and therefore that the Book of Common Prayer should be and will be used as a part of the dynamic, moving, forward-looking church. I go back, finally, to that collect:

O God, the protector of all that trust in thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy: Increase and multiply upon us thy mercy; that, thou being our ruler and guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal: Grant this, O heavenly Father, for Jesus Christ's sake our Lord. Amen.

(The Right Revd Tim Thornton is Bishop of Sherborne. Bishop Thornton's address was given to the Salisbury branch of the Prayer Book Society, in October 2002.)

George Herbert and the Prayer Book

GEORGE TOLLEY

George Herbert's poems are a glory of English spirituality, an Anglican treasure. But what of his religious observance? He is remembered for his faithful ministry at Bemerton, yet that was confined to the last four years of his life. In particular, where did George Herbert stand on the Prayer Book? The forty years of his life (1593–1633) were years of almost continuous bitter controversy about both the Prayer Book and most things to do with the Church of England. Banned by Queen Mary Tudor, the Book of Common Prayer had been reintroduced by Elizabeth, but many Bishops and clergy had refused to use it and as a consequence lost their livings. With the accession of James I in 1603, the Puritans pushed hard for radical changes with the Millenary Petition. James responded with the Hampton Court Conference at which the Puritans were out-manoeuvred and out-voted. They had their revenge forty years later when, in 1645, both Prayer Book and Bishops were abolished.

What were the influences upon George Herbert that moulded his approach to liturgy and theology and led him, in his parish ministry, to be a devoted user of the Book of Common Prayer? First, undoubtedly, his mother, Magdalene, a woman of learning and piety, of grace and taste. For herself and her family there were prayers morning and evening from the Prayer Book, the singing of Psalms every Sabbath evening and regular and frequent Church attendance. Her devotion to the Church of England was complete. When Herbert entered Westminster School at the age of twelve, Lancelot Andrewes, Dean of Westminster, was about to leave to become Bishop of Chichester. Under Andrewes' direction and influence the services at Westminster were what we would call High Anglican, the preaching of the highest

standard, the exposition of Scripture meticulous and inspired.

At Trinity College, Cambridge, Herbert would find a great contrast, for Trinity was markedly Protestant with strong Puritan leanings. There, as a Fellow, he continued his studies of Divinity. As Public Orator of the University he was charged with the important and delicate task of writing Orations to the King and important patrons and benefactors of the University, tasks of demanding diplomacy calling for exemplary learning and wit. His circle of friends was wide, covering the whole spectrum of opinion on matters ecclesiastical and theological. He was not a one-party man. We might perhaps have expected him to be a mere dilettante, swaying with the wind of fashion. Either that, or we could accept the picture painted by Izaak Walton in his *Life of George Herbert*—loveable, naïve, uncomplicated. But we cannot ignore the genius of his poems, the scholarship of his writings, his learning and his devotion to religion throughout his life. His tolerant spirit denotes a liberal magnanimity, not lack of principle or conviction.

Herbert shows his doctrinal hand in his *Briefe Notes to The Hundred and Ten Considerations* of Juan de Valdes, which he would have read in the original Italian. In his *Notes*, Herbert reaffirms the supremacy of Scripture, the necessity of the discipline and order of the Church alongside personal inspiration, and his full acceptance of the doctrine of grace through faith. In his epigrams *Musae Responsoriae*, dedicated to the King in 1620, he roundly condemns Puritan rejection of infant Baptism and stoutly defends the wearing of vestments and use of the sign of the Cross and an ordered liturgy.

Walton, in his *Life*, writes of the diligence of Herbert in his Bemerton ministry, ‘appearing constantly with his wife twice every day at Church prayers, strictly at the canonical hours of 10 and 4, attended by parishioners and many gentry from the neighbourhood.’ But, twice weekly, he would walk to Salisbury for Choral Evensong at the Cathedral. Whilst at Bemerton he wrote *The Country Parson*, a manual of instruction and inspiration for the parish priest whose high calling he described as that of ‘the deputy of Christ for the reducing of man to the obedience of God.’ His guiding principles were: ‘let all things be done decently and in order’, and ‘let all things be done to edification.’ Assiduous performance of parochial duties drew strength and purpose from private prayer and regular public worship using the Book of Common Prayer. In this he was following the example of his dear friend Nicholas Ferrar and his Little Gidding community.

Following the customs of his day he would celebrate Holy Communion monthly, including Easter, Christmas, Whitsunday, Harvest and the beginning of Lent. He accepted preaching as a high

duty and great responsibility, for, to the country parson, the 'pulpit is his joy and his throne.' He would tell his congregation that 'sermons are dangerous things, for none goes out of Church as he came in, but either better or worse.' He was strict in his use of the Prayer Book Catechism, 'partly for obedience to authority, partly for uniformity sake, that the same common truths may be everywhere professed.'

In his poems 'Matins' and 'Evensong', Herbert takes us beyond the words and order of service to the purpose and spirit of worship. 'Matins' begins:

I cannot open mine eyes,
But thou art ready there to catch
My morning-soul and sacrifice.

God is always ready to hear and to receive us, and the act of morning worship guides us to open our hearts and minds to be ready to acknowledge God. True, we are too ready to think of other things, of the world and its affairs, not its Maker, but Matins reminds us of God's nearness to us, his daily sustenance:

My God, what is a heart,
That thou should'st it so eye, and woo,
Pouring upon it all thy art,
As if thou hadst nothing else to do?

Herbert would have us acknowledge that each day's new beginning carries with it the promise of the constancy of God's love.

In 'Evensong' Herbert reflects the themes of the Prayer Book service: thanksgiving for the day that is coming to an end; regret and penitence for failings; comfort and assurance in God's forgiveness; the promise of new beginnings ('new wheels to our disordered clocks'). And, undergirding all, the surety of God's love:

My God, thou art all love.
Not one poor minute scapes thy breast,
But brings a favour from above.

Herbert wrote two poems on Holy Communion and in many of his other poems there are reflections upon the theology of the sacrament. We can see in these poems a perceptive analysis of the doctrinal controversies which the Prayer Book sought to resolve. He refutes transubstantiation, rejects the mass as a continuing sacrifice, and emphasises the gift of grace in the sacrament, bringing renewal and restoration. The enormity of Christ's self-giving on the Cross overwhelms him:

If all men's tears were let
Into one common sewer, sea, and brine;
What were they all compared to thine?

Yet the note of joy is never very far away in Herbert's reflections on the Eucharist, a joy to be shared with all. His 'Come ye hither all' in his poem 'The Invitation' is the hallmark of his ministry as a parish priest.

We can, I believe, see in Herbert's writings and in the pattern of his ministry, a man for whom the Prayer Book was both rock and beacon. A rock of doctrine and a beacon, a guiding light, to a quality of worship that brings fulfilment, joy and (to use his, and St Paul's, word) edification.

(The Revd Canon George Tolley is an Honorary Canon Emeritus of Sheffield Cathedral and was formerly Principal of Sheffield Polytechnic.)

SCRUTINY (33)

The General Confession

STANLEY WARD

Almighty and most merciful Father; We have erred, and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; And we have done those things which we ought not to have done; And there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou them, O God, which confess their faults. Restore thou them that are penitent; According to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesu our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father, for his sake; That we may hereafter live a godly, righteous, and sober life, To the glory of thy holy Name. Amen.

The General Confession is an open acknowledgement before God and each other of our sin—individually, as a church and indeed as a nation.

The opening words, ‘Almighty and most merciful Father’ immediately set forth his position and ours. It is a prayer for believers—those who by grace through faith are truly his, yet have personally failed, needing mercy, Only one who is almighty can grant it and only a merciful Father could desire it for us. We have erred and missed the mark of God’s high calling. The prayer moves through the ranks of sin without any ‘cover-up’. It moves down through the sadness of sheep acting against their Shepherd, through the desperate wickedness of the deceitful heart, the offending of Divine Law, the required good un-done and the thoughtless or deliberate evil committed, to the plain statement ‘and there is no health in us’. In other words we declare ourselves to be in entire need of divine pardon.

At this point, when we have seen and acknowledged our true condition before God, comes the gracious and comforting ‘but thou, O Lord’. So often in Scripture comes the ‘but God’—the answer of hope to human loss and distress. With no excuses and no self-righteousness we take to ourselves the only term describing our state in the eyes of God: ‘miserable offenders’. Sin causes misery. It grieves the Holy Ghost, gives pain to our fellow men, harms our witness for Christ and leads to an experience of unutterable disease in ourselves. More than this—sin results in the judgement and wrath of God. He who longs to be and continue our loving heavenly Father must instead judge and reject us.

In the light of this truth the words ‘Spare thou them, O God, which confess their faults’ is a needful plea. It carries with it the realization that unless spared, we must be punished; for God is holy and righteous and cannot look upon evil. The word ‘hell’ is not used, but we know from Scripture that to be spared from sin and its consequences is to be saved from hell. ‘For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him’ (2 Cor. 5.21). That is why ‘If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness’ (1 John 1.9).

That lovely word ‘restore’ now appears. It is not sufficient that we be forgiven only. We need to be restored to our rightful position as children of God: forgiven and cleansed. Restoration cannot come before repentance. But on the ground of God’s promises declared unto all mankind in Christ Jesus it most surely follows repentance. Then, with a thankful knowledge of his pardon and acceptance, we

quietly ask him to grant that from this time forward—hereafter—we may live a ‘godly, righteous and sober life’ (in this present world: see Titus 2.12). The prayer ends where it ought to—in the petition that our future living shall be to the glory of his holy Name: the only true purpose for life itself.

It is a General Confession, applicable to all, whatever our age, rank, position, attainments or spiritual condition: ‘for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God’. Now, ‘being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation’—appeasement of divine wrath ‘through faith in his blood’ (Rom. 3.23–5)—we have peace with God. And having by confession and faith been made right with God, we should most certainly be kind to each other. We have all ‘come off our pedestal’, so to speak, and must accord to each other the forgiveness and acceptance we have received of him. There must be no hard-heartedness and no broken relationships amongst ourselves carried from the Lord’s presence. To maintain unforgiveness towards our fellow men is to annul the whole of what we have said and done. A sense of peace and sweet brotherly kindness should be our joy. If we have entered into the General Confession aright it should be easy—and certainly necessary—to forgive any who have wronged us. ‘But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin’ (1 John 1.7).

Finally there is a sense in which we—as ‘kings and priests unto God’ (Rev. 1.6)—acknowledge before him the situation of all mankind: those who cannot, or will not, as yet see their own need. Of course, each one must confess his or her own personal shortcomings, for ‘If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us’ (1 John 1.8), but in our open rehearsal of the human state we know something of the compassion which caused our Saviour to weep over Jerusalem, leading to his command: ‘Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest’ (John 4.35). We remember that ‘God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life’ (John 3.16). ‘Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand’ (Matt. 3.2). ‘The Lord is ... not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance’ (2 Pet. 3.9).

On Using the Prayer Book Psalter

J.A. THURMER

This note is about the arrangement and distribution of the Psalter as provided in the Book of Common Prayer. It is not primarily about Coverdale's translation, which is the Prayer Book text; but neither is it a plea for any other version. No one supposes that 'Coverdale' is flawless, and by later standards its English is sometimes clumsy as well as archaic. But (with other parts of the Great Bible of 1539 in the Prayer Book) it is the earliest 'modern' English still in common use. It has devotional and musical associations of over 450 years; and in a collection of songs of worship the most exact translation of the original language may be less important than it is in, say, the denser parts of St Paul's Epistles. One might think there was a case for a cautious revision, such as was offered to the Convocations in 1963 (the revisers included T.S. Eliot and C.S. Lewis: O to have been a fly on the wall at those meetings). But when you start to tinker where do you stop? And such worthy efforts seem to have disappeared under a welter of new translations.

For the Prayer Book, Cranmer simply chopped up the Psalms numerically into sixty blocks, one for each morning and evening of a thirty-day month. In the early books there were complex adaptations to cope with months of different length, but in 1662 these were wisely dropped, and on a thirty-first day you just repeated the psalms of the thirtieth. The old Latin services had aimed to recite the Psalter once a week, spread over the eight daily offices, but the multiplication of festivals led to some psalms being over-used and others neglected, as Cranmer complained in the Preface of 1549, now printed under the heading Concerning the Service of the Church. The Prayer Books always provided proper psalms for major holy days. 1928 extended the list (optionally) to cover all Sundays, and modern provisions favour a daily selection as part of the lectionary, and less in quantity

each day. But for daily use the Prayer Book still has strengths. Its subdivision may lack finesse, but the theme of a psalm is rarely so precise as to benefit by special selection, and indeed is often very varied within the same psalm. The Psalter is a distillation of the range of relations between mankind (individual and corporate) and the God of the Bible. In daily recitation the Prayer Book gives the worshipper enough to attune and settle the mind at the outset of the office. More would be overwhelming; less changes the character of the exercise. What is appropriate when Prayer Book Matins or Evensong is a major 'Service of the Word' on Sunday is another matter. Selection of psalms or portions thereof is characteristic of the Eucharist, where, apart from the gradual, they had the secondary character of accompanying movement. But the Psalter in course is the basis of the office—a basis shared in the Prayer Book by the lessons.

The month and its dates has—with the exception of festivals—little, if any, Christian significance. Their names are pagan, or classical, or merely numerical (and wrong). By distributing the Psalms over the month Cranmer was evidently making a bid to 'consecrate' the civil calendar—as was done with the daily lectionary until the revision of 1922. This seems a worthwhile aim. The Christian year has almost from the beginning operated with two distinct cycles, the Easter-based and the 'fixed' or dated festivals, which combine or clash in interesting and sometimes confusing ways. A monthly cycle of psalms, independent of both, is no great burden and gives the secular date a biblical note of its own, to be approached with comparative pleasure, or a degree of resignation (the fifteenth evening!), but using it all, the nuggets and the roughage.

In private recitation a slight adjustment (almost entirely within the same day) might be edifying. Such an adjustment could lessen imbalance in quantity and transfer the traditional evening psalms from Matins to Evensong (or Compline if used). Where some special arrangement is suggested it is explained in the following table:

- Day 1 Transfer Ps.4 to the evening
- Day 6 Transfer Ps.31.1–6 to the evening and Ps.32 to the morning
- Day 18 Transfer Ps.91 to the evening and Ps.93 to the morning
- Day 19 Omit Ps.100 if used as a canticle
- Day 24 Pss.116 and 118 both touch the deepest matters of death and resurrection, and are more valuable kept apart. Begin in the morning therefore with Ps.119.1–16, followed by Pss.116 and 117; in the evening use Ps.119.17–32 followed by Ps.118

- Day 28 Transfer Ps.134 to the evening
Day 29 Transfer Ps.141 to the evening (suggested by 1928)
Day 30 The psalms provided are quite weighty enough to be spread over two days in a thirty-one day month, viz:
30th Morning Pss.144,146 30th Evening Ps.147
31st Morning Ps.145 31st Evening Pss.148,149,150

After the Second Lesson at Evening Prayer

COURTNEY ATKIN

I begin with a rubric from the Book of Common Prayer:

The Curate of every Parish shall diligently upon Sundays and Holy-days, after the second Lesson at Evening Prayer, openly in the Church instruct and examine so many Children of his Parish sent unto him, as he shall think convenient, in some part of this Catechism.

'This' Catechism, because it is an integral part of the Book of Common Prayer; it is not an optional extra, still less an optional omission. And it is to be conducted 'diligently'. The rubric continues:

So soon as Children are come to a competent age, and can say, in their Mother Tongue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and also can answer to the other Questions of this short Catechism; they shall be brought to the Bishop [for Confirmation].

And woe betide the priest who was not diligent. Canon 59 ordered the

bishop 'to inflict excommunication for a third offence on any Minister that neglects his duty therein'.

Percy Dearmer (1867–1936), priest, author, writer, and translator of many of our best-loved hymns, has much to teach us. In his *The Parson's Handbook* Dearmer made some observations on the Catechism as pertinent as when they were written. His book is of enduring value, though editions following his death have been watered down to accommodate the politically-absurd conventions of our time.

A candidate for ordination told me recently that he was recommended not to read any theological treatise more than twenty-five years old. So Michael Ramsay (my Professor of Theology at Durham and later my friend), George Bell, William Temple, Dorothy L. Sayers, Evelyn Underhill and a host of others who have influenced my ministry—to mention only twentieth-century British scholars of towering intellect—are all well past their sell-by date: 'roll over', as John Lennon famously advised Beethoven. And roll over, Percy Dearmer.

In the magazine *New Directions*, a parish priest wrote recently:

Ten years ago one of my ordinands got into trouble. One Friday night, in the spot reserved for 'experimental liturgy', in the presence of the Principal and staff and impressionable young ordinands, he conducted an unexpurgated BCP Evening Prayer. He was summoned to the Principal's study and warned as to his future conduct. True? I'm afraid it is. Worse still, the Principal is now a bishop!

He doesn't say which one.

But to return to Percy Dearmer. I quote in slightly abridged form from *The Parson's Handbook*:

As it is not generally understood that in 'moderate' churches the Prayer Book is largely disobeyed, one instance may here be given. The Sermon is ordered in the Prayer Book to be preached at the Communion Service, and yet in churches of this description it is transferred to Morning Prayer and thus the Service which we get from the Bible is pushed on one side in favour of the Service which we got from the monks. At Evening Prayer a hymn and sermon are generally tacked on after the Grace. This is surely due to an insufficient study of the Prayer Book. The religion of England would have been in far better condition than it is now, if the clergy had obeyed the most important rubric that 'The Curate of every Parish shall diligently upon Sundays and Holy-days, after the second Lesson at Evening Prayer, openly in the Church instruct and examine'.

Which brings me full circle.

The rubric [Dearmer goes on] should at once be put into effect; the discourse at Evening Prayer should be an instruction and not a sermon. The gain to us of thus escaping from the convention of the sermon, and learning instead to instruct our people (who stand in the direst need of systematic teaching) would be very great. It may well be asked whether this would not be the wisest course when there is too much loose talking in the pulpit, and too little definite teaching. It might be thought that the parson would often do more good by catechizing before his people than by exhausting his powers in a second sermon. Canon 45 orders 'one sermon every Sunday' (not more than one). This can hardly free us from the obligation of having the sermon in the appropriate place.

Dearmer concludes that 'What is urgently needed, at the present day, is not orations upon a text but systematic courses of instruction in Christian doctrine'. Strong words, but to quote out of context, 'worthy of all men to be received', and never more so than at this time of doctrinal chaos.

In the brave new world of twenty-first century liberal theology, the Church has discarded the Book of Common Prayer as though it were a book for illiterates. But when it came to Confirmation, those sixteenth- and seventeenth-century 'illiterates' had to say for themselves: the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments. Learned by rote, yes; maybe even parrot fashion; but *learned*. Not to mention being able to answer to the questions of the Catechism. A recent survey showed that the majority of schoolchildren in this country do not even know the Lord's Prayer by heart. So who are the illiterates now? Our children flounder in a new age of religious ignorance, more so even than did the schoolchildren of the 1960s flounder in a new age of illiteracy, in which spelling and grammar, syntax and punctuation, went by the board. In religious terms, the children born in the last years of the twentieth century and being schooled in the first decade of the twenty-first are already paying a similar price. And it is a price which the Church has brought upon itself.

I have highlighted the Catechism, because it is a convenient focus of attention on the Church of England at this time. But there is much else in the Book of Common Prayer which is worthy of our attention, and which can and should provide the inspiration for revival. The Book of Common Prayer, it has to be reiterated, is not simply a repository of beautiful language, however much that lifts our hearts and minds towards God in a way which contemporary liturgies conspicuously fail

to do. It is the embodiment of the theology which inspired the faith of our fathers, the only guarantee of continuity of worship and doctrine from the time of the Reformation to the present day, a continuity shaken but not broken by the seventeenth-century Cromwellian iconoclasts, but in grave danger from the twenty-first century bully boys of the Liturgical Commission.

It would be wrong to attribute all of the Church's woes to the widespread abandonment of the Book of Common Prayer, but it is certainly fair to ask what the effect of its abandonment has been and to what extent the revival of the Church of England depends upon a return to that book of truly common worship. How far are we, individually and corporately, prepared to do battle for the restoration of the Prayer Book to its rightful place in the worship of Almighty God in our parish churches?

(The Revd Courtney Atkin had been both school chaplain and parish priest before his retirement in 1985. Versions of this address were delivered to both the Hereford and the Worcester branches of the PBS.)

Keeping an Eye on Old Nick

DEWI HOPKINS

Ye have heard also that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his Gospel, to grant all these things that ye have prayed for: which promise he, for his part, will most surely keep and perform. Wherefore, after this promise made by Christ, this Infant must also faithfully, for his part, promise by you that are his sureties, (until he come of age to take it upon himself,) that he will renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy Word, and obediently keep his commandments.

I demand therefore,

Dost thou, in the name of this Child, renounce the devil and all his works ... ?

(Book of Common Prayer: Publick Baptism of Infants)

'Get thee behind me, Satan,' represents—as, of course, it would—a very sound policy: the Christian must keep his attention not on the forces of evil and darkness but on the true light, the source of all real happiness and virtue. Even so one would feel uneasy with Satan always behind one's back, unseen and up to every imaginable mischief. This, and having been asked by a faithful priest, 'Do you believe in the devil? And in hell?' prompt me to look at this matter afresh, although at the time I answered the questions in the affirmative. I did so because it was the answer that came naturally to me, and because I had a feeling that my good friend's own faith was being put under some pressure by his ecclesiastical superiors.

Jesus' words certainly suggest someone talking to someone. When Bishop Latimer, in one of his sermons, described the devil as 'the bishop who is never out of his parish' he too conveyed the impression of a belief in a real being, endlessly and consciously active for our harm. I

suppose he was alluding to St Peter's words in his First Epistle General (1 Pet. 5.8): 'Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour'. This again suggests a belief in a real being, and well might Peter hold such a belief after Jesus had told him that Satan had sought to have Peter and 'sift' him.

Where in the Litany we pray 'that those evils, which the craft and subtilty of the devil or man worketh against us, be brought to nought', the suggestion in 'craft and subtilty' is of a real being with attributes; and the words from the service of Baptism that I have quoted under my title likewise suggest a real being, tirelessly and universally active, to be formally shunned by the Christian embarking upon his life's adventure: 'Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?'

None of which proves the existence of a being called the Devil, Satan, the Tempter, the Evil One, the Enemy, the Prince of this World or whichever of his names we care to use. What I would wish to claim, however, is that it does show that a belief in such a being's having a real existence is not simply childish, silly or superstitious. So whether the devil exists or not it will not do anyone any harm to hold such a belief (which is not made obligatory by any credal clause) as long as, believing in his existence, he sincerely renounces him and all his works.

Indeed the supposedly more sophisticated belief that what we have here is metaphorical or mythological language could be more dangerous than the rough and ready belief in a being with horns and a pitchfork, full of tricks and willing to cast us into his furnace. If it is all myth and metaphor the spiritual reality that it stands for is much more open to private interpretation, and that is a way that is full of snares. A good argument for the existence of the devil is that nearly all those who want to impose modern, relativist or situational ethics upon us don't believe in him. If he exists that disbelief is just what suits his purpose—which is why he has also been called the Plotter.

Still, it remains the case that the metaphorical or mythical understanding might be the right one, and I shall have to look for surer grounds for my own belief in the devil, or go on admitting, 'Well, I'm not really sure'.

Following millions of people more intelligent than I, and millions more perhaps a little less intelligent than I, I do believe in the devil. A note of reservation is appropriate here. When I say that I believe in the devil I mean that I believe in his existence. 'Believe in' is often used in another sense. We might say, for example, 'I believe in Mr Blair: I'd follow him to the ends of the earth—wherever he led!' That is not the sense I intend in this essay. That would indeed be superstitious.

What else can I bring forward to justify my belief, then? Well, there is one witness that I know intimately. I believe in my own experience. If I say that I have encountered the devil you may quite rightly say, 'That is not evidence'. I agree. Or at least it is evidence for me but not evidence for you. Nevertheless I have said it¹, and it is evidence of something. Next someone might object, 'But that was only a dream!' I should be tempted to reply, 'Why do you say "only"? Are dreams (have they always been?) so negligible?' Instead I shall say, less daringly, 'I agree again, but it is still evidence of something.' At least it is evidence that I have, fixed in my unconscious or subconscious mind, a real and unshakeable belief that the devil exists. My dream tells me what I believe. When I contemplate this fact I become aware that those who ridicule the belief have no surer grounds than I have. Some of them, I suspect, have the entirely contemptible ground that they do not wish to be scorned by the more self-proclaimedly 'rational' sort of Christian anxious for the unattainable esteem of 'scientific' atheists (I actually know one man who says, 'But I can't believe in God: I'm a scientist!').

That is my second ground. I believe in the existence of the devil because I find that I do. The most convincing ground of all, however, takes me back to the first: to dominical words. It needs more careful argument than the others. My text now is Luke 8. The people have heard the Parable of the Sower, 'And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable be?' Jesus answers that he will expound the meaning that he has given 'in parables' to the people.

Now those who would explain practically everything in the Bible as myth or metaphor must surely have a difficulty here. Dr Jenkins, formerly of Durham, likes to tell his critics that they have not understood the nature of image and, further, that all language is metaphor. I think that the latter clause contains some truth but is a fine philosophical distinction that has no application here. If I say I have walked ten miles today no doubt there is a very refined element of metaphor in the language of my statement. To every sane person, however, it is a well-understood statement of fact, and we describe it as 'literal' because it is either true or false, and verifiable. There is no need to explain it as a metaphor or by means of a metaphor. If I say I have walked so far that 'my dogs are barking!' I might have to explain myself to someone unfamiliar with the slang idiom.

I would explain the metaphor by replacing it with a literal expression. My meaning would not become clear if I replaced one metaphor with another: much less by simply repeating the first metaphor.

So when Jesus, in this conversation, explains, 'then cometh the devil,' I believe that what he says he means literally. There is, of course,

non-literal language in the Gospels, but this is not, in my view, an example of it. And when later in Luke's Gospel (10.18) we read that Jesus 'beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven', we will easily see that 'as lightning' is a simile and readily understood. We may also reflect that 'beheld' might have an element of metaphor about it (though, if misunderstood, not misunderstood to our damnation) since this was 'before' the Incarnation and its tendency is to make us visualize God as a creature, with physical features such as eyes; and 'fall' suggests heaven as a place, physically above wherever the falling being was falling to. Having made these acknowledgements I find it difficult to believe that 'Satan', in this sentence, is a metaphor in just the same way. An image or abstraction just does not seem to be what the statement is about. Here we have, I think, a spiritual being to whom something happened that we can best express and understand as falling, and there was a suddenness and violence about the happening.

Turning to Matthew 13.19 we find, in the explanation of the Parable of the Sower, 'then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart'. This is followed by the parable of the man who sowed good seed in his field. 'His enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat.' The difference between the two examples is that in the second 'his enemy' is a bad man, parabolically representing the devil, and in the first 'the wicked one' is the devil, referred to by one of his aliases. When the multitude was sent away the disciples asked Jesus to explain this parable too, as well as others. Each time Jesus makes his explanation in terms of angels and the devil: 'The enemy that sewed them [the tares] is the devil' (v. 39) and the binding of the tares into bundles to be burnt (v.30) is explained as 'and shall cast them into a furnace of fire' (v.42).

I can only hope that my argument here is understood. It is not an argument from the *frequency* or *insistence* of the references to the devil. I am saying that Jesus has used parables or metaphors and now offers literal explanations. Therefore, what he says in the explanations is to be understood literally. The Devil, the Enemy, Satan etc. is the Devil, the Enemy, Satan etc. Satan, he implies in Luke 10.18 is a fallen angel. What will happen at the judgement is a gathering in: 'the children of the kingdom' will be received into the kingdom, while 'the children of the wicked one' will be cast into a furnace.

How then can I not believe in the reality of Satan and of hell? I have it on such authority, and from one who was explaining the literal meaning of his own parables. The only way I could disbelieve would be to disbelieve in the divine nature and authority of our

Lord, and that I cannot do. What I say may not be proof, but what is required of me is not incontrovertible proof but witness. It will earn only mockery, but I believe it is entirely rational and I will not be laughed out of it. If I fear the disapproval of those who will suppose that 'science' is against it I shall condemn myself with a lie, and break my own vow to 'renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world'.

¹ I am referring here to my poem 'Shadows of Substance' in *Domus Booklet 11, A Friend in High Places*, p.6, published by the Gild of St George.

Let Me Count the Ways

C.R. GREGSON

On a chilly July day, the devil found work for these idle hands. I was interested to find out exactly how unifying *Common Worship* might be in providing a service that was recognizable wherever one went. The calculation simply aims to show how long it would take to work through all the alternatives in Holy Communion Order 1, if it was said daily.

Holy Communion Order 1

The Gathering

a hymn may	2	2
president may	2	4
president greets ... or	2	8
words of welcome etc. may	2	16
prayer of preparation may	2	32
A,B,C,D (penitence) may	4(5?)	128
minister uses A; or B; or C; or D; or Kyries	5	640
Gloria may	2	1,280
silent prayer or	(1)	

Liturgy of the Word

one or two readings ... may say	4 (really 6!)	5,120
acclamation may	2	10,240
Creed × 3; see below—Sundays only		
Prayers of Intercession or	6	61,440
responses may be used ... or	3	184,320

Liturgy of the Sacrament

may introduce (The Peace)	2	368,640
may be added	2	737,280
may exchange (odd if I don't!)	2	
hymn may	2	1,474,560
gifts may	2	2,949,120
one or more may	3	8,847,360
Eucharistic Prayer—options	8	70,778,880
within it usually acclamations may	5	353,894,400
responses may	2	707,788,800
[Form H balanced by more alternatives A–G]		
Lord's Prayer ... or	2	1,415,577,600
breaks or	2	2,831,155,200
Agnus Dei may ... or	3	8,493,465,600
Invitations	3 (4)	3
prayers may be said before ... or	3	9
Hymns and anthems may	2	18
consumed ... or	2	36
Post Communion or	2	72
may say ... or	3	216

The Dismissal

hymn may	2	432
may use ... or ... or	4	1,728
says ... or	2	3,456

On Sundays a form of the Creed is to be said; this adds a choice of 3 every seventh day.

If said daily, up to the Agnus Dei, it would take 23,254,478.15 years to work through all the structural alternatives (8,493,465,600 divided by 365.24).

Through to the end, it would take more than 80,366 million years—my pocket calculator couldn't cope this high (23.254 x 3456).

(C.R. Gregson is an Opera Director.)

The Loss of the Prayer Book and its Strengthened Reappearance

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS OF THE CHURCH DURING
THE COMMONWEALTH AND AT THE RESTORATION

P.M. CRIDDLE

PART ONE: THE COMMONWEALTH

Half the country celebrated at the overthrow of the Monarchy at the end of the Civil War and Samuel Pepys, who was present as a schoolboy in 1649 at the execution of King Charles I, raised a cheer at his death. With the execution first of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, and then of the King, the Church of England itself was also in defeat and Pepys' fellow-diarist and later friend, John Evelyn, looked back with nostalgia to the time before the war with 'the Church of England in her greatest splendour, all things decent and becoming the peace and the persons that governed'. The triumph of the revolutionaries was however fairly short-lived. Charles the tyrant was soon remembered as Charles the Martyr-King and eleven years under the Commonwealth made the whole country ready for restoration both of the Monarchy and of the Church of England with its established forms of worship, nobody more so than Pepys himself, who had become by the end of his life a High Churchman and was even imprisoned in 1690 on suspicion of Jacobitism.

Harsh measures had already been taken against the English Church

and its liturgy in 1645 when the Long Parliament passed an Ordinance forbidding the use of the Prayer Book in any place of public worship in England or Wales, and supplanted it by a new manual for the conduct of services, the Directory of Public Worship. A further Ordinance prohibited the use of the Prayer Book even in private. All copies of the Prayer Book were to be given up and there were severe penalties for breaching either of the Ordinances, heavy fines for the first or second offence and, on the third offence, a year's imprisonment.

The majority of incumbents during the Commonwealth conformed to the Public Worship regulations. Most were, in any case, Presbyterians and there were some more radical Independents. Until Whit Sunday 1652 Evelyn had managed, as he said, to keep 'his eares incontaminate from their new fangled service'. By then most parish pulpits seemed to him to be filled by 'Independents and Phanatics', though early in 1653 he was impressed at his own church by a visiting preacher and admitted that 'there was now and then an orthodox man gotten into the pulpit and, though the present Incumbent were somewhat Independent, yet he ordinarily preached sound doctrine and was a peaceable man, which was an extraordinary felicity in this age'. Nevertheless this Parish Minister 'durst not (or perhaps would not) have officiated according to the form and usage of the Church of England, to which I always adhered'.

Many of the conformist clergy were, of course, traditionalists who conformed to the new services unwillingly. But by 1654 Evelyn was only able to attend a Prayer Book service either by going to London, where some orthodox clergymen who had lost their livings did use the Book of Common Prayer, or by his procuring one of them to officiate in his own house. At Easter 1655 it was indeed still possible to go up to London for Holy Communion at St Gregory's, 'the ruling powers conniving at the use of the liturgy in this church alone'; but by the end of that year stricter measures were enforced on what Evelyn called 'the mournfullest day that I had seen or the Church of England herself since the Reformation to the great rejoicing of both Papist and Presbyter'.

Thereafter it was hazardous to disobey the Public Worship Ordinances. Robert Sanderson, then Rector of Boothby Pagnell near Grantham, did surreptitiously use the Prayer Book, but was subject to irregular attacks from parliamentary soldiery, and, on one occasion, imprisoned for doing so. And in 1657 Evelyn was assaulted and imprisoned upon taking Holy Communion in a fashionable chapel on Christmas Day, observance of Christmas having been expressly forbidden by the Puritan authorities.¹

So, as Macaulay has been quoted as saying, 'it was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians'. And at Alford in Lincolnshire, for example, where the parliamentary Ordinances had been obeyed since as long ago as 1646, the new Vicar recorded upon the funeral of his Prayer-Book loving predecessor that the use of Common Prayer on that occasion would be 'the last so'.

By May 1659 Evelyn recorded 'the poor Church of England breathing as it were her last, so sad face of things had overspread us'. But, just round the corner, help was to hand. The King was about to return from exile in Holland.

¹ The chapel was surrounded with soldiers and 'these wretched miscreants held their muskets against us as we came up to receive the sacred elements'. Less prominent members of the congregation were taken off to prison after the service, Evelyn being merely imprisoned in a house, where he was later examined by military officers from Whitehall. 'These were men of high flight and above Ordinances and spoke spiteful things about our Blessed Lord's nativity.' Among other 'frivolous and ensnaring questions', they particularly objected to the prayers for 'all Christian Kings, Princes and Governors' which they said could be interpreted as a prayer for 'Charles Steward'. Eventually, after much threatening, Evelyn was released.

(Part Two: The Restoration will appear in the next issue)

Reviews

DAVID DANIELL: *The Bible in English: its History and Influence*
Yale University Press, 2003 ISBN 0 300 09930 4 £29.95

Professor Daniell's own niche in the history of the English Bible is already secured by his handsome editions of Tyndale's translation and his biography (all Yale U.P.). The two critical times, so far, for the Bible in English have been the century from Tyndale to the Authorized or King James Version (KJV) of 1611, and the latter part of the twentieth century with its torrent of new versions. On the twentieth century Daniell is very good, and takes only thirty-four pages. He welcomes good new translation and is perhaps too kind, for instance, to the Revised English Bible. But again and again he finds himself deploring the kind of inaccuracy associated with what is called 'dynamic translation' or styles that are incapable of expressing, sometimes, seriousness of any kind. Daniell often convincingly quotes Tyndale's words of the early sixteenth century as both more accurate and better modern English than recent versions: Tyndale remains the criterion.

Daniell's book is an effort—with which this reviewer sympathizes—to confute the currently fashionable view that the Reformation never really happened as a popular movement and was a brutally top-down-driven destruction of medieval spirituality. One great fact that does emerge again and again is just how popular the English Bible was for about four hundred years.

As regards the century between Tyndale and KJV, Daniell's view can be reported without much reduction as: Tyndale good, bishops bad. The great English version for Daniell is the Geneva Bible of 1560 onwards, most of which is Tyndale, but I have to part company when he goes on, 'The replacement from 1611 ... with the backward-looking, increasingly Latinist, often baldly unhelpful KJV is one of the tragedies of our culture.' (p.347) Whatever support this opinion may have it is at best exaggerated.

Not that Daniell is immune to the charms of 1611, to which he pays some well-deserved compliments. But the occasionally just objection to a beautiful sound as against Tyndale's pithy sense is not

as important to Daniell as the sparsity of notes in the KJV and the absence of introductions. The difficulty is that on the one hand he wants to affirm the Bible as a self-sufficient guide to the Christian life, giving all we need for salvation; on the other he agrees that there are many 'hard' places where we need a guide. The Geneva practice of translating fairly literally but then marginally glossing, for instance, some of the opaque imagery of the Psalms or Ecclesiastes seems better, I agree, than either the infrequent notes of KJV or the drastic removal of metaphor in, for instance, the Good News Bible. But ... I am unconvinced.

Daniell recounts the history of Protestant attitudes to the Apocalypse. The first was embarrassment, which lasted long enough for the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible to leave the book completely without notes. This was rectified—altered anyway—in later editions, until by 1599 the copious annotations of 'Junius' were standard. But: is it really an advantage to have lengthy guidance to the Apocalypse which identifies different beasts with different popes? Can we really not understand the Bible without notes which themselves demand a knowledge of medieval history? Is not this a variety of the error to which the Protestants including Daniell object in the Rheims/Douai version? The Church must expound the true meaning of the Bible, but does one explanation have to be incorporated into the text? Professor Daniell has not answered this objection.

Then: why did King James supplant Geneva? Daniell thinks Geneva was the victim of dirty financial tricks by the monopoly printers, and tells the quite shocking story of the protracted lawsuits. But why then did not Geneva come storming back in the Commonwealth, when its annotations would be welcome and there were no bishops to get in the way? Why above all did Geneva not triumph in the American colonies? The huge predominance of KJV both sides of the Atlantic is to Daniell just a puzzle. I think the answer is the great advantage of one version as national possession, and the merit of KJV. (Daniell: its triumph owed 'nothing whatever to any special merits' (p.618). Well, that's special pleading.)

It has to be said that Daniell does not make the most of his interesting case. The book is repetitive and uncoordinated. The formidably big subject is not enough: pages are given to the Bible in Roman Britannia, well before the English language came into being! The history of the English settlements in America takes sixteen pages before the Bible is mentioned. More than ten pages are given to Blake's illustrations of the Book of Job. The principle that anything repeated often enough sinks in is not enough to excuse the three statements (after which I gave

up counting) that the 1611 Bible was never ‘authorized’ or the other three that the Paraphrases of Erasmus were set up in churches. On the other hand Daniell makes much of Hugh Broughton’s omission from King James’s team of translators, and anticipates Broughton’s devastating criticisms of the KJV, but then Broughton vanishes from the story and we never hear what they were!

When reviewing I usually note misprints; which has the dual virtue of proving I have read a book and aiding the author in case of a revised edition. I rapidly gave up with this one: there are too many. It has not been sub-edited or proof-read. The appearance of two bullet points instead of a number on p. 481 is funny, but not all the misprints are trivial. Cædmon’s Hymn has its text mangled into nonsense, thereby unluckily hinting that Daniell’s Old English is unreliable. He can surely read the Wycliffite Bible manuscripts, yet reproduces the *yogh* as & rather than either itself or the *y* or *gh* into which it can be easily transliterated. Then the factual errors. A professor emeritus of English should not get the date of the *Brut* wrong by a century, nor misquote the opening of *Piers Plowman*, nor tell us that the Douai version introduced the word ‘advent’ into English, that Newman wrote ‘Abide with me’, that Heber was a Victorian and Cowper a nonconformist, and that the 1662 Book of Common Prayer was changed after 300 years (p.488), nor offer the musical impossibility of a polyphonic tune (p.464), nor refer us to chapter 68 of Isaiah (p.741), nor put Scrooby in Northamptonshire. Etc., I have to say, etc. So great an admirer of Tyndale should have learned from him something even more important than accuracy: how to write English prose. Many of the sentences are too tangled to be easily sorted out. ‘In many—in most—concerns, and for many—most—of them, Protestants in the British Isles were facing the same way ...’ (p.132)

The remark that Cardinal Newman ‘shows no trace of any interest whatsoever in the Bible’ (p.662) is worse than a mistake. Daniell really ought to have dipped far enough into Newman’s life to learn that when he was ‘formally invited by the Hierarchy under Cardinal Wiseman to provide an annotated English version of the Bible Newman took up the work with enthusiasm’.¹ According to the same authority Newman was ‘obliged to abandon the undertaking’, but who made better remarks about translation? ‘Scripture easy of translation! Then why have there been so few good translators? why is it that there has been such great difficulty in combining the two necessary qualities, fidelity to the original and purity in the adopted vernacular?’²—which points straight at Tyndale and should have been used.

I much regret having to make such remarks about work by a

distinguished scholar whom I esteem. It is certainly true that *The Bible in English* is a pudding full of plums and sixpences, and not at all a bad book to take away to a desert island for six months; but I'm afraid it also has to be said that a job worth doing is worth doing properly. Anyone without the desert island might do as well with Alister McGrath, *In the Beginning: the Story of the King James Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton, 2001) or Benson Bobrick, *The Making of the English Bible*, (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2001) or with the very solid *Cambridge History of the Bible*.

Ian Robinson

¹ Jaak Seynaeve, W.F., *Cardinal Newman's Doctrine on Holy Scripture*, Louvain, 1953, pp.52–3. It should be said that this is one of Daniell's baggy sentences, the grammatical subject of which is 'the large bibliography of Arnold's contemporary, John Henry, Cardinal Newman': but I think he means what I object to.

² Newman, J.H., 'Literature', 1858, repr. *The Idea of a University*, New York, 1959, p.279.

DIARMAID MACCULLOCH: *Reformation: Europe's House Divided*
Allen Lane, 2003 ISBN 0 713 99370 7 £30.00.

We begin at the parish church of Preston Bissett, the sort of place we have all visited, but soon move to places few of us have visited. A proem in recreation of the mental life of former worshippers at Preston moves to consider their place in Christendom and its systems. Screens, pictures and carvings, remnants of late medieval worship in ordinary churches, are seen within the context of a whole spiritual situation in the West. Thus the drama of reformation unfolds on a very well set stage in a presentation which lacks in neither action nor reflection. In the end we get from Preston Bissett to China and Peru. C.S. Lewis is supposed to have made righteousness readable: MacCulloch makes godliness gripping, which may be more difficult.

This is a big, bold, book. The writer has woven his own research, and the researches of many others, into a synoptic panorama, strong in human interest. Prominent personalities are glimpsed in hitherto rather unpublicized guises; Erasmus, young man in love; Knox, loving husband; Perne, protector of Familists; Philip of Hesse, Protestant ecumenist and educational reformer; Elizabeth of England, daily reader

of the Greek New Testament. His judgements are as frank (Calvin 'did however relish getting his own way, which he identified with the will of God' p.241) as some of his wordbites are dry (Zwingli and a small group of colleagues 'were only too willing to tell Zurich what the Bible said' p.145). The narrative has an epic quality as it sets down 'a series of actions and events of deep and lasting significance in the history of a people'¹—ourselves as inhabitants of modern Europe and much of modern America. How refreshing to find a professional historian who writes of his book: 'It will tell a story, to begin with, as far as possible in an interwoven narrative, because that is how people experienced events'. Some histories of the Reformation are exclusive, and leave lots of people out. He aims to be inclusive and, though inevitably he knows more about the leaders than the led, is largely successful. The 'magisterial Reformation' does not dwarf the others, and ordinary churchgoing men and women get uncondescending respect, for they were practising Christians too, even if thin on the acute analytic and synthetic knowledge of God which their leaders supposed themselves to have. The leaders are presented warts and all and the inconsistencies of their thought are not spared, but for all the (refreshing) lack of verbal holy water no one is belittled. MacCulloch may demythologize but he does not debunk. He rises to the level of events, never supposing the Reformation was much ado about nothing or that the Thirty Years War was fought for a 'mere hypothesis'. He gives an impression that his characters meet in their beginning as in their end, that is the reality of the thing.

Gordon Rupp once said in a sermon: 'More terrible than an army with banners is the power of an idea whose hour has come.'² The Wittenburg idea is expressed in one of Luther's hymns, 'secret weapons' in MacCulloch:

'Tis through Thy love alone we gain
The pardon of our sin;
The strictest life is but in vain,
Our works can nothing win;
That none should boast himself of aught,
But own in fear Thy grace hath wrought
What in him seemeth righteous.³

When Luther had written in the spring of 1517: 'Our theology and St Augustine are making good progress, and are dominant in our university, thanks to what God has done' he was giving partly unwitting testimony to a European phenomenon. In previous centuries Augustine had probably always been the most prestigious

and influential of the Fathers; in this he was to reach a dominance. 'De multiples indications convergentes restituent l'énorme place tenue par saint Augustin à partir de la Renaissance.'⁴

MacCulloch traces Luther's progress crisply, without distracting debate about when or where the 'tower experience' actually happened. 'Luther' he observes acutely 'wanted to talk about grace, and his opponents about authority'. Indeed, Luther had talked about grace from the start, as befitted an Augustinian of mind and habit. 'Freud is not much use in understanding Luther, Augustine of Hippo is of central importance.' MacCulloch treats theology as an 'independent variable', and his Reformation is to do with sin and grace and only incidentally about copper mines, constipation or class struggle. 'As he leads us through the twists and turns of events which first made Luther a public figure, ensured his survival and propelled him into the leadership of a movement, we never lose sight of the fact that at issue were fundamental principles of belief.'⁵

Wittenburg is not, of course, treated in isolation. Indeed, it is as well the book has good maps in it, for the reader needs them. There were future religious leaders elsewhere undergoing similar experiences and reaching not dissimilar conclusions at the same time as Luther, as the 'Shadow of Augustine' began to loom over Europe (Augustine first appeared, in print, at Basel in 1506), including Luther's interlocutor Cajetan and Reginald Pole, future Archbishop of Canterbury. Fisher of Rochester was impelled to re-think his theology of grace and in 1511 Contarini 'experienced a sense of mystical peace that released him from anxiety; suddenly he felt his worries foolish and unnecessary in the face of a gift of free forgiveness from God'. Erasmus, by contrast with Luther, is presented as an Origenist. Origen was a Father of the Church about whom both sides were to entertain serious reservations, and Augustine the only one equally revered by both. However, it is difficult to forget that in the *Enchiridion* Augustine is more often referred to than any other writer, that Erasmus edited Augustine, and that when he, reluctantly, entered the lists against Luther he 'played by the Augustinian rules'.

In 1521, the year of Luther's final excommunication, Ignatius of Loyola was, in the All Souls sense, 'converted'. 'Catholic renewal' was under way before the 'Counter-Reformation' and, for the earlier part of the century it is difficult, if not impossible, to dis sever that movement from the 'Reformation' in its traditional sense, something the Spanish Inquisition was keen to do. It was not the original intention of Ignatius to form a body of storm-troopers for the Counter-Reformation. Like Valdes (to become a strong influence on Little Gidding in the next

century) before him, he moved to safer Italy, en route to the Holy Land. It seems, in retrospect, ironic that the Papacy only found the Society of Jesus to hand for its purposes because Ignatius and his companions discovered that there was a war on, and there were no passenger boats to Palestine. Contarini used his influence at the Vatican in favour of its recognition. These were still times before the lines were finally drawn, though MacCulloch judges that, by the 'Cardinals' vote which elected Julius on 8 February 1550, the last chance had passed away for a reformation such as Erasmus sought'.

The general reader, saddened perhaps by the outcomes of Regensburg and Poisy, may not find much cheer in the second part of the book and any sense of religion as too important to be left to the theologians will be strengthened. Queen Elizabeth and the regents of Dutch towns both thought so and MacCulloch seems rather to approve of them. What will be found is a vivid running commentary on the clash of spiritual, and sometimes material, armies. Treatment of central and eastern Europe is particularly revealing, as is the account of the evolution of the Jesuit order. The story is at all times and in all places one of increasing polarization, and often enough of the apparent preference of instrumentality to truth. But if there is not much for our comfort there is plenty for our fascinated attention, including some personal and pertinent reflections on the contemporary.

MacCulloch's *Reformation* looks set to become a book like Carlyle's *French Revolution*, necessary and unavoidable to anyone interested; and it is, additionally, the work of an historian's historian; splendidly accessible, none the less.

C.W. Kemp

¹ See the entries for 'epic' and 'epic poem' in Nuttall's *Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, new edn. 1951.

² Heard, circa 1953.

³ *The Methodist Hymn Book*, 1933, No.359.

⁴ Delumeau, Jean, *Le Pêché et la peur: la culpabilisation en Occident*, Paris, 1983 p.293.

⁵ From Andrew Pettegree's article 'Parallel Loyalties', in the *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 November 2003, which is a lively and extensive review of MacCulloch's *Reformation*.

PHILIP SECOR: *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship: Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V, A Modern Version*
SPCK, 2003 ISBN 0 281 05585 8 £49.00.

As Roger Clarke has noted elsewhere in this issue, Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* is currently out of print and little read, and one can feel therefore only sympathy and approval for scholars who wish to enlarge the circle of its readers. Philip Secor is one such scholar, whose commitment to Hooker has already been demonstrated in a modern edition of the sermons and in the biographical study *Richard Hooker: Prophet of Anglicanism*, mentioned by Mr Clarke.

Dr Secor notes in his preface that 'for centuries literate Anglicans and Episcopalians regarded the Fifth Book of Hooker's *Laws* as the cornerstone of their understanding of their faith and worship', and expresses the view that

Hooker's writing style has made him inaccessible in our day to all but a shrinking élite among church scholars. To all intents and purposes Hooker's sustaining wisdom is lost to most members of the Church that he helped to inaugurate.

The reasons perhaps go wider than Hooker's 'writing style', and Dr Secor surely concedes too much in elsewhere calling it 'difficult and cumbersome'—the more traditional praise has spoken rather of 'exquisite balance' and 'harmony'.¹ But no one who cares about Hooker will quarrel with the intention of providing, in this 'modern edition', 'a readable and accurate version of Book V of the *Laws*' while making 'every effort to preserve Hooker's rhetorical style, retain his syntax, and allow him to speak in his own voice'.

Perhaps the fairest test in a short notice is to choose a passage apt for *Faith & Worship* (from a book in which so much is apt) and put alongside it Dr Secor's rendering:

But of all helps for due performance of this service [of public prayer], the greatest is that very set and standing order itself, which framed with common advice hath both for matter and form prescribed whatsoever is herein publicly done. No doubt from God it hath proceeded and by us it must be acknowledged a work of his singular care and providence, that the Church hath evermore held a prescript form of common prayer, although not in all things everywhere the same, yet for the most retaining still the same analogy ... To him which considereth the grievous and scandalous inconveniences whereunto they make themselves daily

subject, with whom any blind and secret corner is judged a fit house of common prayer; the manifold confusions which they fall into where every man's private Spirit and gift (as they term it) is the only Bishop that ordaineth him to this ministry; the irksome deformities whereby through endless and senseless effusions of indigested prayers they oftentimes disgrace in most unsufferable manner the worthiest part of Christian duty towards God, who herein are subject to no certain order but pray both what and how they list; to him I say which weigheth duly all these things the reasons cannot be obscure, why God doth in public prayer so much respect the solemnity of places where, the authority and calling of persons by whom, and the precise appointment even with what words or sentences his name should be called on amongst his people.²

And here is Secor's version:

Of all the aids for proper performance of common prayer the greatest is the very regularity and prescription of both form and content in the service. No doubt our service of worship came from God and we must acknowledge it to be the result of His special care and generosity that the Church would for ever have a prescribed form of common prayer—though not the same in all respects everywhere, nevertheless for the most part having the same general form ... Consider the grievous and scandalous inconvenience to which those who judge any blind alley or secret corner to be a fit house for common worship are subjected. Consider also the manifold confusions that befall all those who think that every person's spirit and gift (as they call it) is the only bishop that ordains them to their ministry. Consider the irksome deformities of those ministers who are subject to no set order of prayer but pray whatever and however they please and frequently disagree in a most insufferable manner with the worthiest part of Christian worship by their endless and senseless effusions of undigested prayers.

To those who carefully weigh all these things, the reasons will not be at all obscure why—in matters concerning common prayer—God cares so much about the solemnity of the location, the authority and calling of the minister, and the prescription of words and sentences by means of which His name should be called upon by His people.

The new version is clear enough and conveys Hooker's substantive thought, but I do have reservations about aspects of the 'translation':

is 'generosity' quite the same as 'providence'? Isn't the post-Hooker meaning of 'blind alley' too narrow in suggestion? And doesn't Hooker in the second sentence quoted intend us to think of the minister as disgracing public worship with the 'deformities' of extempore prayer, rather than, as Dr Secor's version suggests, himself being deformed and by his mode of prayer 'disagreeing' with the worship? Perhaps these are rather niggling objections—they ought at any rate to remind us of the difficulty of modernizing such a text. A wider change from the original is made, as Dr Secor is I am sure aware, by his policy of 'dividing sentences'. In the passage quoted he has made six of three. One sees why this is done, but it weakens Hooker rhetorically: those long sentences which hold so much as it were suspended before weightily concluding, remind and convince the reader locally, and in microcosm, of a mind which is at the same time holding all the threads of a complex and richly-patterned overall argument.

Perhaps this is to say no more than that if you have read Hooker you will prefer him. It would be churlish not to welcome what is evidently a labour of love. The volume is well-printed and clearly arranged; it gives full references; and it has a simple but useful index. It will surely be a necessary purchase for theological colleges, and one can imagine it serving as a key to unlock the greater treasures in store.

J.R. Scrivener

¹ See George Saintsbury, *A Short History of English Literature*, London, 1898; repr. 1966, p.300.

² From Book V, ch.xxv, 'Of the forme of common prayer'. I have used the Folger Library Edition, but have modernized the spelling.

The Cloud of Unknowing, ed. EVELYN UNDERHILL
Vega, 2002 ISBN 1 84333 591 3 £5.99.

Evelyn Underhill's classic text (originally published in 1912) of this celebrated fourteenth-century 'mystical' treatise is once again available, though sadly without her introduction. Underhill disclaimed scholarship, but she had done a good deal of work on the manuscripts and her version is, apart from spelling, only very lightly modernized, as sample references to Phyllis Hodgson's edition for the

Early English Text Society (1944) show. The reader of this text is far closer to the original than in various paraphrases in modern English, as can be seen from an almost random comparison:

& þerfore take good keep into tyme, how þat þou dispendist it. For noþing is more precious þan tyme. In oo litel tyme, as litel as it is, may heuen be wonne & lost. [EETS]

And therefore take good heed unto time, how that thou dispendest it: for nothing is more precious than time. In one little time, as little as it is, may heaven be won and lost. [Underhill]

So be very careful how you spend time. There is nothing more precious. In the twinkling of an eye heaven may be won or lost.

[Penguin edition, Clifton Wolters]

Perhaps some brave publisher will now reprint Grace Warrack's edition of Julian of Norwich, which followed similar principles (1901, with many subsequent reprints).

The *Cloud* is preceded by 'The Prayer on the Prologue', familiar to Anglicans, in a slightly different form, as the Collect for Purity. It is said by Hodgson to be 'the opening collect of the Mass *ad postulandum gratiam Spiritus Sancti*', and to be first found in Alcuin. Procter and Frere talk of its being 'probably of English origin or at any rate especially connected with England'. In the *Cloud* it runs as follows, with only the spelling modernized:

God, unto whom all hearts be open, and unto whom all will speaketh, and unto whom no privy thing is hid. I beseech Thee so for to cleanse the intent of mine heart with the unspeakable gift of Thy grace, that I may perfectly love Thee, and worthily praise Thee. Amen.

Is this the earliest English translation?

J.R. Scrivener

A Godly Competition

THE COMMON PRAYER TRADITION IN LIVING USE

PETER TOON

The Board of the Prayer Book Society of the U.S.A. firmly believes that in the new millennium there is a need to encourage the creation of prayers and hymns as part of a larger determination to encourage and experience Anglican Common Prayer as a tradition in living use. To this end, it has decided to sponsor a godly competition to encourage the revival of the production and provision of contemporary prayers and hymns in the traditional religious language found in The Book of Common Prayer and the hymnody of Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley and John Keble (to name but three).

Until the 1970s, there were constantly being printed books of prayers, collects and litanies for use alongside The Book of Common Prayer, especially for use at the end of Morning and Evening Prayer, at mid-week meetings, in family prayers and for private devotions. Also there was a continual appearance of hymns to be used in association with the services within the Prayer Book or for communal hymn-singing.

With the advent of modern liturgies and the insistence that God be addressed as 'You' and that the second person singular (thou/thee) for God and man be no longer used, the publication of books of prayers and new hymns in the traditional English style of prayer gradually ceased. Since the 1970s very few have appeared.

THE GODLY COMPETITION

There will be six categories—collects, prayers, litanies, hymns, liturgies and homilies—and there will be two age-groups, those who have not yet reached their eighteenth birthday and those over eighteen years. All entries must be in English and may be submitted from any part of the world with British or American spelling. Each entrant shall make a statement to the effect that the submission is his own work.

Collects: a minimum of three in the style and of the length found in

the Collects for Sundays and Holy Days in the Prayer Book. They must be connected with a season or festival of the Church Year and have a strong biblical theme, related to the Prayer Book Lectionary.

Prayers: a minimum of two in the style and of the length of the General Confession and the General Thanksgiving. They must be connected with modern life and be in the form of petition, intercession, confession, praise or thanksgiving, or a combination of two or three of these themes.

Litanies: a minimum of one about two-thirds of the length of the Litany in the Prayer Book. They must be connected with modern life and may be general or specific in content.

Hymns: a minimum of two of the kind of length of the hymns found in the Episcopal Hymnal of 1940 or the English Hymnal of 1933. They must be rooted in a biblical or Christian festival theme and connected with modern life. It will be necessary to indicate what tune each one is to be sung to or to provide new music. If the latter, two persons may co-operate to produce words and music.

A Liturgy: the outline of a form of service for an important occasion not provided for in The Book of Common Prayer (e.g. Harvest Festival; Graduating Service at a College or School; Carol Service), with any special prayers, litany, versicles and responses given in full.

Homilies: a minimum of one sermon of not more than 1,500 words on a theme of current personal, Christian, moral concern (e.g. the use of money, the nature of temperance, the place of discipline and relations with persons of other religions). Biblical quotations to be from the Authorized King James Version.

Entries must be submitted to the Prayer Book Society Office in Philadelphia no later than 1 November, 2004, addressed to: Godly Competition, Prayer Book Society, P.O. Box 35220, Philadelphia, PA 19128-0220, USA.

There will be three judges who will make their report by January 2005.

The best entries will be published in *The Mandate* in early 2005 or, if there are sufficient of good quality, they will be published in a booklet.

If the judges believe that a contestant reveals a special gift for this kind of creative, godly writing they will prepare a special note for that person offering encouragement and advice.

The following books may be found helpful in terms of indicating the kind of collects and prayers produced in the recent past.

J.W. Suter, *The Book of English Collects*, 1940.

F.B. McNutt, *The Prayer Manual*, 1951.

Eric Milner-White, *After the Third Collect*, 1955.

Eric Milner-White and G.W. Briggs, *Daily Prayer*, 1959.

Frank Colquhoun, *Parish Prayers*, 1967

Church of Scotland *Book of Common Order*, 1940 and *Prayers for the Christian Year*, 1952.

Church of South India, *Book of Common Worship*, 1963.

Society of St John the Evangelist, *A Manual for Priests*, 1944.

Loren Gavitt, *Saint Augustine's Prayer Book*, revised edition 1967.

Letters

From the Revd Dr DAVID PYM, Southam

Sir,

As both an active member of the Prayer Book Society and a country parish priest for many years I am saddened that we are not able to bring the services of the Prayer Book to many more parishes. There are several reasons, one being that not every bishop is an enthusiastic supporter or even user. Until forty years ago the *raison d'être* of the whole Church of England was to be a Prayer Book Society.

However, improvement of the present situation is within our own remit. It is much more realistic for us to aim to further the tradition of Prayer Book worship rather than indulge in adoration of the 1662 Book for its own sake. The truth of the matter is that for many Anglicans, including clergy, the 1662 Book is long, closely packed, with services that are never used. I would like to suggest that we make widely available at as low a price as possible a fairly slim, attractive and well presented, perhaps A5, volume containing the following:

Morning and Evening Prayer (1662)

Holy Communion (1662) with Exhortations and additional prayers omitted

Baptism (1928)

Marriage (1928)

Burial of the Dead (1928) with the order tidied up and rarely-used material omitted

Twenty of the most used psalms

The Collects

This is what for the vast majority of Anglicans in this country constitutes Prayer Book worship as we know it. For those whom we hope to bring to share its spirituality and beauty, what we have at present is often not helpful or encouraging. We must think clearly, simply and yet boldly.

From Sir ERIC ANDERSON, Provost of Eton

Sir,

I expect that better qualified readers than me will already have pointed out a misprint on page sixteen of *Faith and Worship* No.54. In an otherwise excellent article on the language of the Prayer Book Stephen White includes the phrase 'till death do us part' in his quotation from the Marriage Service. Should it not be 'till death us do part'? The ungrammatical 'do' always worried me (surely it should be 'does' or even 'doth') until I learned that it should really be 'till death us depart', the English form of the French word *departir*, to separate. As always the Prayer Book makes perfect sense.

From Professor DAVID WULSTAN, Aberystwyth

Sir,

The heading 'In Defence of Baker and Dykes' under which my article appeared in *Faith and Worship* No.54 may have misled the cursory reader into assuming my support for them. As the article will have shown however, I have no enthusiasm for Dykes, and my defence of Baker was only as a run-of-the-mill hymnodist.