Contents

EDITORIAL 2

THE HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE OF 1604 4
Richard Chartres

THE MAKING OF 1662 17
D. N. Griffiths

REFLECTIONS ON THE USE OF THE WORD GOD IN A SECULAR AGE 26
John Garbutt

IN A WONDERFUL ORDER: ANGELOLOGY FROM SARUM TO CRANMER 37
Jonathan Macy

THE LOSS OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND ITS STRENGTHENED REAPPEARANCE 54
P. M. Criddle

REVIEWS 56
Raymond Chapman, John Scrivener

LETTERS 61

BRANCHES AND BRANCH CONTACTS 64

Editorial

When is a Prayer Book service not a Prayer Book service? The Prayer Book Society makes clear on its web-site that 'it does *not* propagate Prayer Book fundamentalism but believes a modest amount of flexibility in usage is both sensible and to be desired'. In part this is, I imagine, simply a recognition that most Prayer Book services are not in *strict* conformity to the letter of the text. Things have been added and other things (usually) subtracted. Some of the 1928 alternatives have been quite widely adopted. Individuals may approve or not of these changes in the living use of the Prayer Book, but no one doubts that services so modified are still 'BCP'. Again, some services have simply fallen into desuetude: even parishes which use *only* the Prayer Book do not commonly use the *whole* Prayer Book. To that extent Dr David Pym's proposal for a shortened Prayer Book (*Faith & Worship* No.55) including only 'what for the vast majority of Anglicans in this country constitutes Prayer Book worship as we know it' has appeal, and has in fact prompted a number of readers to write in support (see Letters page). The difficulty of such a project arises of course in matters of detail, but it might well be that a consensus would emerge for something very like the existing *Shorter Prayer Book*.[1]

Mr D. B. Taylor, however, opens a much larger question when he recommends the old Rite B in preference to the 1662 order for Holy Communion. The history here is very complex, of course. The early Tractarians stood for 'no change to the Prayer Book', but some of the later heirs of the Oxford Movement came to think that Cranmer had in 1552 produced a 'maimed' or 'mutilated' rite, only inadequately repaired in 1662, and looked rather to 1549 as a model, which had influenced the old Scottish and American orders. Common to these, and to later rites such as Series 1, was the incorporation of the Prayer of Oblation into the Prayer of Consecration. On the other hand there were many High Churchmen who thought 1662 patient, as it stood, of a sufficiently 'Catholic' interpretation.[2] Whatever one's view, the variations from 1662 were at any rate composed of predominantly 'Prayer Book material' rearranged within recognizably Anglican constraints, and I would suppose (under correction) that the Prayer Book Society would see them as falling within whatever is implied by 'flexibility'. With Rite B, however, we arrive at a new level of 'alternativity'. It is true that, with some effort, it can be made to yield a service fairly close to 1662, but with equal pertinacity in the opposite direction it can result in something very remote in spirit from any of the family of services referred to above. It allows so many permissive alternatives within itself that it is almost misleading to describe it as a unified rite at all. There are uses of it, therefore, which fall within the description of a 'Prayer Book service', and other uses which do not.[3]

Wherever you set the boundaries of Prayer Book worship, however, the 1662 Order for Holy Communion surely remains normative for the Church of England. Am I right in thinking that positive accounts of its strengths have been rather muted and apologetic? They need not be. Those who have long used 1662 know that their attachment to it involves more than mere familiarity or even beauty of language. It has a strength and coherence—a rightness—of its own, and Cranmer's supposed omissions are often present in another form.[4]

The question of undertaking a revision of the 1662 book itself—as opposed to recognizing various divergences in practice—is altogether more fraught, and I should think undesirable to raise in present circumstances. The book as it stands is permanently authorized. This has disadvantages, no doubt. If we could return to an earlier stage we would all be willing to contemplate a conservative revision. But the established character of the Book of Common Prayer has advantages too: it can't be disavowed by the Church, and, though parts of it will never again be much used, its continued existence as a whole leaves open the possibility of things currently disused being rediscovered.

John Scrivener

---

[1] *The Shorter Prayer Book: Being an Abbreviated Form of the Book of Common Prayer with Some Additional Matter* (1946) is still available. Its contents are very similar to what Dr Pym has proposed, but it includes all the Psalms, the Litany and the Catechism. The Communion service is 1662 with the Exhortations omitted and some alternatives from the 1928 book (but not the alternative Prayer of Consecration).

[2] Not to mention the great mass of those professing that central churchmanship which, as Charles Smyth observed, 'being always undemonstrative and unromantic, has no snob value for historians'. See Charles Smyth, *The Church and the Nation*, London, 1962, p.71.

[3] Order One in Traditional Language in *Common Worship* has moved further in the same direction. By contrast, Order Two in the same book is, in its invariant parts, a Prayer Book Communion as ordinarily understood.

[4] See the brilliant short account by Stephen Neill in his *Anglicanism*, 2nd Edn., Oxford, 1977, pp.73–80. See also Ian Robinson, *Prayers for the New Babel*, Brynmill, 1982, pp.44–67.

The Hampton Court Conference of 1604

RICHARD CHARTRES

A lecture given in the Great Hall of Hampton Court on 6 May 2004.

For our own Hampton Court Conference, 400 years after the Conference of 1604, we assemble here in Henry VIII's Great Hall. The setting is artfully archaic and it was built at a time when as much effort had to be made to resist the charge of novelty, as must be employed now to rebut the suggestion of antiquity. Simon Thurley in his excellent new book on the Palace casts doubt, for example, on whether the central hearth was ever used and was anything more than part of a 'chivalric conceit'.

We are too numerous to be accommodated in the Royal Privy Chamber where the sessions of the Jacobean Conference took place and indeed we lack the Royal Presence. The Royal Promise, however, we do have. The Queen will visit the Chapel next week to attend divine service according to the Book of Common Prayer and hear the lessons read from the Authorized Version of the Bible, the principal fruit of the Conference of 1604.

You will forgive me for beginning with location. Having myself worked in a partly Tudor Palace at Lambeth, I know that questions of access and the interconnection of rooms are crucial matters when considering the operations of Court Government. Courts, which surround monarchs or other great persons, have dynamics which are not easily understood by those schooled in modern management theory. The Palace itself and the other activities of that winter season of 1604 had their impact on the Conference, which is our theme.

The plague had been horribly virulent in the year 1603 and Hampton by Thames did not entirely escape its ravages. By Christmas, 119 persons out of a population of no more than 500 had already succumbed. In London, however, some 30,000 had perished out of a population in normal times of about 140,000. We can understand why this Palace seemed to be a more salubrious place than the old Palace at Whitehall for the keeping of the Christmas feast. Hampton Court was pulsing with life while so many were dying elsewhere. It must have been a nightmare in such circumstances to organize the festivities and adjudicate between those who were summoned to entertain the new King and Queen, spending their first Christmas in England.

Among the three companies of players who performed at Hampton Court that Christmas, the King's Men had the pre-eminence. Shakespeare was of course the principal playwright and part owner of the King's Men. They performed on December 26th, 27th, 28th, 30th and twice on January 1st. They were back for the feast of Candlemas on February 2nd. It has recently been argued (see Thurley, note 4, p.408) that *Hamlet* was the first play performed here, the night after Christmas 1603, as a tribute to the Danish Queen and King James who had spent their honeymoon at Elsinore in 1590. Other companies played perhaps in this very hall on the eve of the Conference and on the day after its preliminary session.

We know for certain that the Hall was used for the elaborate allegorical masques, which involved not so much actors as courtiers and members of the Royal Family in person.

The diplomat Sir Dudley Carleton described the scene here on January 8th (a Sunday evening) when Samuel Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* was staged. A great 'paradisical mountain' was constructed at the screen's end with a winding staircase, down which the ladies of the court descended, dressed in Queen Elizabeth's finery and representing goddesses. Queen Anne herself was Pallas Athene. After speaking a few lines, they danced down the hall and curtsied to the King and the foreign ambassadors before resuming the dance in the 'piazza' before the Cloth of Estate. The ambassadors of the great powers of Europe joined in the dance tossing the nine year old Prince Henry 'like a tennis ball' from hand to hand. Midnight struck and the unmasked goddesses with the king and his guests went into the Presence Chamber for a banquet which, Carleton notes, was eaten with 'accustomed confusion'.

This was a society which valued elaborate courtesies and communicated emblematically. It was in this setting that the Right Reverend Prelates and the Grave Divines came to debate the future Ecclesiastical and Liturgical Establishment in England in the presence of the King.

It is not easy to find contemporary parallels to the revolution in affairs which flowed from a change of monarch in the seventeenth century and the re-direction of the stream of lucrative patronage. In the months after his accession in March 1603, James's every word was minutely scrutinized for signs of where he stood on ecclesiastical matters. As the King made his slow progress to London Sir Francis Bacon's assessment of public opinion was that there 'be two extreams. Some few would have no change; no not reformation. Some many would have much change, even with perturbation'.

James advertised himself as the bringer of union and peace, the *Rex Pacificus*. With such an ambition, the widest possible unity in religion was clearly vital. The question was how this could be achieved. The consensus of the political nation was unclear and the King's own position with respect to the Royal Supremacy in the Church and his relations with Parliament and the Bishops were full of complications.

Those pressing for a greater measure of reform to bring the Church of England into line with the 'best reformed' Continental Churches, were quick off the mark. In April after some efficient canvassing in the localities, the King was presented with the Millenary Petition, supposedly signed by a thousand ministers, 'desiring and longing for the redress of divers abuses of the church'.

The Petition was a moderate document designed to unite a wide range of reformist opinion and to test the temper of the new regime. There were various liturgical points which were old sores. The Petitioners complained about the use of the cross in Baptism and the ring in marriage; they urged the abolition of Confirmation as 'superfluous'; they did not want Baptism administered by women; they desired changes in liturgical vesture and the removal of the mandatory wearing of cap and surplice. They wanted to 'correct' references to priest and absolution in the Prayer Book; to abridge 'the longsomeness' of the service (to give more time for the sermon); to moderate 'to better edification' church songs and music. They wanted no bowing at the name of Jesus and no readings from the Apocrypha. They wanted more strict Sabbath observance but not 'rest upon holy days'. In short they wanted the removal of anything that smacked of Catholic practice.

For the Puritans who instigated the Petition, the Word in the mind and the mouth was the way to engage with the rational God. Bodily observances and everything else was a muddying of the waters. Those who wished to retain old ceremonies and symbols in the Church were simply intent on curdling the pure milk of the Gospel, obscuring the truth, as Milton later said, with 'guegaws fetcht from Aron's old wardrobe'.

There was another, minority but more musical voice within the Jacobean Church with a different vision of what God required. One of the most influential of these voices belonged to Lancelot Andrewes who, as Dean of Westminster, was a largely silent but influential participant in the Conference. He had a different view both of God and human beings. Like the theologians of the Primitive Church, Andrewes and his school believed that God was a mystery to be approached not so much with the word in the mind and the mouth but with the mind in the spiritual heart. One of Andrewes' friends, John Buckeridge warned that 'true religion is no way a gargleism only, to wash the tongue and mouth, to speak words; it must root in the heart and then fructify in the hand, else it will not cleanse the whole man'.

The Andrewes school went further. Stripping the altars was simple arrogance. God had always been approached with ceremony and bodily reverence. Those who rejected this spiritual tradition were simply 'novelists'.

Andrewes, who later (we ought to remember in this place) became not only a bishop but Dean of the Chapel Royal as well, reveals his inmost self in his own book of private prayers. The volume was, according to a contemporary admirer, 'slubbered o'er with penitential tears'. The prayers have a humility, a consciousness of sin and an emotionalism which is light years away from the confidence of those who believed themselves to be certainly predestined to salvation.

The second and third sections of the Petition dealt with recruiting and making financial provision for an educated preaching ministry. There was some common ground with the episcopate here. Everyone agreed that the educational level of the clergy needed improvement and that the Church was in economic difficulties after being half plundered during the changes of the sixteenth century. The nub of the question was who should oversee the reforms.

The fourth section of the Petition was cautiously phrased but set the alarm bells ringing in Lambeth and Fulham. The ecclesiastical courts were criticised, as was the issuing of sentences of excommunication by church lawyers and it was urged that 'discipline and excommunication may be administered according to Christ's own institution'. This was fairly transparent code and the Vice Chancellor and the Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford in their 'Answere' to the Petition, discerned an intention of 'the utter overthrow of the present Church government, and in stead thereof the setting up of a Presbitery in every parish'.

How would the King react? The aged and ailing Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift, had an audience with James in May 1603 at Theobalds, Robert Cecil's palatial residence. The King was amiable and the Archbishop was encouraged but other forces were at work. Among the many Scots attending the new king was an influential minister, Patrick Galloway, who provided a private channel of influence for the Puritan coalition.

There was a further flurry of petitioning. The Archbishop and the Bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, who was by now carrying the heat and burden of the day for the Primate, informed Cecil that disaffected ministers in Sussex were attempting to gather signatures from county officers and other members of the gentry, pretending 'that his Majesty favoureth their course, and that they do nothing without the direction of some that are in especiall creditt with his Highness'.

The Privy Council met to consider the situation in the presence of the King and the Proclamation of October 24th 1603 was a direct result. The existence of 'scandals' in the Church was admitted, but crucially the Proclamation declares that the Church of England, 'both the constitution and doctrine thereof is agreeable to God's word and neare to the condition of the Primitive Church'.

The document also revealed that the meeting we know as the Hampton Court Conference was to be between 'divers Bishops' and other 'learned men'. In the words of Frederick Shriver (see bibliography) who to my mind has most convincingly re-constructed the background to the Conference, it was to be a scholarly disputation 'not a general airing of grievances'.

Even so, the bishops were not convinced about the wisdom of such an encounter. Bishops had disputed with Puritans on numerous occasions in the previous reign but the Queen herself had never given the opponents of the Church Establishment the countenance of a personal hearing. James had a different style however. He loved talking theological and constitutional shop. He was familiar with Continental academic practices, relished disputations and saw himself as a latter day Solomon, or rather Constantine, presiding as the Emperor had done at the Council of Nicaea and bringing peace and unity to the Church. It is significant that the medal struck for the king's accession portrays James as a Roman ruler and he is described as Emperor of the whole Island of Britain. The stage was set for a Conference at Hampton Court which was in part a display of the Royal Supremacy but also one event in a busy winter theatrical programme at the Palace.

In response to the Petition, the Conference with the Puritans had originally been set for November but the virulence of the plague in London caused its postponement and it was finally convened in this Palace on Saturday January 14th 1603/4. In the event, the prime movers of the Petition were not included in the Puritan delegation who met with the king and the bishops. The more radical voices like those of Arthur Hildersham, Minister of Ashby de la Zouche (whose mother, ironically, was a niece to Cardinal Pole) were excluded. The Puritan team of four were all from the moderate wing.

The most hard line was John Knewstub, Rector of Cockfield in Suffolk. Laurence Chaderton was the Master of the Puritan stronghold Emmanuel College in Cambridge. Both Knewstub and Chaderton had been Cambridge contemporaries and fellow undergraduates with Bancroft who now faced them as Bishop of London. Thomas Sparke, Rector of Bletchley, had been a friend of Richard Hooker's antagonist at the Temple Church, Walter Travers, but soon after the Conference Sparke became a convinced conformitan, publishing an apologia in 1607 entitled *A Brotherly Persuasion to Unity*. The leader of the group was John Reynolds, Master of Corpus Christi College, Oxford and a moderate defender of episcopal government in the Church, though not *jure divino*. The make-up of the delegation was such that there might be some substance in the complaint of Henry Jacob, one of the more extreme and excluded Petitioners, that the 'whole managing of it was underhand plotted and procured by the Prelats themselves'.

On January 14th, a Saturday, the King conferred with a number of bishops, deans and members of the Privy Council for about five hours. Dudley Carleton again described the scene in a letter written the next day. The King began with a speech to the assembled dignitaries telling them 'he sent not for them as persons accused but as men of choice by whom he sought to receive instruction'. He dealt with many of the matters raised in the Petition and

> insisted somewhat upon the disorder of Bishops' Chancellors; to which the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the Bishop of Winchester and Durham made mild and good answers and the Bishop of London spake well to the purpose but with too rough boldness. The Deans amongst whom was Westminster were only hearers.

The silent Dean of Westminster was none other than Lancelot Andrewes.

Bancroft, who played such a prominent part in the Conference, was an ecclesiastical bruiser with a special talent for investigation. In his youth he had been especially distinguished at Cambridge for his boxing, wrestling and quarterstaff play. Contemporaries said that his life had been saved by Chaderton in one town and gown riot. As Bishop of London, Bancroft was a veteran of the long running controversy about governance in the Church.

Theodore Beza, the successor of Calvin in Geneva had divided bishops into three types. *Episcopus divinus* was 'one and the same with a Presbyter'. *Episcopus humanus* was 'chosen by the Presbyters to be

President over them'. *Episcopus diabolus* however was 'a bishop with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction; lording it over God's heritage and governing by his own will and authority'.

Even allowing for the prejudicial rhetoric it is clear what kind of episcopate Puritans believed had survived in the Church of England. Puritans alleged that bishops stood in the way of a thorough reformation of the Church of England. The pseudonymous Martin Marprelate, expressed his alliterative contempt for bishops thus, 'proud, popish, presumptive, profane, paltry, pestilent and pernicious prelates'. Bancroft riposted in a sermon at Paul's Cross which stirred up a veritable hornets' nest. He poured scorn on the proposition that the Presbyterian form of Church government was the one intended by Christ. 'A very strange matter if it were true that Christ should erect a form of government for the ruling of his church to continue from his departure out of this world to his coming again: and that the same should never be once thought of or put into practice for the space of 1500 years.' He also described John Knox as 'a man of nature too contentious' and of 'perverse behaviour' which brought protests from the Scots and was a trifle rich coming from such an ecclesiastical brawler.

After Saturday's consultation the Bishops were ordered to return on Wednesday while Monday was assigned for hearing the Petitioners. Carleton writing on Sunday remarked of the prelates and the Puritans that 'as they do differ in opinions so do they in fashions, for one side marches in gowns and rochets, and t'other in cloaks and night caps'.

The bishops had been examined alone, but on the Monday when the Puritans were ushered into the Privy Chamber, they found that Bancroft of London and Bilson of Winchester with a bevy of deans were waiting for them. William Barlow, Dean of Chester described the scene: 'The King's Majesty entering the chamber, presently took his chair placed as the day before (the noble young Prince [the nine year old Henry] sitting by upon a stool)'. In the aweful presence of the monarch, the four Puritans knelt down to present their case. 'Pernicious and pestilent' prelate I may be, but I can find it in my heart to sympathize somewhat with the petitioners' plight. The Puritan quartet stepped onto the stage and became extras in the drama of the Royal Supremacy. They were in a Court used to ceremonious and symbolic communication to plead that the liturgy be abridged and purged of ceremony. They were on their knees representing a tendency in the Church of England that objected to kneeling to receive the host at the Holy Communion.

The King was enjoying himself. Not since King Alfred had such an intellectual come to the throne. James's tutor had been the Calvinist

George Buchanan, one of the foremost scholars of the day. The King's own voluminous works on statecraft and kingship had a Europe wide circulation.

Like many great men, James had developed the fatal facility for continuous utterance and he constantly intervened as the delegation led by Dr Reynolds made their points. The Barlow account of the Conference (which, although it must be treated with some caution since it was drawn up at the request of the Bishop of London, is the fullest we have available) has the King 'taxing St Jerome for his assertion that a Bishop was not *Divinae ordinationis*'. The excitable Bancroft broke in that if he could not prove his ordination as a bishop lawful out of Scripture, 'he would not be a bishop four hours'. The King approved 'their calling and use in the Church' and closed the discussion with his famous aphorism 'No Bishop, no King'.

Dr Reynolds wanted the Catechism of Church teaching expanded. The King was courteous but unyielding.

> He would have a catechism in the fewest and plainest affirmative terms that may be … adding this excellent gnomical and canon-like conclusion that in reforming of a Church, he would have two rules observed: first that old deep and intricate questions might be avoided in the fundamental instruction of a people …

and secondly that changes should not be dictated by a desire to distance the Church from Roman Catholic positions, because there were many areas of agreement.

The Bishop of London also fell to his knees to request that as well as a preaching ministry, 'there might be amongst us a praying ministry'. He taxed some ministers with being content 'to walk in the churchyard till sermon time rather than be present at public prayer'.

These are very important exchanges, which reveal what was at stake in the Hampton Court Conference. One of the curses of the Western Christian World in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the tendency to over-define mystery with a polemical intention. After the nuclear explosion which shattered the old Western Church, all the fragments recast themselves as the Churches we know today. In Diarmaid MacCulloch's excellent recent history of the Reformation in Europe, he points out that there were no Roman Catholics in Europe in 1500, with the sole exception of the Kingdom of Bohemia where there were churches loyal to the Pope operating under an Establishment which traced its origins to the Hussite movement. The Roman Church recast itself at the long running Council of Trent and in many ways it was reformed more successfully than the Church of England. In the course of drawing up battle lines in the disastrous civil war which was to convulse Europe until the Peace of Westphalia and beyond, all sides were tempted to greater and greater clarity about what divided them with consequences which last to this day.

The reign of James I was overshadowed by this Christian civil war. He tried to play the *Rex Pacificus* and to identify the common ground, to make peace with Spain and even to contemplate a Spanish match for his son Charles. All this enraged the hotter English Puritans who pressed for intervention in the European war on the Protestant side. It was to be Bancroft's successor as Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, who pressed for English troops to be sent in battle on the Continent in what he regarded as an apocalyptic conflict with the armies of Anti-Christ. The middle ground was contracting all the time but the Hampton Court Conference left open the possibility that the Church of England might resist the general trend towards the over-definition of mystery and that it might retain the vocabulary of symbol and ceremony which, certainly, the silent Dean of Westminster, Lancelot Andrewes, believed was the door into mystery.

The Puritans, however, were exclusive in their devotion to words and at this point Mr Knewstub intervened. He criticised the use of the cross in Baptism and made the astonishing charge that the surplice had been the 'kind of garment which the priests of Isis used to wear'. The King saw no reason why such vesture should not continue to be worn in Divine Service, 'for comeliness and for order sake'. 'This being his constant and resolute opinion, that no church ought further to separate itself from the Church of Rome, either in doctrine or ceremony than she had departed from herself when she was in her flourishing and best estate.'

Dr Reynolds took exceptions at those words in the Common Prayer Book of Matrimony, 'With my body I thee worship'. The King replied that this was but a strong way of saying we must give honour to our wives and then followed one of those bawdy humorous asides which did not always go down well with the more strait-laced—'turning to Dr Reynolds (with smiling, saith His Majesty,) Many a man speaks of Robin Hood who never shot in his bow: if you had a good wife yourself you would think all the honour and worship you could do to her were well bestowed'.

Reynolds went on to church discipline, which in many ways was the nub of the matter. Perhaps he had been advised by Patrick Galloway to urge a form of discipline, not unlike the evolving Scottish system, which blended episcopal with presbyteral elements. He envisaged a regime grounded in ruridecanal meetings where they could have 'prophesying' of the kind Archbishop Grindall had tried and failed to commend to Queen Elizabeth. At the apex there would be an 'episcopal synod where the bishop with his presbytery should determine all such points as before could not be decided'.

It was a fatal misjudgement. Barlow says that His Majesty was 'somewhat stirred' but the anonymous account of the Conference preserved in the British Library, which on the whole is more favourably disposed to the Puritan cause, gives an even more graphic account of the King's displeasure. 'His Majesty utterly distasting his coors sayd that this was rightly the presbytery of Scotland, wherein John and William and Richard and such like must have theyr censure.'

The dictum 'No Bishop, no King' was once more pronounced and the King left the room for his private quarters.

Another day elapsed and on Wednesday, January 18th the King spent a couple of hours with the bishops and deans and various civil lawyers. Even in a ceremonious age the compliments to the King's understanding verged on the blasphemous. The Bishop of London fell on his knees again and protested that 'his heart melted within him with joy' and he acknowledged 'unto Almighty God the singular mercy we have received at his hands in giving us such a king as since Christ his time, the like he thought had not been; whereunto the Lords with one voice did yield a very affectionate acclamation'. In this rather febrile atmosphere the Puritan delegation was shown in. The King was gracious, amiable but vague and this led to a certain amount of confusion about whether anything at all was to be done to meet the Puritan case.

In truth the liturgy and polity of the Elizabethan Church remained virtually intact. This gave a vital breathing space for the development of that tradition in the Church of England so closely associated with Lancelot Andrewes and his spiritual heirs. That part of the Anglican tradition, which was allowed to grow, was concerned with mystery, manners and the golden mean.

The King was pleased with his own performance. Shortly after the Conference he wrote to one of the crypto-Catholic members of the Privy Council, Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton:

> We have kept such a revel with the Puritans here these two days … They fled me so from argument to argument without ever answering me directly ut est eorum moris as I was forced at last to say unto them that if any of them had been in a college disputing with their scholars, if any of their disciples had answered them in that sort [then] should the rod have played upon the poor boys buttocks.

The minor changes agreed at the Conference were referred to a committee of bishops and members of the Privy Council. They reported to the King and he, on February 9th, by Letters Patent ordered the publication and exclusive use of the slightly amended Book of Common Prayer. The Letters were followed up by a royal proclamation on March 5th. The King's assessment of the Hampton Court Conference was published in the Proclamation in the following words. 'We found mighty and vehement informations supported by so weak and slender proofs, as it appeared unto us and our council that there was no cause why any change should have been at all in that which was most impugned, the Book of Common Prayer.' In consequence 'we do admonish all men that hereafter they shall not expect or attempt any further alteration in the common and public form of God's service.'

In the months following the Conference, the King closely identified himself with the bishops' programme for reforming the church. In March 1604 in his first address to Parliament, James gave his own definition of Puritanism. He castigates Puritans as 'a sect rather than a Religion' and specifies their danger to the state:

> The Puritans and Novelists do not so far differ from us in points of religion as in their confused form of Policy and Parity, being ever discontented with the present government and impatient to suffer any superiority which maketh their sect unable to be suffered in any well governed Commonwealth.

Archbishop Whitgift had died on February 29th and Bancroft as Dean of the Province of Canterbury was authorized to summon Convocation, the Church's own Parliament, to proceed with a revision of the Canons. This was to be a prelude to a renewed effort to secure conformity. The new Canon XXXVI stipulated that ministers were only to be ordained or licensed after subscribing to three things, the Royal Supremacy, the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. The wording is based on the three articles issued by Whitgift in 1583 but in the new canon there is a concluding clause to exclude the possibility of casuistical equivocation. Ministers are to subscribe 'willingly and *ex animo*'. This provoked opposition from parliamentarians and Puritan pamphleteers. It did not in the event prove possible to enforce the canon with entire consistency but in accordance with the King's intention to divide moderate from radical Puritans the subsequent campaign resulted in the departure of modest numbers of the more extreme. About eighty beneficed clergy refused to subscribe and left the licensed ministry of the Church of England.

Some of the details can be read in Dr. Babbage's useful book on Jacobean Puritanism.

I have of course left the most substantial fruit of the Conference to the last. During the conversation between Dr Reynolds and the King on Monday 16th, the former had pressed for a new translation of the Bible on account of the corruptions in those which had been authorized in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. When the request is decoded, Reynolds wanted a strict Puritan Bible, the naked word of God, without what Puritans regarded as tendentious translations like the use of the words 'bishop' and 'church'. In apparently agreeing with him the King described the very opposite of what Reynolds wanted. James characterized the Puritan's favourite translation, the Geneva version as 'the worst of all'. He proposed that a new translation should be prepared by the best learned in the two universities, then it should be reviewed by the bishops and presented to the Privy Council before being ratified by royal authority for use in public preaching. The Bishop of London broke in complaining about the marginal notes in the Geneva version which, among other examples of eisegesis, firmly identified the Bishop of Rome with the figure of Anti-Christ in the Book of Revelation. The new Bible was to be an instrument of peace, and tendentious marginalia were to be omitted.

It was the beginning of an enterprise which was to involve both Reynolds and Chaderton and lead to the publication of the Authorized Version or the King James Bible in 1611. The appointment of fifty-four Translators to work in a number of syndicates on different portions of the Scripture is another illustration of the King's determination to include as wide a range of theological opinion as possible in his Church Establishment.

The King's instructions to the Translators directed that they were to use 'circumlocution' and language in which meaning was to be 'set forth gorgeously'. Translation, as Miles Smith wrote in the preface to the Authorized Version, is the work that 'openeth the window to let in the light'. There was to be light, but as Adam Nicolson says in a book which I cannot praise too highly, there was to be 'no terror of richness'—richness of the kind found in Jacobean art and decoration. The English of the Authorized Version was never the language of the street but a middle way between the demotic and Greek and Hebrew. Plainness was to be married to majesty in stately language which has had a profound influence on English sensibility ever since.

By commissioning the Authorized Version and refusing further substantial alterations of the Prayer Book in response to Puritan complaints, the Hampton Court Conference played an important part in keeping the Church of England open to the spirituality of Lancelot Andrewes and his heirs—mystery, manners and reverence for tradition and the golden mean.

In supporting James's efforts to call for a General Christian Council to bring peace to the Church, Andrewes explained, in writing against Cardinal Bellarmine, the position as he saw it of the Church of England with regard to the conflict between Catholic and Protestant. 'Our appeal is to antiquity yea even to the most extreme antiquity. We do not innovate; it may be we renovate what was customary with some ancients but with you has disappeared in novelties.' In limiting what the Church believed to the creeds and the first four Councils, Andrewes asserted that whatever was clouded by controversy was not part of fundamental truth, for God had made plain whatever was necessary for salvation. The name Protestant was a temporary convenience, intended to last only as long as Roman abuses persisted.

The King's behaviour at the Hampton Court Conference may have been startling or even coarse at times but his desire not be trapped into a polemical over-definition of mysteries and to devise an ecclesiastical regime which was inclusive enough to serve the unity and peace not only of the realm but of Europe, these are surely not ignoble ambitions. St Augustine described the true Church as one in which there was 'in certis unitas; in dubiis libertas et in omnibus caritas'. It is a definition with which King James would have sympathized. The responsibility for the Civil War which broke out under his more rigid and unbending son cannot be laid at his door. After the Conference, only the most extreme Puritans were compelled to leave the ministry of the Church of England, and the realm faced the threat of religious terrorism which surfaced in the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 relatively united, and able to include and rely on the loyalty of moderate Catholics as well as a wide spectrum of Protestant conformitans.

As for us at a time when the Church of England is uncertain about its identity; when the stream of inspiration which flows from the altar of God is very low; when we have many opportunities to speak but our words lack the power to convince; when the sense of confidence based on imperial power has dissolved; we could do worse than revisit the sources for the peculiar and rich identity of the Church of England as it developed when England was little more than an offshore island menaced by the big battalions massing on the European mainland—this was the England of the Hampton Court Conference, an England which then as now was ruled by Scots.

Select Bibliography

Babbage, Stuart Barton, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*, London, 1962.

Barlow, William, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference … at Hampton Court*, London, 1605.

Cardwell, Edward, *Synodalia. Documents from the Province of Canterbury 1547–1717*, Oxford, 1842.

Curtis, Mark, 'The Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', *History* 46, 1961.

Fincham, Kenneth (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, London, 1993.

Gee, Henry and Hardy, William John , *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, London, 1896.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Reformation. Europe's House Divided 1490–1700*, Penguin, 2003.

Nicolson, Adam, *Power and Glory. Jacobean England and the Making of the King James Bible*, London, 2003.

Shriver, Frederick, 'Hampton Court Revisited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1982.

Tanner, J. R.,*Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, 1603–1625*, Cambridge, 1952.

Thurley, Simon, *Hampton Court*, Yale, 2003.

Usher, R. G., *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, New York, 1910.

(The Rt Revd and Rt Hon Richard Chartres, DD, FSA, is Bishop of London.)

The Making of 1662

D. N. GRIFFITHS

What made the year 1662 so important in the history of the English Book of Common Prayer? It wasn't the year that Oliver Cromwell died; nor when King Charles II became King of England, nor even the year of his coronation. These events were spread over several years before a new Prayer Book could at last become the official liturgy of the Church of England. Its predecessor (sometimes known as the Hampton Court Book) had been authorized in 1604 by King James I but is now largely forgotten.

Nevertheless the 1604 prayer-book had appeared in about 200 English editions and impressions (plus another ten in foreign languages) over its 40 years of existence, until its use was made a penal offence by a Parliamentary Ordinance of 1645. The Puritan clergy took this in their stride (one called it 'taking away a heavy burthen'), yet various stalwart priests and deacons continued to offer Prayer Book worship in private houses, and traditional services were even unofficially tolerated at several centres in London (notably Lincoln's Inn Chapel, St Gregory-by-St Paul's, and St Clement's, Eastcheap).

However, the principal centre for continuing Prayer Book worship was not London nor even England, but Paris, at the (still) royalist British Residency to the French court. Here for nineteen years Sir Richard Browne, the Ambassador, provided a chapel for Anglican services, a home for Anglican divines, and a cemetery for Protestants. In the words of his son-in-law, John Evelyn the diarist, 'in many Controversies with Papists and sectaries, [at] a time when it was so low and as many thought utterly lost, our divines used to argue for the visibility of the Church from his Chapell and Congregation'.

At home in republican England a new generation had grown up without access to the traditional worship of the national church. How did the tables come to be so dramatically turned that King Charles II recovered his father's throne? Sheer lapse of time was one factor. Citizens who had experienced the trial and judicial murder of King Charles I had had ample opportunity to reflect on the King's personal dignity and holiness at his trial and on the scaffold. Meanwhile erstwhile supporters of the Commonwealth were beginning to tire of its internal divisions and interference with the details of ordinary life.

Ralph Josselin, the Puritan who in 1645 had dared to call the Prayer Book a 'heavy burden' wrote in his diary on 28 March 1657, that there was 'talke now of a king, the Lord bee our king and lawgive'r'. Eighteen months later he wrote 'Cromwell died 3 September, people not much minding it'. His death raised the immediate problem of succession (always a difficulty in revolutionary governments). Although Oliver Cromwell had refused Parliament's offer of the royal throne, he allowed them to nominate his son Richard to succeed him as Lord Protector. However, Richard Cromwell proved to be an inadequate and reluctant monarch (commonly known as 'Tumbledown Dick'), who was even accused of opening up personal negotiations to transfer the throne to Charles.

Meanwhile Charles had been spending the years of the interregnum in exile on the continent of Europe, and at the time of Oliver Cromwell's death had just set up court in the Low Countries. Even so, he continued to travel widely, looking for a continental army prepared to enthrone him with the help of a Cavalier uprising at home. Fortunately these schemes came to nothing, and the time was coming when he could return home by invitation. Eighteen months after Cromwell's death, George Monk, commanding general in Scotland, had restored peace in both England and Scotland, and was pressing for an elected Parliament.

General Monk was also in touch with the King-in-Waiting, who was then receiving a deputation of Puritan ministers from England. They had come to sound out his religious views, and ask him to cease using the Book of Common Prayer in his private chapel. The King told them that he considered that form of worship to be 'the best in the world' and refused their request. Shortly afterwards Charles issued his Declaration of Breda, offering a general pardon to all except a few regicides, and declaring some measure of religious toleration:

> Because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other … we do declare a liberty to tender consciences and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom.

These eirenic words helped to appease the Presbyterians and their allies, who dominated the specially-elected Convention Parliament, and on 29 May 1660 (his 30th birthday) Charles returned to his capital city. John Evelyn wrote in his diary that the King was welcomed with a 'Triumph of above 20,000 horse and foot, brandishing their swords and shouting with inexpressible joy'. Josselin's diary put it differently: 'The naçon runneth to the king as Israel to bring back King David; Lord make him ye like blessing to our England and let God's counsell bee in the worke'.

The King's return began a gradual drift back towards the Prayer Book, beginning in early July in the chapel royal and cathedrals. The King's Printers (Christopher Barker and John Bill) and also the Cambridge University Press reprinted the 1604 book (there were no Oxford editions in those days). In his diary Pepys seemed more impressed by hearing an organ played and seeing a surplice worn for the first time. By November, at his parish church of St Olave, Hart Street, the vicar 'did begin to nibble at the Common Prayer by saying "Glory be to the Father &c." after he had read the two psalms. But the people have been so little used to it that they could not tell what to answer'.

Some moderate churchmen seemed ready to negotiate with moderate Presbyterians on the lines of the King's Breda Declaration, but first there was serious work to be done. As the established national church was still nominally Presbyterian, Anglicans were soon pressing for the ministry and structures of the Church of England to be restored in all their bewildering complexity. This process was initiated not by the Convention Parliament, but by crown and court acting under the royal prerogative. Meanwhile the Presbyterians wanted to reform the Prayer Book on Puritan lines, complaining that it 'contained many things that are justly offensive and need amendment'.

The Lord Chancellor (the future Lord Clarendon) promised to appoint 'some learned divines of different persuasions to review [the book], and to make such alterations as shall be thought most necessary, and some such additional prayers as shall be thought fit for emergent occasions'. This wording was tightened when a royal warrant was issued for these divines to meet at the Savoy Palace in London between 15 April and 24 July 1661. Its agenda was now extended to read: '… avoiding, as much as may be, all unnecessary alterations of the forms and liturgy wherewith the people are already acquainted'.

The participants were to be twelve bishops and twelve Presbyterian divines, with nine assessors from each party. Gilbert Sheldon, newly appointed Bishop of London, was the effective leader of the Anglican party. He opened proceedings with a pre-emptive strike by saying that the bishops were content with the book as it stood and it was for the other side to produce proposals for revision. The Presbyterians gladly accepted the invitation, and tabled their own liturgy, as conceived by Richard Baxter. Although he personally was so deeply respected by Anglicans that he had recently been offered (but refused) the Bishopric of Hereford, his liturgy itself was regarded as far too 'Genevan' (or Calvinist) to be seriously considered.

The other Presbyterian contribution was a list of eighteen 'general' and seventy-eight 'particular' objections to the 1604 Prayer Book (although it is hard to tell one kind from the other). The general principles all sprang from the premise that the book should be doctrinally acceptable to all Protestants. The next clause needs explanation: 'The gift of conceived prayer should be allowed free exercise', meaning that the liturgy ought not to be 'too rigorously imposed', but that 'ministers may also make use of those gifts for prayer and exhortation which Christ hath given' them. (There is an old story about a Scots Presbyterian minister who was hauled up before the Kirk Session for using the Apostles' Creed every Sunday. He took to using the Nicene Creed instead and was given credit for having composed it himself.)

They were against lay people joining (audibly) in the prayers; even in the Litany the people's responses ought to be the single word 'amen'. The word 'priest' should be replaced by 'minister' and 'Sunday' by 'Lord's Day'. Lessons from the Old Testament or the Acts of the Apostles ought never to be described as 'Epistles'; the Authorized Version of the Bible should be used for all the readings; Lent and Saints' Days should have no religious observance, although they might remain in the civil calendar; and movement round a church within services should be kept at an absolute minimum.

Four well-known Puritan complaints were restated: no kneeling for Communion; no surplices for the clergy; no sign of the cross at Baptism; and no obligatory wedding ring at a marriage. All these rather miscellaneous suggestions far out-stepped the limits laid down in the Royal Warrant, and the bishops only conceded seventeen exceptions out of ninety-six. Apart from the 'general' points and fourteen 'particular' ones, each of the others was carefully but firmly rebutted by the bishops. The Presbyterians were in a cleft stick. Weighty objections were being rejected because they 'secretly [struck] at some established doctrine or laudable practice of the Church of England', whereas matters of detail were brushed aside 'as being of no consequence at all but utterly frivolous and vain'.

No wonder the conference had lasted so long and achieved so little. This stone-walling strategy had certainly preserved the familiar Book of Common Prayer in its essentials, but it also prevented the bishops themselves from introducing major innovations of their own. For example John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, had set out his proposals in a complete draft book incorporating material from the controversial Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, but before they could even be discussed, Cosin had been obliged to abandon the Savoy conference to travel up to Durham and be enthroned in his cathedral.

Another factor was that a new House of Commons had taken office in April, a week after the conference began. This 'Cavalier Parliament'—which Macaulay once called 'more zealous for royalty than the King and more zealous for episcopacy than the bishops'—soon tired of waiting for its outcome. By July the Commons had reached the third reading of a Bill for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, annexed to a copy of the 1604 Prayer Book. The Bill was then sent up to the House of Lords, where it remained unread until January 1662.

The Canterbury Convocation met on 21 November to agree on the text of a final Prayer Book to lay before Parliament. The formal proceedings took place each morning between 8 a.m. and 10 a.m., which totalled sixteen hours spread over twenty-two days. The real work was done in committee, which occupied the remainder of each day (no records survive). 4,500 words are said to have been erased from the book of 1604 whereas 10,500 new words were being added.

(The 1662 book of today contains about 185,000 words, of which 110,000 are direct quotations from Holy Scripture). In the words of Dean Jasper, 'Despite some six hundred changes, there was no striking departure from the 1604 book. Neither Laudians nor Puritans could claim any major concessions in their favour: yet neither could complain that they had been totally ignored'.

Friends of the Presbyterians tried to banish the Benedicite, and the lessons from the Apocrypha, but were defeated in full session. Of the ninety-six points raised at the Savoy, thirty-eight had been conceded, but eight of them were withdrawn in Convocation. What was given with one hand was often taken away with the other. The Prayer for all Sorts and Conditions of Men (one of the most successful innovations) might sound like an answer to the Presbyterian request for the Litany to be 'composed into one solemn prayer', and yet its rubric directs that it is to be read only 'when the Litany is *not* appointed to be read'.

Even the Declaration on Kneeling, at the end of Holy Communion, that so-called 'Black Rubric' which had been added in 1552 but omitted in 1559 and 1604, received similar treatment. The Puritans had pressed for its return; this was agreed, except that worshippers were now merely asked to deny the *corporal* presence of our Lord's body and blood in the Blessed Sacrament rather than his *real and essential* presence. Perhaps their principal achievement was to replace Coverdale's Great Bible with the Authorized Version of 1611 as the source of the readings at Holy Communion. This change was less than it sounded, because doctrine was not affected and such favourite passages as the Comfortable Words and the Psalter continued to use Coverdale's version.

There were other innovations. The Ministration of Baptism to Such as Are of Riper Years, and Able to Answer for Themselves was added to provide for those who had been denied infant baptism during the Commonwealth, and is arguably more scriptural than the original Prayer Book service which it now augmented. Another was the Forms of Prayer to Be Used at Sea, the only service to be adapted from the (Puritan) Directory for Public Worship, first issued in 1645 by the Long Parliament.

Another new section of the draft Prayer Book was the series of Prayers and Thanksgivings that appeared between the Litany and the Collects, Epistles and Gospels. These included the Prayer for all Sorts and Conditions, already mentioned, and of course the General Thanksgiving, one of the delights of the 1662 book. Many of these innovations and corrections take longer to describe than to detect, but towards the end of the Prayer Book there are two more. The first is the Ordinal, meaning The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and

Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The innovation here is not the Ordinal itself, which dates back to 1549, but that it now at last became an integral part of the Common Prayer.

The other was the so-called State Services, which remained in the book for almost two centuries and were then quietly dropped in 1859 with the consent of Queen Victoria. The one survivor today is the Accession Service, which in fact did not appear until 1685. In 1662 there was a service for 29 May, which by a happy coincidence was both the 30th birthday of King Charles and also the day on which he entered London to be proclaimed king. On the principle of 'The King is dead; long live the King', Charles had theoretically succeeded to the throne on 30 January 1649 when his father was executed in Whitehall Palace. The Accession Service was to become a separate observance when King James II succeeded his brother on 6 February 1685.

The titles of the other State Services sound intriguing to modern ears: every 5 November there was to be a 'Thanksgiving for the happy deliverance of the King, & the Three Estates of the Realm from the most Traiterous & Bloudy intended Massacre by Gun-Powder'. Then on 30 January there was a 'Form of Prayer for the day of the Martyrdom of King Charles the First', and on 29 May 'The King's Birth and Return'.

When I was an assistant curate, I used to dream of reviving these services when I had a parish of my own; that is, before I had studied them in detail. They are incredibly wordy. Many of their special collects contain 150 or more words (as compared with seventy in the Lord's Prayer). It was as though Cranmer's charisma had carried the revisers triumphantly through the other innovations and then faltered with the State Services. A similar fault-line exists between the 1662 collects for Advent 3 (an improvement on Cranmer's choice), and Epiphany 6—a completely new collect which fills a gap in Cranmer's calendar but then (to my mind) spoils it by not only preaching rather than praying, but also by trying to preach the whole Gospel in eight lines.

The final draft of the revised Prayer Book was approved by Convocation in December 1661 and by the King in Council on 24 February 1662, but its printing was delayed until the Uniformity Bill had received the royal assent in the middle of May. This Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer allowed just fourteen weeks for its enforcement to take effect upon thousands of clergymen and teachers scattered widely over England and Wales. That timing is thought to have been a deliberate Cavalier ploy to eject non-conforming Puritan clergy from their livings, depriving them not only of their homes but also of the tithes that they had hoped and expected to receive at Michaelmas.

Thus every dignitary, fellow, incumbent, and teacher had to perform three tests: by 17 August he had to have read Morning and Evening Prayer from the new Prayer Book, at the same time making a public declaration of his 'unfeigned assent and consent' to all its contents. Secondly, by 24 August (St Bartholomew's Day), he had to swear two formal written declarations in which he both renounced taking arms against the King, and also renounced the (Anglo-Scottish) Solemn League and Covenant. Finally, if he held a cure of souls and had not yet been ordained by a bishop, he had either to obtain his Ordination speedily or lose his living.

Although these provisions of the Act had been widely known long before it became law, little or nothing appears to have been done to solve the logistic problems that would arise. Most of the bishops were new to office, and not all their legal officials had yet received formal appointment. No instructions or advice from either Lambeth or Bishopsthorpe reached the diocesan bishops. It would be at least another twelve months before the historic pastoral and administrative structures of the Church of England had fully recovered from the traumas of the Civil War and Commonwealth.

Copies of the new Prayer Book had been supposed to be available well before 17 August, which happened to be the last Sunday before St Bartholomew's Day. Its crown copyright was vested in the King's Printers, a commercial firm who refused to call in outside help. No copies at all were ready until about 6 August, only eleven days before the deadline; the Bishop of Peterborough was still awaiting his personal copy on 17 August, and the Dean of Lincoln had not received his by the 25th. The non-appearance of the new Prayer Book not only denied Puritan incumbents the opportunity to judge its contents, but also threatened even the more conformable clergy with ejection from office.

Dean Honywood of Lincoln and some other conscientious clergy went to great trouble to obtain private lists of the changes to the Prayer Book of 1604, and then to obey the law to the letter by painstakingly correcting that book in ink, but this happened in personal correspondence rather than in response to any official circular. 'Of the 7,000 Ministers who kept their Livings, few except those who lived near London, could possibly have a sight of the Book with its alterations, till after they had declar'd their Assent and Consent to it.'

Even though its time-table could not be rigorously enforced, the Act of Uniformity took effect and (to quote Bishop Moorman)

> the Church of England was fully and exclusively restored, and those who were not prepared to accept its liturgy and its discipline had to go ... Many of the Presbyterian clergy were ordained by bishops

> in order to retain their benefices, but nearly a thousand were ejected and either went abroad or found some other occupation in England.

Better things might have been done, or the same things might have been done better, and yet the publication of the 1662 Prayer Book was a prodigious enterprise.

Rather than dwell on what went wrong, I choose instead to quote from a sermon preached by that great churchman John Durel. Durel was a Jerseyman who had been ordained at the British Residency in Paris during the bleak reign of Oliver Cromwell. After preaching and publishing this sermon he was asked to superintend an official French translation of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, which appeared in 1667 and then the Latin version two years later. This is how he described the 1662 Prayer Book on the threshold of its first appearance in English:

> Our Liturgy is an admirable piece of Devotion and instruction. It is the marrow and substance of all that the Piety and experience of the first five Centuries of Christianity found most proper to Edification in the publick Assemblies. It is a Compound of Texts of Scripture, of Exhortations to Repentance, of Prayers, Hymns, Psalmes, Doxologies, Lessons, Creeds and of Thanksgivings, and for other publick duties of Christians in the Church. And of Comminations against impenitent sinners. And all this mixed and diversified with great care expressly to quicken devotion, and stir up attention …
>
> The Prayers of our Liturgy are short for the most part … and they do seldom comprise more than one thing, to the intent that they may be the better comprehended, and cause the less distraction when they are made. And to the end the whole Congregation may be quickened up to a necessary attention, and … feel the secret motions of a holy Joy.

This paper owes much to the advice and encouragement of Professor J. R. Porter who saw it in draft; any remaining errors are my own. The principal modern authorities are *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663*, by Professor I. M. Green (Oxford, 1978), and *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, by Canon G. J. Cuming (Macmillan Press, second edition, 1982). The final quotation is extracted from John Durel's 'The Liturgy of the Church of England asserted': the contemporary sermon preached at the opening of the Savoy Chapel in London (Wing D2692).

(*The Ven Dr D. N. Griffiths is the author of* The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer 1549–1999. *This address was given for the Prayer Book Society at Lambeth Palace, 21 July 2004.*)

Reflections on the Use of the Word God in a Secular Age

JOHN GARBUTT

Whatever the current assumptions about the decline of Christianity, the crisis of faith, or the death of God, the word God remains in constant use in everyday life. In the spoken language, God is as popular as ever. That is to say, the word God has numerous uses, some of pre-Christian origin, some non-Christian in connotation, and some plainly anti-religious.

In the English variants of Christianity, unlike those religions in which the word God is too sacred to pronounce, or is ring-fenced and protected against misuse, the word is active in scores of everyday expressions, and as part of the living language is exposed to both misuse and change. Change is inevitable; the nature and possible causes of misuse deserve more attention than they have received.

While the ever-winding fabric of the spoken language is coloured and enriched by expressions originating in early translations of the Bible, in the Book of Common Prayer, and in popular or once-popular hymns, all these expressions are subject to the rough and tumble of daily life, and their meaning is modified by usage which is itself influenced by contemporary culture, a culture not to be imagined as some steady-state force field but as a congruence of infinitely variable, unpredictable pressures in which beliefs and attitudes, fashionable behaviours, and social, political and economic factors all play a part.

To take a key example, the phrase ‘Almighty God’, resounding throughout the BCP and central not only to the liturgy but also to rituals and ceremonies such as coronations where Church supports State, becomes insecure when it steps outside the church door. Almighty God might be thought to be the guarantor of the judicial system, performing a vital role in upholding the law of the land, but this is not so. It can be shown that when faced with the question of God's existence the law remains firmly agnostic. The evidence of non-Christians has been accepted as competent for nearly 140 years. Accepting the inevitable, the Court of Appeal observed in 1977 that 'it would be unrealistic to suppose that in contemporary society the divine sanction of an oath was generally recognized'.[1] The Oaths Act of 1978 confirmed that 'the validity of an oath duly administered and taken is unaffected by any lack of religious belief on the part of the witness'.[2] Hence a witness, instead of taking the oath approved in 1927 and beginning with the familiar form of words, 'I swear by Almighty God that the evidence I shall give …' is able as an alternative to make an affirmation, so revealing the truth about the oath, which the court knew all along, that it is not God who guarantees the truth of the witness's evidence, but it is the intention of the witness himself, in his belief that what he is about to say is true, that guarantees its truth to the best of his or her knowledge. Although it might be said that when a witness does prefer to take the conventional oath, God becomes a servant of the court, the law is prepared on request to do without God's services, as it does in the civil ceremony of marriage and when oaths are administered by solicitors and others in the legal profession.

In a more informal context the phrase often takes on a jocular tone, as in the conversational aside, 'Who does he think he is? God Almighty?', where the reference to the deity is co-opted into supporting an allegation of presumptuousness, so that the image of God is by inference re-drawn as that of an overweening figure of authority who indulges in tyrannical behaviour, like the object of the allegation.

The phrase Almighty God can be traced back to Old English and speaks from an age of faith. It commands attention throughout the BCP where its first use is in the Absolution or Remission of Sins, setting up an interactive relationship with the Creator. But when transmuted into the demotic interjection 'Godalmighty!' (one word) meaning little more than 'Well I never!', the expletive acts as a knowing parody of its origin, playing off irreverence and reverence against each other in an ambiguity that denies any relationship.

Almighty God is not the only term of convenience to be found in a legal setting. An equally serviceable expression, without a definition of which no legal textbook is complete, is 'Act of God'. All the textbooks are agreed that Act of God is a universal term that does duty for floods, tropical storms, bolts of lightning, volcanic eruptions and plagues,[3] including their consequences: in other words, natural disasters.

The image of God so presented is bleak. This is a quixotic God who specializes in death and destruction.

With its headline-appeal, Act of God is also an adopted child of the media, where such acts are a long-established and user-friendly part of the journalist's stock-in-trade, hinting at the continued existence of an angry Old Testament deity, though a touch of irony is permissible: 'Guided hurricanes, disastrous tidal waves and sudden holes in the protective ozone layer of the earth will allow high energy radiated from the sun to burn selected areas to death. These are the simulated Acts of God already labelled for tomorrow's armoury'.[4] And of the late Viscount Esher, architect and administrator, concerning his appointment as planner to Hatfield New Town, the obituarist wrote: 'This time, an act of God reinforced his sense of failure. Violent gales swept the county, taking with them a great number of the natty modern roofs that Esher had designed for hapless Hatfield residents'.[5] With or without the irony, Act of God is an anachronism and it is surprising that it survives without objection.

The gratuitous swearing of oaths in everyday conversation is a behaviour subject to fashion and the oaths favoured are subject to local and regional variations. Readers will be aware that 'By God!' is an oath with a long provenance and with sources and parallels in ancient Rome. Vehement in its brevity and deriving much of its force from what is *not* said, it is a versatile intensifier depending on the complicity of the listener for full effect. For this very reason its use is diminishing in a secular age. In its heyday it could be taken as an act of defiance against Mosaic law and against Pauline prohibition.[6] But this form of blasphemy was always ill at ease in the office or on the bus. Today its use seems archaic, finding a home in costume drama and historical fiction. It has passed through the stage of implying 'Listen to me, I mean business!' and ended by implying 'Look at me, I am showing my age'.

In this state of exhaustion and ineffectiveness it is echoed by the mannered use of the single word 'God!' as an interjection, adding an intended spicy flavour to speech whether in monologue or dialogue, any religious allusion having disappeared. (The similar use of the names 'Jesus!' and 'Christ!' deserves comment, omitted here.) In any declaration such as 'God! I felt shattered', the context serves to deplete the meaning, which is conventionally understood as 'I felt absolutely shattered'. Such use is considered socially acceptable today at every level. The contraction of 'By God!' into 'God!' recalls the earlier contraction of 'God damn me' into 'Goddam' and finally into the expletive 'Damn!' In the Middle Ages, we are told, the English used 'Goddam' so frequently that the French employed 'goddams' as a synonym for Englishmen.[7]

To borrow further from lexicography, the word God is found 'in phrases expressive of a strong desire for benefit or injury of a particular person or thing, as in God bless, curse, damn, preserve, etc. (him, it, etc.)'.[8] In other words, there is no involvement of the deity; the word God is employed to express the speaker's intentions whether for good or ill. But hiding within such use lies a trace of the superstition that voicing one's desire may succeed in transferring one's desire to the object itself, whether human or inanimate. Under emotional pressure, voicing one's desire becomes intuitive, and connects with the belief that one's own will or indeed the national will reflects the will of God.

When 'God bless' is deployed in the slogan 'God bless America', a warmly benign attitude with sentimental personal connotations and an assumed reference to the founding Pilgrim Fathers is attached to a political context, so that the use of 'God bless' serves to strengthen party political morale. As a commentator on Texas observed, 'There's no great distinction here between God and country'.[9] In this usage, sadly, the phrase 'God bless' loses its innocence. Such loss is not inevitable, witness the fact that 'God bless' is still used with a degree of conviction in daily life; sanctified by the Beatitudes, the Psalms from 1.21 onwards and (echoing Numbers 6.24–6) the Benediction in the BCP, its use even in the secular world retains some sense of conferring virtue. Though the cheerful custom of exclaiming 'Bless you!' when someone sneezes is only a light-hearted way of expressing sympathy, it earns inclusion here because one would have to admit, under duress, that it turns blessing into an accepted form of superstitious behaviour.[10] On a different level, in the accepted context where artistic prowess is rewarded by divine inspiration, the pianist Garrick Ohisson, referring to one of his own recordings, said, 'I was blessed by God on that particular day'.[11] Gratitude for a fine performance when everything went right cannot be better expressed.

It is a short step from divine blessing to belief in divine guidance. The most controversial claim of divine guidance made in modern times is the claim made by the President of the United States, reported in the British Press with worldly scepticism: 'Bush says God chose him to lead his nation'.[12] There are Biblical precedents. But of course a long line of British monarchs, not to mention certain military leaders, believed as much and had a similar interest in ensuring that the common people believed likewise. The danger lies in the linkage: any erosion of confidence in God causes an erosion of confidence in the leader, and vice versa. As suggested above, believing that one is carrying out the 'will of God' depends upon intuition, not upon evidence; it is a belief that can be sustained without regard for the consequences. In the words of Mohammed Saad al-Beshi, Saudi Arabia's state executioner, who is said to behead on average seven people a day, 'It doesn't matter to me. Two, four, ten—as long as I'm doing God's will, it doesn't matter how many I execute'.[13] Enemies in wartime believe that they are doing God's will in slaughtering each other. Each side believes that 'God is on our side'. Irrefutable words have been and still are wrenched from their context in Scripture as authority: 'If God be for us, who can be against us?'[14]

The above examples are among those most likely to cause loss of life and suffering. It is a relief to take instead the comparatively harmless expressions 'God-botherer', 'God-bothering', 'God-squad' and 'God-slot'. 'God-botherer' is said to have originated in Australia as slang for preacher; it has a breezy materialism and a certain sense of humour about it. Removed to another continent with a long religious history the word takes on a stronger anti-clerical bias; from a secular point of view, 'God-bothering' is a form of activity pursued by eccentrics or fanatics and making no contribution to economic growth and social progress. It is found mainly among evangelical groups conspicuous for their enthusiastic behaviour. 'God-squad' is an Americanism used to identify an enthusiastic evangelical college group with missionary designs upon their fellow-students. The expression has travelled moderately well, in the sense that it can be used flexibly for any group distinguished by religious zeal. 'God-slot' is tinged with a British sense of humour and is applied to programming of religious broadcasts in which a precise and suitably limited time is allocated as a token gesture towards the interests of the religious minority: a cultural phenomenon not expected to influence the secular age of technology that makes it possible. Any unforeseen increase in the ratings is expected to be contained within a carefully separated 'God-channel'.

In this sorry catalogue of depleted meanings and lost causes, surely 'Thank God!' retains a degree of devotional integrity? One would hope, buttressed by the General Thanksgiving, Catherine Winkworth's hymn, Johann Crüger's melody *Nun danket*,[15] regular renditions of 'We plough the fields, and scatter' and 'Come, ye thankful people, come', not forgetting the Pauline emphasis in the Epistles on giving thanks to God,[16] that 'Thank God' would be proof against misuse. For personal use outside the liturgy, 'Thank God' is available as always. But there is a fashionable throw-away version which must be poked into everyday conversation as a casual aside. It is only meant light-heartedly, so who could object? Anyone foolish enough to show disapproval would instantly become an object of derision. This throw-away version is also humorously paired with incongruous objects, as in 'Thank God for instant soups', and is at home in chatty journalism, as in the trailer for a TV programme on marine predators: 'Thank God you weren't born a sardine'.[17] At least the writer knows how to exploit an anti-climax.

More dangerous in its handling of relationships is the expression 'For God's sake!' Intended to be persuasive, rarely does it carry a religious connotation. When used with a tone of exasperation, an air of being unable to put up with something a moment longer, it is forcefully divisive, alienating speaker from listener. Unfortunately, when used in the same way, 'For the love of God!' may convey a heartfelt appeal while expressing anything but love. There is a weak link between the use of God, indirect as it is, and the speaker's true intentions.

The nearest to a direct approach to God in daily discourse would appear to be in the exclamation 'O my God!'[18] Preferably uttered with someone else present, it is used to convey surprise or alarm and to attract attention. Yet the relationship between speaker and listener is strangely that of an actor to an audience. Exclaiming 'O my God!' is a form of behaviour akin to a fashion statement, certainly having nothing to do with any form of religious belief. The listener is meant to understand that no offence is intended by such a reference.[19] But the question of offensiveness is generally neglected in the widespread use of the word God for a host of non-religious purposes, taking it for granted that any fault lies in those offended. It is a rare dictionary that touches on the question of tact and advises the reader where such use may give offence.[20]

So suspect has the colloquial use of the word God become that even the use of the phrase 'Honest to God' loses credibility. This is no reflection on the provocative polemic of 1963 by Dr John Robinson, a book which became notorious when its author, then Bishop of Woolwich, was accused of being an atheist.[21] The colloquial use of the phrase, where it persists, is marked by redundancy, as in 'God's truth', with its echo of the oath sworn in the courtroom, though when compressed into the slang ''Strewth!' its meaning vanishes entirely.

There survives a loosely connected group of expressions each deferring to the existence of God and each deserving a brief comment: 'God willing', 'God grant' and 'God forbid'. Of these the first, synonymous with *Deo volente*,[22] seems pious in intention but is ambiguous in use. Hoping for God's approval for an action that one intends to carry out of one's own volition is different from seeking

God's will in order to carry it out. 'God willing' is sometimes used in a pre-Christian sense to mean 'If fate allows', but it is difficult to reinterpret fatalism in the light of free will. For some it stands for Christian obedience rather than predestination. At other times it is used to mean 'If my health and strength permit'. 'God grant' has limited application in a worldly context. It seems the appropriate petition for good health, long life, a good harvest or a safe voyage. But even here there are pre-Christian overtones hinting at the existence of ancient gods who decide behind the scenes who is to be favoured and who is not. 'God forbid', when used in common speech, carries no more than a whiff of disapproval. An exception is to be found among the Jewish community where the OT sense of an injunction carrying all the force of Hebraic law and traditional way of life survives.[23] In Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, 'God forbid' recurs as one of St Paul's robust stylistic trademarks. This is too interventionist for some translators and is now replaced by a more undemonstrative substitute.[24] Still the phrase survives as a relic of the earlier translations, found more often in writing, albeit with an archaic and literary aura, than in common speech. The future of these expressions would seem to be in doubt.

In contrast, the expression 'Playing God' has currency for today notwithstanding its peculiar blend of anthropomorphism and journalistic licence. In a variety of contexts, but most notably in medical research, the ethical questions and dilemmas raised by interfering with natural processes are generalized under the headline 'Playing God'. Those questions are energetically discussed in the media while crucial decisions are taken without the long-term effects of those decisions being known. From an extended headline with byline: 'But even if we perfect the biotechnology, should we really begin to "play God"?' (The inverted commas were dropped in the article that followed, but could be understood).[25] And from a TV broadcast giving a viewer's reaction to a news item: 'Cloning gives people the right to play God'.[26] Of lesser importance today than the ethical questions is the use of the unreconstructed image of God taken straight from the Book of Genesis, where it dominates the Creation myth, all for the sake of a journalistic catchphrase. It is as though Darwin were still hesitating whether to publish his work, knowing the trouble he would bring. The legacy of more than a century of division over the theory of evolution has been a poor background for informed debate. And so the life-saving decisions rest in the hands of scientists in research laboratories, pharmaceutical companies and inaccessible committees.

The same image of God from the Old Testament, creative but authoritarian, patriarchal but punitive, lies behind 'God-fearing' and 'Fear of God'.[27] Translators have been reluctant to abandon the word fear[28] and have relied on readers picking up the connotations of the word from its Biblical context: not in the modern sense of a psychological state of terror, but registering a sense of awe at the supernatural power of the deity, coloured by reverence for all that is holy. But when taken abruptly out of context, and tied to the word God in a depleted meaning, the word fear draws upon all sorts of inappropriate associations, such as crime and violence, insecurity and intimidation. To quote the words of the British corporal concerning an incident in the Iraq war, 'I wanted to put the fear of God into the enemy'. In this instance, the five British soldiers who had been cornered and took part in the charge survived. All the enemy were killed.[29]

Reserved for extreme predicaments, the exclamation 'God help us!' draws upon faint echoes of Scripture, prayer and common worship: 'God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble'; or: '*Priest*: O God, make speed to save us; *Answer*: O Lord, make haste to help us'; and the great Isaac Watts hymn, 'O God, our help in ages past'.[30] It may be that 'refuge' has been misunderstood as 'last resort', because the exclamation is frequently preceded by a conditional clause: '(*If all else fails, then*) God help us!' Help was originally understood in the context of a complete world-view with man in a trusting relationship with God, rather than an appeal to God in cases of accident and emergency. Without that world-view, 'God help us!' takes on a plaintive tone, becoming one more example of the flotsam and jetsam of religion found in a secular world without certainties, and implies: 'We expect no help, we are truly lost.'

This review concludes with some reflections on two expressions with a strong Biblical base, expressions that have crept into current use and appear to give God the benefit of the doubt. Echoing 'Seek ye the Lord while he may be found,' and 'Seek, and ye shall find,' they allow God to escape categorization either as a mindless engineer of destruction (Acts of God) or as a tyrannical authority-figure who needs to be bothered, thanked, and have his works left unaltered. These expressions are 'Finding God' and 'With (his) God'.

To quote an example, the poet W. H. Auden is said to have 'found God' during his period in America, describing himself in 1942 as 'a would-be Christian'.[31] There is a way of presenting this biographical information so as to undermine its credibility. On its own, 'Finding God', sundered from the injunction to seek, where it is implied that it is the nature of the seeking that provides access, sounds like the activity of a surprised beach-comber or collector of antiques. It is all a world apart from the passionate 'seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul'. Likewise when in a commentary on a painting by John Constable an art critic made the suggestion, 'Perhaps Constable was making peace with his God',[32] the private preoccupations of the artist had apparently led him to a deity set apart from normal life, some recondite deity that he alone preferred. The inner struggle of the artist in the Romantic period is resolved in terms of setting up an agreement with a threatening supernatural figure outside the experience of ordinary people. Or perhaps this is an example of psychology dressed in religious language. The all-embracing protective image of God as in, say, Psalm 23, where walking with or being with are understood in terms of a sustaining relationship, is not hinted at.

There is a way of detaching oneself from the belief system referred to, so that the system is placed in a world remote from our own, as part of a world that progress has left behind. On the one hand, the biographer or critic needs to be detached and objective; on the other, without sympathetic understanding he will miss his target. If he rules out any important area of his subject, while admitting its existence, his work will never be complete. The God referred to in these examples is so remote that this might be one of a plethora of possible deities, nothing to do with ourselves, chosen for veneration by peculiar people for individual purposes. The biographer or critic stands back with an air of tolerance at what might as well be polytheism as far as he is concerned.

The above reflections are concerned with language and belief, more often where belief is lacking. Attitudes to intentional or unintentional blasphemy depend on one's perspective. St Paul adopted a policy of zero tolerance towards blasphemy, but it was and is common practice and that was not the only sin he inveighed against. If one asks why the word God is so extensively misused, and how its meaning is currently depleted, one is driven to review the history of ideas, going back to the Middle Ages if not beyond, and to focus on the way the Church interpreted the Bible as the Word of God. Not just by default but by preference, literal interpretation was what the Church had to offer, in spite of the warning (from St Paul again) that 'the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life'.[33] To ensure conformity, teaching the faith was by repetition, reinforced by religious art, while the political and social structure was controlled by Church and State, sometimes in collusion, sometimes in collision with each other.

A thumb-nail history cannot do justice to how, for centuries, the persecution of minorities and the hunting down of heretics served to defend the faith, culminating in the grim procession of the Protestant martyrs and the Catholic martyrs.[34] A medieval cast of thought prolonged beyond its useful life was never likely to welcome change or to look further than scholastic theology when faced with the spirit of enquiry and the scepticism of the Enlightenment. It is in the past, as usual, that one may find the root cause of the resistance to reinterpretation of Scriptures, reinterpretation that could bring them back to life for a secular age.

Not just Darwin, but the Hubble telescope and the human genome (described as 'the book of life') all mean facing up to the need for reinterpretation of Scriptures. The devaluation of the word God today is the result not simply of the irresistible force of secularization in itself but of conspicuous failures to embrace reinterpretation, essentially because of fear of change.

---

[1] Peter Murphy, *Murphy on Evidence*, p.548–9 (Court of Appeal, *Hayes*, 1977), OUP, 2003.

[2] I. H. Dennis, *The Law of Evidence*, p.458, Sweet & Maxwell, 2002.

[3] A view of natural disasters and global geophysical events derived from Exod. 7–10, as reflected in the Prayer in the time of any common Plague or Sickness, to be found among the BCP's Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions, following the prayers for rain etc. Most disasters are represented as just punishments for our iniquities, but plagues, which do not merely punish but wipe out God's people, are seen as an example of God's wrath running to excess; even atonement is not enough to stop the destroying Angel, and all that can be hoped for is a reduction in the mortality rate. The pessimism of Cranmer's prayer may be a tacit acknowledgement of the harm done to the faith of the common people, when prayers to God to 'deliver us from evil' went unanswered.

[4] Anthony Tucker, *The Guardian*, 28 March 1968.

[5] *The Guardian*, 13 July 2004.

[6] Exod. 20.7; Col. 3.8, and see 1 Tim. 1.13.

[7] Chambers Dictionary gives probably before 1398, and see George Bernard Shaw, *Saint Joan*.

[8] *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd Edition, 1989.

[9] Michael Buerk, *The Hand of God*, BBC1, 9 December 2003.

[10] Pope Gregory I (590–604) is reputed to have originated this blessing for victims of the plague, who sneezed constantly. The Romans used to say 'absit omen'.

[11] *CD Review*, BBC Radio 3, 25 October 2003.

[12] *The Observer*, 2 November 2003, and Michael Buerk, *The Hand of God*, BBC1, 2 December 2003. The President appears to be comparing himself to one of the kings of Israel such as Solomon, who served God and whom God rewarded with many favours (Solomon's dream, 1 Kings. 3.5–15). The catch was that any royal transgressions attracted God's punishment on a massive scale, as David had discovered (1 Chr. 21.9–17).

[13] *The Observer*, 28 December 2003.

[14] Rom. 8.31, King James' Version. Tyndale's translation, 'if God be on our side', is echoed in the BCP's Psalm or Hymn of Praise and Thanksgiving after Victory (in the Forms of Prayer to Be Used at Sea): 'If the Lord had not been on our side …'

[15] Also adapted by J. S. Bach in Cantatas 79 and 192 and an organ prelude.

[16] As in Rom. 1.8, 1 Cor. 1.4, Phil. 4 and elsewhere.

[17] *Radio Times*, 15 July 2004.

[18] Pss. 22.2 and 25.2. e.g., exclamation by an award-winner at the Emmy Awards, 22 September 2003.

[19] If alluding to Mark 15.34 and Matt. 27.46, echoing Ps. 22.1, then a blasphemy too far.

[20] *Encarta World English Dictionary*, Bloomsbury, London, 1999. e.g. for this usage: 'God: expression of strong feeling used to express or emphasize feelings such as anger, helplessness and frustration (*sometimes considered offensive*)'.

[21] See '*Honest to God* and the 1960s' in *Anglican Attitudes*, Darton, Longman & Todd, 2004, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams. *OED* traces the expression 'Honest to God' to Jack London, *The Valley of the Moon*, 1913, though it sounds less like a literary coinage than a product of the US Bible belt.

[22] *OED* entry ends with 'The use of the phrase "DV", after the initials of *Deo volente*, or the English form God willing, as an interjection after an expressed intention is a verbal counterpart of knocking on wood and has about the same value'.

[23] e.g., Gen. 44.7,17; Josh. 22.29, 24.16; 1 Sam. 26.11, and elsewhere.

[24] RSV (1946): 'Far be it from me', but NEB (1961) keeps 'God forbid', Gal. 6.14. RSV and NEB: 'Never', 1 Cor. 6.15. RSV 'by no means' and NEB 'of course not', Rom. 7.7.

[25] *The Observer*, 26 October 1913.

[26] Channel 5, 16 June 2004.

[27] Eccles. 12.13 and 1 Pet. 2.17, King James Version, also Ps. 111.10 and Prov. 1.7. See also Ps. 112.1, *Beatus Vir*: 'Blessed is the man that feareth the Lord'.

[28] RSV: 'Fear God'; NEB: reverence to God', 1 Pet. 2.17.

[29] Stephen Grey, *Sunday Times*, 11 July 2004.

[30] Ps. 46.1, 60.11, 108.12, 146.3; BCP Morning Prayer, versicles and responses; also James Edmeston's 'Lead us, heavenly Father, lead us'.

[31] Adam Mars-Jones, *The Observer*, 9 June 2002.

[32] Tim Marlow, Channel 5, 13 May 2004.

[33] More explicitly, RSV gives 'written code kills', and NEB, unhelpfully, 'written law condemns to death', 2 Cor. 3.6.

[34] Not forgetting William Tyndale, martyred in 1536, and Thomas Cranmer, maker of martyrs, himself martyred in 1556.

In a Wonderful Order: Angelology from Sarum to Cranmer

JONATHAN MACY

INTRODUCTION

During the Reformation, while much ink was spilt over questions about the Eucharist, the authority of the Papacy, and the Cult of Saints, far less was written about angels, and their ministry. In England the devotion to the angelic cultus was strong,[1] and this was reinforced by the teaching of the Sarum Missal. On the continent, while Luther retained a positive if cautious approach to the subject, Calvin and other Reformers took a harder line, and made systematic attempts to reduce the role of angels and angelology in theology, the Church and the personal devotional life. The pull of all three of these influences is clear in Cranmer's work during Henry's reign, and in both BCPs, and it this that this article will examine.

GENERAL TEACHING IN SARUM [2]

During the 15th and early 16th century Sarum was the dominant Rite.[3] Its teaching would have been impressed upon the religious psyche of the vast majority of English people, and it fed strongly into the Prayer Books of Edward VI's reign.[4] Sarum highlights how through Patristic and medieval influences angelology had developed beyond the explicitly Scriptural, mainly through the inclusion of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael into the Cult of Saints. Further, angelic ministry developed, and included a mediating role between God and men, and the role of angels in the sacraments. It was a personal ministry, where guardian angels directly help their charges, and protect the Church.

The underpinning role for angels was to pray and intercede for the Church on earth, and from this Litanies (often paralleled in Primers) were regularly used, containing the following:

> Holy Michael, pray for us.
> Holy Gabriel, pray for us.
> Holy Raphael, pray for us.
> All ye holy Angels and Archangels of God, pray for us.[5]

However, the detail of their wider ministry was further developed in other areas of the Missal. For example, during the Mass of the Angels there is a collect which asks:

> Grant the perpetual help of thy mercy, O Lord, unto us, whom thou hast granted not to lack the ministrations of angels.[6]

The range of these ministrations was great and based upon Biblical ideas developed during the Patristic and Medieval periods. The most important areas were as Guardian Angels praying and interceding for people,[7] advancing the Great Commission, [8] assisting souls after death,[9] and being part of God's healing miracles.[10] However, in addition to these core ministrations were others, which Sarum strongly portrayed to the average worshipper. Very important was the idea that angels were a part of the sacramental economy.[11] For example, during the post-communion prayers of the Mass Of Angels one would say:

> Having been fulfilled, O Lord, with thy heavenly benediction, we humbly beseech thee that the service which we celebrate in weakness, may by the aid of holy angels and archangels, and of all the heavenly spirits, *be perceptibly profitable to us*.

This suggests that angels play a part in making the Mass efficacious to man—a development of Patristic ideas, mainly from John Chrysostom.[12] Beyond the direct bounds of the Church, angels were understood and invoked as part of normal daily life. The Order of Matrimony refers to the Apocryphal story of Tobias and Sarah, where an angel arranges their marriage, and on their wedding night, Raphael fights and defeats a demonic attack upon them.[13] The Service for Pilgrims, reminiscent of the tradition of Basil,[14] invokes angelic protection for those going on a journey, and the final collect says:

> May (God) send his angel Raphael to be your guardian in your pilgrimage; to conduct you on your way, in peace, to the place whither you would go, and to bring you back again in safety on your return to us.[15]

In a time when the Plague and other sicknesses were a constant threat, the Mass to Turn Away Pestilence makes clear that angels were sent by God to exact judgement upon sinners, and it was God who could command them to cease their destructive activity.[16] On the other side of the coin, the healing work of angels was depicted in the Mass of the Holy Cross, based on the Mass of the Five Wounds of St Boniface. This Mass grew from the tradition that when Boniface was close to death, God sent Raphael with the Mass, which Boniface was to record, and say five times, after which he would be healed. Raphael said that any priest who said it five times for either himself or another sick person would:

> … receive health and grace, and shall hereafter possess life eternal, if he perseveres in good … If it be said on behalf of the soul of a deceased person, directly after it has been said completely, that is to say, five times, that soul shall be freed from punishment.[17]

The teaching shown by this Mass was that Raphael was not only able to give revelation direct from God, but was also a medium for God giving new revelations, liturgies and Masses. (It must, however, be noted that in Thomas More's *Goodly Primer* (1535) this mass was roundly attacked as being spurious and misleading.)[18]

MASSES FOR THE THREE ARCHANGELS

The most interesting aspects of Sarum's angelology are, however, best demonstrated in the Masses for the three archangels—Michael, Gabriel and Raphael. The Commemorative Mass of the Archangel Raphael, usually celebrated for travellers and pilgrims, was built around the story of Tobias and Sarah.[19] Raphael is cited as 'one of the seven holy angels who stand in the presence of the Lord sent to heal', and the collect continues:

> O God who didst direct the blessed archangel to be a guide to thy servant Tobias hastening on his way, and didst give him as a guardian amidst all the changes and the chances of this mortal life; grant, we beseech thee, that we may be protected by the aid of the same angel, so that we may both avoid the dangers of this present life and may reach securely the joys of heaven.

Raphael's traditional ministry as the protector of travellers, and protector in both life and death, is reaffirmed. The Gradual goes further, saying:

> Alleluya. Angel of healing,
> be with me perpetually,
> as thou wast with Tobias,
> so be with me on my way.

Alleluya. Send down to us from heaven the angel Raphael,
the giver of health, that he may heal all the sick,
and equally direct our actions.

Alleluya. The angel of the Lord descended from heaven,
and came and rolled back the stone from the door
and sat upon it.

Raphael is the giver of health and healing, who directs human action, and who, interestingly, is said to be the one who rolled the stone away from Christ's tomb. Following the Offertory, which calls him *Saint* Raphael, the Secret adds depth:

> Send, O God, thine archangel Raphael, the worker of healing, to convey unto us health of soul and body; and may he pour upon us the gift of heavenly pity, and put away from us those things which are adverse.

Communion includes the ejaculatory prayer:

> Let the shout of highest praise resound in the mouth of all, in praise of the blessed archangel Raphael, that he whose memory we keep on earth, may intercede for us before God in heaven. Alleluya.

The post-Communion prayer says:

> Vouchsafe, O Lord God, to direct the archangel Raphael to our assistance; and may he whom we believe to be ever standing in the presence of thy majesty, assign our poor prayers to be blessed by thee.

This Mass conveys to the participants a comprehensive angelic ministry of guardianship, healing, guidance, protection, defeating of demons, angelic mediation and the presentation of prayers to God, and the mediation of God's activity to men.

The Mass of St Gabriel (note *Saint* Gabriel, as opposed to the *Archangel* Raphael) develops the role surrounding the visitation to Mary.[20] Of central importance is the Gradual:

Herald shining with exceeding splendour
jewel glistening with celestial ray,
be thou consolation to the desolate
and a firm protection to the tempted.

Thou Gabriel, *who burstest prisons*,
regard the poor among captives,
and bring them swiftly forth to life.

Alleluya. Through thee, O herald, a wonderful work is accomplished,
exceeding deep and notable;
through thee may that we ask become both possible and attainable.

Highlighted here are a number of aspects not Scripturally linked to, or associated with, Gabriel—being a consolation to the desolate and protector of the tempted, a freer from prison, and one who has a special interest in the captive poor. Gabriel is an enabler who makes things possible and achievable. The Tract then asks that Gabriel 'shall make us one with God', and intercede for 'mercy' and 'deliverance', a mediating and intercessory role, with the ability to deliver and save men from peril and danger. Developing this further, the Communion prayer says:

O Gabriel, comfort the mourners,
heal the sick, strengthen the weak,
make us ever gentle and humble,
and strong and established in the faith.

Again, this is a direct and personal ministry (paralleling the virtues in the Beatitudes) through which Gabriel can move and motivate a man's soul, promoting Christian righteousness in order to make firm the foundations of one's faith. The service concludes with a post-Communion prayer that says how Gabriel and all the heavenly powers intercede for men, and how the sacrament was taken 'in veneration of them' and which is 'profitable to our salvation'. Again, the Mass is made effective by angels. What this Mass stresses is the ministry of revelation and illumination to men from God, angels teaching and guiding. It is more than external protection and healing, as shown by Raphael's Mass: it is an ability to work internally on a man's mind, body and soul. The Proper of Saints takes these developments, and adds to them in numerous ways. In the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary the collect says:

> O God, who wast pleased that thy Word should take flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, through the message of an angel.

This parallels the tradition that Mary conceived *through* the angelic message, a literary picture shown in some Medieval poetry, reflected in the post-Communion prayer.[21]

Arguably the most important angelic feast is that of St Michael the Archangel.[22] Firstly, the collect says:

> O God, who dost ordain the services of angels and men in a wonderful order; mercifully grant us that as thine angels always do thee service in heaven, so our life may be defended by them on earth.

Here are the ideas of God conceiving angels and men as a single society, and of angels protecting men here in earth. Following this is a Sequence that makes explicit the existence of the angelic hierarchies. Initially, the subject is Christ as King, but this is followed by an exaltation of Michael 'whose ministry gives lustre to the mighty universe'. The praise is directed to Christ, but hymns are in honour of Michael, who is shown to have true power across the whole of creation. It continues:

> *Nine are the orders of the heavenly hosts*, by thee created,
> and these angel's forms thou makest flames of fire at thy pleasure.
> These are works of thy primeval hand,
> *We latest in thine image fashioned*.

Pseudo-Dionysius's Nine Orders are mentioned, and the following Sequence then describes those Orders:

> Nine orders, each retaining its own office,
> So teach divines, of heavenly hosts are reckoned—
> The angel host, the angelic phalanx,
> The principalities, the heavenly powers,
> Might gracious mouthed, high names of dominion,
> And thrones divine, and cherubim ethereal,
> And seraphim with hair that glows as fire.[23]

Continuing, Michael is now addressed directly.

> To you, Michael, first of heavenly princes,
> And Gabriel, the Word's true messenger,
> And Raphael, once on earth hired servant,
> Bear us to those who rest in paradise.

The three major angels are mentioned and given titles—Michael is the prince of heaven—as opposed to Christ the King, Gabriel's title is tied into the Annunciation, and Raphael's title is from the story in Tobit. They are invoked to *bear* souls into heaven. Continuing:

> All the commandments of the Father you fulfil,
> Sent forth by Wisdom of the same,
> And the coequal Spirit in one substance,
> Which God you serve, ten thousand times ten thousand.
> In twice ten thousand ministering courses

> Your hundred thousand in the palace wait,
> To which your king brought back a hundredth sheep,
> Born of the Word; and a tenth piece of silver,
> Over which, found, you do rejoice together,
> You in heaven, we on earth below.

This is reaffirmation of a number of Biblical themes, together with some Patristic echoes—the tradition of taking the parable of the ninety-nine sheep as representing man as the missing piece of the heavenly society.[24] The Sequence talks of angels offering prayers to God, and mentions Michael warring gloriously, adding to the view that Michael was the warrior angel who defended Christians against the devil. The reading is Matthew 18.1–10, alluding to Guardian Angels, and the Offertory is based on Revelation 8.3–4, reaffirming that angels present prayers to God. The presentation of prayers is again stressed in the Secret that follows, as also that prayers become more efficacious through angelic intercession. Finally, the post-Communion prayer again reiterates the intercession and *intervention* of Michael.

Thus we see Sarum portraying a broad angelic ministry, thoroughly rooted in Patristic and medieval developments of Biblical themes and teachings: it was exactly these developments that Reformers would criticise. It was also these that Cranmer would have to weigh and test as he constructed the Prayer Books.

THE CHALLENGE TO MEDIEVAL ANGELOLOGY IN THE INITIAL PHASES OF THE REFORMATION

It should be recognized that this is not an exhaustive exposition, but a statement based more on the attitude and methods that underpinned Luther's and Calvin's angelology. Primarily, angels are central to Luther's thought:

> Let the beginning of all our affairs be prayer to God, and the next the thought of the care of angels.[25]

The existence and ministry of angels is an 'ancient' and 'heavenly' doctrine, summed up in the statement:

> In this life, empires, states and households, and, in short, whatever this world has are all governed by the ministry of holy angels. [26]

For Luther, guardian angels clearly exist,[27] (every man has a guardian angel, be he Christian or not)[28] and in the Church men live 'with the guardian angels'—where the Church is, there is the ministry of angels.[29] They provide companionship, friendship and protection; are peaceable, merciful and kind, guiding men and inspiring their thought *from without*, while God guides them *from within*. Nevertheless, criticism of current practice is a regular theme. He rejected the Apocryphal books as authoritative,[30] and his attitude to Pseudo-Dionysius was harsh, asserting that it was a 'fanciful hodge-podge' that led men away from Christ.[31] Luther rejects the angels' place as mediators and intercessors, saying that 'there is not a single word of God's commanding us to call on either angels or saints to intercede for us, and we have no examples in Scripture'.[32]

Calvin's approach to angelology too exhibited a profound rejection of medieval Catholic ideas, yet also differed radically from Lutheranism. He refused to go beyond the explicitly scriptural,[33] and was generally reluctant to find anything positive in the subject at all.[34] Only that which was 'distinct and explicit' in Scripture would be examined.[35] Calvin seems to want to do two things: first, to affirm that angelic ministry existed, but only in the context of God's wider providence, avoiding talk of specific ministries toward individuals; second, to ensure that angels were studied and understood as little as possible.[36]

Angelic ministry is only for the elect,[37] and when Calvin tackles the issue of Guardian Angels he is pointedly agnostic about it.[38] An understanding of angels as useful in daily Christian life is absent—only a distant, impersonal and generalized role of angels in God's wider providence gains any credence. Angelology is dangerous and misleading, and it is 'our [Christian] duty to remain in willing ignorance' of it, since 'in obscure matters [we] must not speak or think, or even long to know more than the Word of God has given'. One must direct one's mind to those things that are 'edifying' and 'not indulge in curiosity, or studying things that are of no use'.[39] Angelology is a superfluous area of theology, and anyone who studied it was wasting his time on that which is useless. Not only that, man's own weakness, sinfulness and proneness to superstition make the study of angels dangerous, and to be avoided, as it obscures Christ.

CRANMER'S ANGELOLOGY IN THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII

From the early 1530s, Henry's flirtation with the Continental Reformers allowed Lutheran influences to enter the English Church, and Sarum's angelology began to be reined in. Angels are rarely explicitly mentioned, but were often implied—for example, in the Ten Articles, Article VIII (*Of Praying To Saints*) says that God alone gives grace, but saints intercede. They are not as powerful intercessors as Christ himself, but they do intercede since:

> All Holy angels and saints pray in heaven for us and with us … that we may have grace of him and remission of our sins. … [but

> one] must not think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any saint doth serve for one thing more than another, or is patron of the same.[40]

In *The Bishop's Book* (1537),[41] John Chrysostom is quoted as saying:

> Neither angel nor archangel can of his own power give us any of these things which be given by God.[42]

This affirms that God is the primary agent in the sacramental economy, who can then secondarily use angels in the process. Further Cranmer's Revision of the Litany (1544) drew on a number of sources, including Sarum and Luther's Litany,[43] and pruned any reference to the angelic saints, yet still contained the words:

> All holy Angels and Archangels,
> And all holy orders of blessed spirits, Pray for us.[44]

Again, in the preface to the Litany itself, in an Exhortation To Prayer, Cranmer writes:

> (Let us pray that God will send) his holy angell
> to be his succour, keeper, and defender
> from all his adverseries and from all evyls.[45]

This more Lutheran understanding of angels implies that Cranmer held to, if not guardian angels ('succour, keeper and defender'), then a personal angelic ministry which protects, builds up and guides men.

THE 1549 AND 1552 PRAYER BOOKS [46]

A quick overview of Cranmer's method would be valuable here, for while he was a great liturgist and an innovator, and even though he had a good knowledge of the Fathers, everything was second to, and subordinate to, Scripture.[47] He held to all the central dogmas of the Reformers, especially the concept of a non-mediated faith,[48] and had a good understanding of the Continental Reformers, and was influenced by them. However, his Prayer Books remained quintessentially English and different from those in Europe.[49] His method was to use Scripture to reform abuse in line with his Reformed beliefs and his unique grasp of the doctrine and practice of the Fathers, as opposed to aiming at a Continental Reformation in England—there was no change for the sake of change.[50] Cranmer wanted to reform and simplify the service in order to maintain the support of the majority.[51] However, the increasing influence of Calvinism can be detected in the angelology of the two books, as Cranmer moved in a more Reformed direction.[52]

Compared with Sarum, the two Prayer Books are short and compact.[53] Around angelology Cranmer's editing was particularly brutal. Graduals, Sequences, Offertories, Tracts and Secrets, and various masses and feasts, all fruitful areas of angelology in the Sarum Rite, simply disappear. But his editing was also very subtle, as will become clear.

In the Calendar the only feasts which remained from Sarum were those of the New Testament saints,[54] plus, strangely, that of St Michael and All Angels. All other Sarum festivals are lost, or absorbed into others. However, the Canticles did retain their angelology. For example, the Te Deum in both Books says:

> We praise thee, O God, we knowlage thee to be the Lorde.
> All the earth doeth worshippe thee, the father everlasting.
> To thee all Angels crye aloude, the heavens and all the powers
> therein.
> To thee Cherubin, and Seraphin continually doe crye.[55]

This is a simple and scriptural picture, and one that makes no link between angels and men. Similarly, the Benedicite, in both, exhorts angels to worship God.[56] The Litany is the first place where the angelology of the two books differs. The 1549 Book, following Cranmer's 1544 Litany, says:

> All holy angels and archangels
> and all the holy orders of blessed spirits, pray for us.[57]

However, in the 1552 Book, this, and the following exhortations to 'All Holy Patriarchs and Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors and Virgins' are omitted. This indicates that while Cranmer in 1549 still recognized that angels prayed for men, even if men did not ask for that, by 1552 Calvinist influences had minimized the intercessory role of angels to a point where he could remove this from the Litany.

In the Lectionary's various readings throughout the year, angels appear, and the main point to note is the lack of focus on ministry for individual Christians. The first is at Christmas, where the 1549 Book, following Sarum, has the reading in Luke 2 concerning the angels appearing to the shepherds—1552 omits this reading.[58] Both books, however, after the collect, have a reading of Hebrews 1.1–12, which talks of Christ being superior to the angels and equal to God. Interestingly, the reading ends at verse 12, leaving out verse 14, and so avoids citing angelic ministry to men, and places the focus on Christ as exalted above angels.[59] On The Innocents' Day, both books use Matthew 2.1–18, which tells of the angels warning Joseph of Herod's coming attack,[60] and on the Sunday after Christmas, both books recount how an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph.[61] In contrast to Christmas, both books, at Epiphany, contain the reading about the angel appearing to the shepherds,[62] and on the First Sunday in Lent, Christ's temptation is the reading (Matt. 4), where angels are said to both protect Christ, and to have come and ministered to him.[63] The reading on the Sunday before Easter is Matthew 26–7, where Christ says he has twelve legions of angels at his command to save him, which makes the point that angels are subordinate to Christ, and serve him.[64]

During Holy Week, on the Monday before Easter, Isaiah 63 is used which tells of how the angel of the Lord protected and saved those in distress,[65] and this neatly fits in with the reading on Wednesday, where Luke 22 describes how angels came to minister to Christ whilst he prayed in the Garden of Gethsemane.[66] Coming to Easter Day itself, it is of interest, however, that neither book makes mention of the angels at the tomb, as Sarum did,[67] using John 20.1–10, which stops short of mentioning the angels, and Mark 16 which calls the figure at the tomb simply a young man. Further, on Monday in Easter Week Luke 24, the Emmaus Road, is used, which, while mentioning that the women had seen visions of angels, does not mention the angelic commission to the women to tell the disciples of the Resurrection (Matt. 28.5–8).[68] Reformers would not have felt comfortable with citing angels as a driving force behind the spreading of the good news of the Resurrection. Therefore, Mark 16 is used, which does not have the angelic commission, and Luke 24, which simply says that there was a vision announcing the Resurrection, with no mention of a commission. Finally, Trinity Sunday's reading in both books is Revelation 4, which talks of the Living Creatures, who are generally regarded as angels worshipping God,[69] and the Second Sunday after Trinity is the parable of Lazarus who was taken to Abraham's bosom by the angels (Luke 16).[70]

The Annunciation in both books begins with a collect that clearly deviates from the Sarum Rite, which had said:

> O God, who wast pleased that thy Word should take flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, through the message of an angel.[71]

However, the Prayer Books say:

> … we have known Christ thy Son's Incarnation, by the message of the angel.

Sarum talks of how the Word became flesh 'through the message'. Here though, *by* the message Christ becomes *known*. This is a clear rejection of the medieval tradition surrounding Gabriel and the

Incarnation, and a refocusing on God as the active agent in the Incarnation, and the angel just as one who announces the event.[72]

The festival of St Peter arguably has Sarum's Feast of St Peter's Chains in the background, and while the 1552 service is shorter (missing out the opening prayer based on Psalm 119), both still use the same reading (Acts 12) where an angel freed Peter from jail. However, the reading only goes to verse 11, omitting verse 15 where Rhoda indicates that Peter had his own Guardian Angel.[73]

When we come to the feast of St Michael and All Angels,[74] Cranmer's pruning is clear, as is his method. For Cranmer, Scripture is primary, and this leads to three consequences. First, the Apocrypha is sidelined; second, no tradition is accepted that is not verifiable by Scripture; and third, nothing not explicitly sanctioned in Scripture is used. As previously mentioned, it is noticeable that Michael is the only non-New Testament saint to have a festival—and the fact that he is still cited as a saint at all is strange. Cranmer's broader methodology led to him remove all the Patristic and Medieval Saint's Days, and all those relating to Old Testament figures. This left a much purged Calendar featuring only specific New Testament individuals. The retention of Michael does not neatly fit with his wider approach. A reason for this could be that Cranmer did not follow Calvin in seeing angels as in themselves an inherent threat to true religion and piety, but saw a need to set them in a proper context. He wished to retain an understanding of the positive nature of, and the need to be aware of, angelic ministry. It seems to be a pro-active (and more Lutheran) attempt to redress the imbalance left by medieval angelology.

The first thing to note is that it is now *St Michael and all Angels*, the individual feasts of Gabriel and Raphael being removed from the liturgical Calendar, to make one compound service from the three. The colourful Sequences, Prayers and Graduals are removed, taking some notable teachings with them. Obviously, any reference to Dionysian hierarchies has gone, as have Guardian Angels and also any indication of their place in the Cultus, but there remain subtle references to the joint human and angelic society, hinted at by Hebrews 12.22. Gabriel and Raphael are ignored, and all their angelic roles are removed. Only Michael is mentioned by name, and being the only archangel named in Scripture, this is understandable. What remains of the service is short, simple and to the point.

The 1549 service begins by changing the Psalm used in Continental Catholic services (Psalm 103, with v.20 stating the power and might of the angels), to Psalm 113, which, while talking of God's goodness and providence, makes no mention of angels—a more Calvinist approach. This is an interesting opening to a service which had previously exalted Michael as the one who gives 'mighty lustre to the universe', making the point that God works providence, not angels.[75] This Psalm was removed and not replaced in 1552. The Collect of both services mirrors Sarum:

> Everlasting God, which hast ordained and constituted
> the services of all Angels and men in a wonderful order:
> mercifully grant that they which alway do thee service in heaven,
> may by their appointment succour and defend us in earth:
> through Jesus Christ our Lord.

A number of things are worth noting here. There is no mention of special angelic ministries, the Dionysian hierarchy, or the intercessory role. 'Succour and defend' limits angels to helping men in times of difficulty alone, and even then it is clear that this by God's *appointment*—any idea of autonomy is absent. 'Wonderful Order' simply indicates that God has ordered creation with angels and men within a general order and scheme of things, and is solely corporately focused, as opposed to Sarum's stress on the individual, personal ministry. This collect is followed by the reading Revelation 12, which tells of Michael fighting and defeating the devil, and then Matthew 18, which says children have angels in heaven. And there the service ends. The difference would have been clear to those participating. For those brought up with the Sarum Rite, little could be found in the service to support the medieval ideas. Within a generation, those with no knowledge of the Catholic tradition would have had little to lead them to any developed idea of angelic ministry. It is almost as if Michael's role (and angelic roles in general) was such an issue that there was a need to address it with a service as reserved and stripped as possible, to put angels back in a place that English Reformers felt was biblical and true to the tradition of the Church.

The service for SS Simon and Jude has another subtle piece of editing where the first eight verses of Jude are read, stopping short of the reference to Michael fighting over Moses' body in verse 9—perhaps in order to remove Scriptural allusions to traditions of Michael helping souls in death. What remains is the affirmation of the fall of the angels 'which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation', and the admonition not to slander angels.[76] Both books keep All Saints' Day, 1549 prefacing the collect with a prayer, using Revelation 7 as the reading which talks of the worship of God by all men and angels together.[77] 1549 also changed the reading for Evensong from Sarum to Revelation 19.1–16, which again stresses the worship in heaven, but also has the admonishment by the angel to John not to worship him since they were both servants of God.[78] This was removed in 1552.

Holy Communion was probably the greatest bone of contention in both Prayer Books, and the differences in angelology expressed in the two are striking. After the appropriate Preface for the service, the priest was called to say:

> Therefore with Angels and Archangels,
> and with all the company of heaven:
> we laude and magnify thy glorious name,
> evermore, praising thee, and singing
> Holy, Holy , Holy, Lorde God of Hosts,
> heaven and earth are full of thy glory.[79]

Again, the corporate congregational focus remains in the light of the joint society. From here, it is at the consecration of the elements that the main difference between the angelologies of the two books arises. The following was omitted from the 1552 Book:

> We beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service,
> and commend these our prayers and supplications,
> by the ministry of thy holy Angels,
> to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle before the sight of thy divine majesty.[80]

This strongly echoes Sarum and the Patristic traditions of angels attending the liturgy and Mass, attracted by the Real Presence of Christ, as well as the intercessory role of angels, whose very 'ministry' is to commend men's 'prayers and supplications' to God, and to take them into his presence.[81] Its removal in 1552 is not surprising, since the Real Presence, Eucharistic devotion, and angelic mediation and intercession at the Mass would have all been rejected by the Reformers. A similar difference appears in the service of Matrimony, where 1549, following Sarum, uses the Apocryphal story of Tobias and Sara. It has the following prayer of blessing for the newly weds:

> Looke O lord, mercifully upon them from heaven and bless them:
> And as thou didst send thy Angel Raphael to Tobias and Sara …
> to their great comfort; so vouchsafe to send thy blessing …[82]

1552 removes this and replaces it with the angel-less story of Abraham and Sara—again, not a surprising move since the Tobit reading implied the authoritative use of the Apocrypha, and direct angelic ministry by Raphael. Similar method and editing is shown in the Visitation of the Sick. Both books have the prayer:

> Visit him O Lord, as thou didst visit Peter's wife's mother, and the Captain's servant.[83]

However, 1549 has an additional section immediately afterwards which said:

> And as thou preservedst Tobias and Sara by thy Angel from danger, so restore unto this sick person his former health (if it be thy will).

As before, the removal was probably due to the Apocryphal reference, as well as to the implication of personal angelic protection and healing ministry.

CONCLUSION

What will now be clear is that Cranmer's angelology in the Prayer Books is specific and unique. In taking such a particular stance, he rejected both the over-developed and speculative angelology of Sarum, as well as the brutally stripped-down angelology of Calvin. Cranmer could not deny the reality of angelic ministry, yet, through his adherence to Scripture, and reforming principles, could not safely advocate Guardian Angels and their attendant ministries. What remains is a wonderful example of what would later be seen as the *Via Media*. Calvin's angelology was distant, impersonal and generalized over all mankind. Sarum's was personal and individualized and soul-deep. Cranmer made it personal to the corporate Body, where angels, under God, stood alongside men, not only attending church with them as part of God's heavenly society, but being their protectors and defenders. Yet in the same breath the more individualized aspects of medieval angelic ministry (specifically, Guardian Angels) are noticeably removed.

Cranmer's distinctive stance sets him apart from other thinkers of the time; it was faithful to Scripture and tradition, and yet purged of the excess that he perceived to be endemic in medieval angelology, and so clearly taught in Sarum. In later years, Richard Hooker, in line with Cranmer, would further develop this approach. In his *Laws Of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1595), Hooker fully expounded the role of angels in terms of their prayer for, and carrying of blessings to, the corporate Church; for him the Church could not be understood without understanding of the angels who also attend.[84] The fundamental integration of angels and men within the Church, pointed to by Cranmer, was made clear by Hooker. Hooker's theological flesh upon Cranmer's liturgical bones set the Church of England apart from the Continental Reformers, allowing the Church of England to retain its appreciation of the work of God's angelic ministers.

[1] eds. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church,* Oxford, OUP, 1993, pp.301, 173, 367.

[2] Trans. F. E. Warren *The Sarum Missal In English (Vol I* & *II)*, London, A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1913,—cited from now on as Sarum.

[3] G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy,* London, MacMillan Press Ltd, 1982, p.14 cf. E. Yarnold and J. Fisher 'The West from about 500AD to the Reformation' in C. Jones et al (eds.) *The Study of Liturgy,* London, SPCK, 1993, p.150.

[4] P. M. Hope and G. Woolfenden, 'The Medieval Western Rites' in C. Jones et al (eds.) *The Study of Liturgy,* London, SPCK, 1993, p.280.

[5] Sarum I:277–80; cf. I:40–41; Thomas More's *Goodly Primer,* 1535: ed. E. Burton, *Three Primers of the Reign of Henry VIII,* Oxford, OUP, 1834, p.124.

[6] Sarum II:55–7.

[7] e.g. Sarum I:284–5; cf. Rev. 8.3–4; Matt. 18.1–10.

[8] e.g. Sarum I:305; cf. Matt. 28.5–8, Acts 8.26.

[9] e.g. Sarum II:516–519; cf. Luke 16.22.

[10] e.g. Sarum II:222–4; cf. John 5.4.

[11] The line of thought that led to the idea of angels being a part of the sacramental economy was simple. Men and angels made up one society under God (Heb. 12.22), and both men and angels were to worship and pray to God (cf. Rev. 5:11–12; Rev. 8:3–4). The centre of prayer and worship was the Eucharist, and so men and angels would naturally both attend and benefit from the Eucharist. This was developed over the centuries, and Sarum on this issue will be discussed below.

[12] John Chrysostom: 'The angels surround the priest and the whole sanctuary and the space before the altar is filled with the heavenly powers come to honour him who is present upon the altar.' (Adv. Anom. 3–4); cf. Hom. Eph. 1.3; De Sac. VI:4.

[13] Tobit 5–8 cf. 8.7; Sarum II:151–3.

[14] Ep. 13 cf. Gen. 24.40.

[15] Sarum II:170–3.

[16] Sarum II:203.

[17] Sarum II:64–5.

[18] Burton pp.4–5.

[19] Sarum II:222–4.

[20] Sarum II:224–6: Another Votive Mass around the Blessed Virgin Mary, also promoted Gabriel to an archangel (' No one lower in grade to the virgin is sent, but an archangel dread, mighty Gabriel') a promotion nowhere indicated by Scripture (Sarum II:78ff).

[21] Sarum II:288ff cf. p.319 cf. D. Gray, *Themes and Images in the Medieval English Lyric,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972, pp.100–1: often Gabriel was pictured whispering in Mary's ear, and Christ (the Word) entered her. Conception through the ear sometimes becomes strangely literal: 'When Gabriel greeted her, and whispered in her ear. In blissful time Christ was born, our Saviour she bore'. Also: 'Blessed be, Lady, your right ear: The Holy Ghost, he alighted in there. Flesh and blood to take'.

[22] Sarum II:516–9.

[23] Sarum II:536-7: The Feast of St. Michael in the Mountain Tomb (16 Oct.), also indicates the Dionysian hierarchy: 'O Christ, king enthroned on high, whom the nine fair ranks of angels praise incessantly, vouchsafe ever to have mercy on thy servants'.

[24] e.g. Origen: Comm. Gen. 12.102; Hom. Num. 19.4; Hom. Gen. 13.2 cf. Irenaeus: Adv. Haer. 3.19:3; Cyril of Jeru. Cat. 15:24.

[25] eds. J. Pelikan and H. Lehmann *Luther's Works,* Concordia/Fortress Press, 1958–86. From now on cited as *Luther*: *Luther* IV:265.

[26] *Luther* VI:89–93; cf. *Luther* III:62.

[27] *Luther* IV:265 cf. IV:182/256.

[28] *Luther* XX:170–2 cf. 138.

[29] *Luther* VIII:60, XXII:14, 20.

[30] ed. B. M. Metzger, *Oxford Annotated Apocrypha,* New York, OUP, 1977, p.x; Trans. and ed. W. Hazlitt, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther,* London, H. G. Bohn, 1857, XXIV.

[31] *Luther* XXVI:109–10; LIV:112; XX:26; XX:64; XIII:110–11 cf. *Table Talk* VII.

[32] *Luther* XXXV:198–9 cf. *Table Talk* CLXXVIII.

[33] S. Schriener, *The Theatre of His Glory*, Labyrinth Press, 1991, p.39 cf. p.52.

[34] Schriener p.49.

[35] Trans. H. Beveridge, *John Calvin's Institutes*, Wm. B. Eerdmanns Pub. Co., 1994, Institutes I:XIV:3.

[36] Schriener pp.52–3.

[37] Institutes I:XIV:9.

[38] Institutes I:XIV:7.

[39] Institutes I:XIV:8.

[40] ed. C. H. Williams, *English Historical Documents* (*1485–1558*): Vol. V, London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967, pp.795–805.

[41] ed. C. Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority during the reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford, OUP, 1856, pp.21–212.

[42] Ibid p.106.

[43] J. E. Hunt, *Cranmer's First Litany, 1544 and Merbecke's Book of Common Prayer noted 1550*, London, SPCK, 1939, cf. Cuming pp.35–6.

[44] Hunt p.89.

[45] Ibid pp.35–6—this was also reflected in the *King's Primer* (1545), Burton, p.481.

[46] Text Used: F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (*Vols I* & *II*), London, Rivington, 1921.

[47] P. Newman-Brooks, *Cranmer in Context*, Cambridge, Lutterworth Press, 1989, pp.52–4 cf. p.viii, 3.

[48] Harrison and Sansom, *Worship In The Church Of England*, London, SPCK, 1982, p.43.

[49] Harrison and Sansom, p.40; D. MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation In England* (*1547–1603*), London, MacMillan, 1990, p.16.

[50] cf. *Preface To The Book Of Common Prayer*: Harrison and Sansom p.48, 62.

[51] cf. *Of Ceremonies*.

[52] Harrison and Sansom pp.47–8; MacCulloch p.13.

[53] Harrison and Sansom p.42, 48.

[54] Harrison and Sansom p.57.

[55] Brightman pp.136–7.

[56] Brightman pp.138–9.

[57] Brightman pp.174–5.

[58] Brightman pp.218–21.

[59] Brightman pp.220–3.

[60] Brightman pp.236–7.

[61] Brightman pp.240–3.

[62] Brightman pp.246–7 Luke 2.38ff.

[63] Brightman pp.296–7.

[64] Brightman pp.322–3.

[65] Brightman pp.332–3.

[66] Brightman pp.356–7.

[67] Sarum I:292, 300, 316 cf. K. Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church Vol I* & *II*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933, I:533.

[68] Brightman p.406–7.

[69] Brightman p.456–9.

[70] Brightman p.464–5.

[71] Sarum II:319.

[72] Brightman pp.574–5 cf. D. Gray *Themes and Images in the Medieval English Lyric*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972, pp.100–1.

[73] Brightman p.598.

[74] Brightman p.620ff.

[75] cf. Sarum II:517.

[76] Brightman pp.628–31.

[77] Brightman pp.634–5.

[78] Brightman pp.636–7.

[79] Brightman pp.686–7.

[80] Brightman pp.694–5.

[81] Chrysostom: De Sacr. 6:4, Adv. Anom 4.

[82] Brightman pp.810–11.

[83] Brightman pp.622–3.

[84] Ecc. Pol. I:4:1; I:16:4; V:23, 25; cf. Sermons III:2; Expounded in: Jonathan Macy *Angels In The Anglican Tradition 1547–1662*, PhD Thesis, King's College, London, 2003, Chap. 5.

(Jonathan Macy completed his doctorate on Angels in the Anglican Tradition (1547–1662) *at King's College London in 2003.)*

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 TWO: THE RESTORATION

In 1660 King Charles II returned to England to widespread rejoicing, following the collapse of the Commonwealth. While in exile in Holland, he had already announced that his policy as King would so far as possible be based on religious tolerance and he was hopeful that the dominant Puritan clergy in the Church of England would be able to accept the reinstatement of traditional clergy who had been deprived of their livings and, in some cases, spent the Commonwealth years in exile abroad. The diaries of John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys, who had already become friends in Commonwealth times, and even before the Restoration were attending church services together, record developments.

The reintroduction of the Prayer Book was bound to be a gradual process. The Puritans, of course, were against it and in London, Pepys said, they were potentially powerful. The younger generation and indeed many of the clergy were not at all familiar with Prayer Book services.

In July 1660 Pepys heard a good sermon at Westminster Abbey, 'but no Common Prayer yet'. It was not until the beginning of November that Mr Mills, the parson at Pepys' own church, 'began to nibble at the Common Prayer by saying "Glory be to the Father" etc after he had read the two psalms but the people have been so little used to it that they could not tell what to answer'. The next Sunday 'did Mr Mills begin to read all the Common Prayer, which I was glad of'. A little longer was required for things to settle down, however, and it is only in the spring of 1662 that we find Evelyn recording points of detail being attended to at his parish vestry meeting, when 'we ordered that the Communion Table should be set (as usually) altar-wise, with a decent rail before it, according as formerly before the Rebellion'. At last, in October of that year Pepys noted 'saw the first time Mr Mills in a surplice but it seemed absurd for him to pull it down over his ears in the reading-pew after he had done before all the church, to go up to the pulpit to preach without it'.

Meanwhile, however, the opposing parties in the Church had been unable to reach agreement as to the liturgy. The newly-revised Prayer Book of 1662 endeavoured, as Bishop Robert Sanderson of Lincoln said in his preface, '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'. But the 1662 Prayer Book was introduced with an Act of Uniformity which with other statutes required all clergy and schoolteachers formally to declare that they would exclusively use the 1662 Prayer Book, and restrictions and penalties were imposed for non-conformity. On 17 August 1662, Pepys mentions 'being up very early this being the last Sunday that the Presbyterians are to preach unless they read the new Common Prayer'. Very many of the Church of England's Presbyterian clergy did lose their livings, but Pepys was writing a few weeks later that 'the late outing of the presbyter clergy … is the greatest piece of state now in discourse. But for aught I see, they are gone out very peaceably and the people not so much concerned therein as was expected'.

The policy of religious tolerance the King had been aiming for had had to be abandoned and new problems in the Church were already becoming apparent. Unfortunately the traditionalist clergy, once back in authority, were not always generous or wise. Already, immediately after the Restoration, Pepys had complained that 'all things grow high, the old clergy talk of being sure of their lands again and laugh at the presbytery'. Three years later he was reporting that the conceited way the clergy carried themselves made them 'hated and laughed at by every body'. The bishops were especially pompous and did so 'overdo' their ceremonies, the public looked upon them 'as strange creatures and few with any kind of love or respect'. And the House of Commons, he heard, were 'very high to stand to the Act of Uniformity and will not indulge the papists (which is endeavoured by the Court party) nor the presbyters'.

Above all the King was a disappointment. He minded nothing but pleasures and Evelyn grumbled with Pepys that 'a Bishop shall never be seen about him as the King of France has always'. Of course the King's private sympathies were with Roman Catholicism but 'his sad, vicious, negligent court' made the two diarist friends despair. In 1669 Evelyn, round at Pepys' house for dinner, 'speaks openly to me his thoughts of the times and our ruin approaching and all by the folly of the King'.

Church attendance seems to have been very good in the years after the Restoration—in April 1667 Pepys went to Hackney church 'where very full and found much difficulty to get pews, I offering the sexton money and he could not help me'. Talk was already of the necessity for radical reform and Church and State were well on the way to the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

Reviews

ROWAN WILLIAMS: *Anglican Identities*
Darton, Longman & Todd, 2004 ISBN 0 232 52527 7 £7.95

The Archbishop begins his book with the observation that 'The question of what if anything holds together the Anglican Communion has recently become a painfully immediate one'. It is certain that attempts to define the essential spirit of Anglicanism, which have been made by many over the years, have become both more difficult and more urgent. The present book is made up from lectures and articles by Dr Williams, but it holds together as an integral work with a central theme. It is not intended to be a history of Anglicanism. It is an examination, through some leading thinkers, of major developments which may help us towards an understanding of the Church which we have today. Seen in historical perspective, the book concentrates on the formative years of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and then moves forward to the nineteenth and twentieth. There is a long chronological gap from Herbert to Westcott;

something on the Oxford Movement would have been welcome. However the reader can be grateful for what we have here.

The question of the Christian Society as it presented itself to the founders of the new ecclesiastical settlement is considered through Tyndale. Richard Hooker, perhaps the nearest thing to a founding father in the history of the Church of England, has two chapters which select and examine some ideas from his voluminous works. In George Herbert we see the joy and the anxieties which attended the Church, confident but also threatened, in the years before the Civil War. Then we move to Westcott and the new liberalism of the late nineteenth century. Michael Ramsey, who was the outstanding thinker among Archbishops of Canterbury in the last century, engaged with the theological questions which confronted his Church. John Robinson, a radical who became more conservative in his later years, at least in his Bible criticism, aroused controversy with *Honest to God* which seems now to express the turbulent nature of the 1960s rather than to have left a permanent message. The final chapter returns to these last three thinkers, together with E. C. Hoskyns, and looks at their work on the Fourth Gospel. The importance of Gospel scholarship and criticism in recent and continuing Anglican thought is thereby recognized.

It has been said by some that writings by Dr Williams are difficult to read. There is no problem of clarity and understanding in this book, which perhaps benefits by being largely drawn from material which was first delivered orally. One of his great qualities is his skill in making connections and seeing the course of development in a sequence of ideas which might at first seem isolated from each other. The ability to accommodate various and sometimes polarized opinions has been sometimes the weakness of the Church of England, more often its strength. It is an ability never more tested than at the present time. Careful reading of this book should give encouragement to many loyal but troubled Anglicans, and insights which may be useful in problems whose resolution has not yet come.

Raymond Chapman

EDWARD NORMAN: *Anglican Difficulties*
Continuum, 2004 ISBN 0 81928 100 X £14.99

At the time of this book's publication an interview appeared, in the *Daily Telegraph*, in which the author announced his intention of joining, after retirement, the Church of Rome, and knowledge of this colours one's reading: *Anglican Difficulties* is certainly no call to arms, rather a Parthian shot, the arrow dipped in venom. It is true, as Dr Norman's interviewer observed, that it contains 'no mention of conversion to Rome', but the title itself was perhaps intended as a clue, echoing as it does Newman's *Difficulties of Anglicans in Submitting to the Catholic Church*, written five years after his departure from the Church of England and designed to remove obstacles in the way of other Catholic Anglicans tempted to follow his example. The 'difficulties' here, however, are not so much those which might impede the path to Rome (Dr Norman has presumably overcome these) as those which prevent the Church of England, on his view, from realizing its 'vocation as the national Church' (p.25).

The book is subtitled—another echo—'A New Syllabus of Errors', but might more aptly be described as a budget of (sometimes rather querulous) complaints. It at any rate offers little in the way of advice towards reconstruction or recovery: its attitude is too relentlessly negative for that to be possible. The focus of the book shifts unhelpfully about: sometimes it is the Church of England, sometimes the Anglican Communion, sometimes English (or Western) Christianity in general. The cultural conditions which make the work of the Church so difficult in our time and place are obviously not exclusive to Anglicanism. Besides this instability of focus, the book has the air of having been written in haste, and there is evidence of carelessness at every stage of composition and editing. There are, besides many misprints, errors of fact—Deanery Synods, for example, are described as 'clerical gatherings' where 'dissatisfaction sometimes erupts' (p.11). They are, of course, gatherings of clergy and laity. The 'Double Procession' is said to have 'disappeared from the Creed in *Common Worship*' (p.120), which it has not. Apart from the outright errors there are any number of statements which, to say the least, require further elaboration: is it true that 'secular welfare workers … have more prestige in the public's estimation' than clergy (p.12)? Or that 'in the modern secular world of values the definition of racism … is very precise' (p.14)? Can one rely on an observer who believes that in the typical parish 'local worshippers choose [from the Eucharistic Prayers in *Common Worship*] the one most compatible with their understanding of Eucharistic doctrine' (p.18)? And then there are those asides which seem merely peevish and resentful:

> The educational achievements of the higher clergy of all sorts … are in sharp decline relative to the accomplishments of professionals in general. It would be instructive to know how many of them have read a word of Plato (p.39).

What reason is there to suppose that Plato is more widely read by senior doctors or lawyers than by senior clergy? The inconveniently well-read Rowan Williams is nowhere mentioned.

The author is by training an historian of course, and it was one of the strengths of his 1978 Reith Lectures, *Christianity and the World Order*, that they contained a wealth of carefully-documented instances: assertions were thoroughly underpinned by quotation and citation. In *Anglican Difficulties*, by contrast, Dr Norman is writing off the top of his head. The head in question is a learned and well-stocked one, to be sure, and what bubbles up in it is not insipid, but there is a lack of really telling illustration. And though he has interesting and recognizable things to say on many of the topics he discusses (which include the secularized state, modern sexual mores and the 'gravitational pull downwards in the cultural values of capitalist society') there is actually little sense of a cumulating argument: while deploring the dearth of systematic thinking by other Anglican theologians he does nothing himself to supply the deficiency.

Readers of this journal will agree, of course, with much of what is said, especially in the chapter on 'Worship'. There are sound, if hardly revelatory, remarks on the enthronement of 'choice' and 'diversity' as goods-in-themselves, on man-centred worship, and on the shortcomings of recent liturgy (though, again, he is not specific). Dr Norman has come to recognize the importance of the Prayer Book for the Church's coherence:

> The greatest damage done by the practical abandonment of the Book of Common Prayer was not to the Church's guardianship of a great spiritual treasure but to its teaching office. The passing of the book—which is now rarely used in many parish churches—was lamented because of the beauty of its prose, the familiar cool words giving an organic structure to the lives of all those who called themselves Anglican (p. 16).

It is implied here—and elsewhere—that those who have deprecated the book's dislodgement are neglectful of its doctrinal importance, and value it only for 'the beauty of its prose'. This is untrue, and it might be said in riposte that if Dr Norman believes the Prayer Book to be *the* 'teaching authority' for the Church of England, and its sole 'bond of union' (p.19), it is surprising that he has not been doughtier on its behalf in the past, and makes his strongest commendation of it only on the eve of departure. Certainly if he had been following the argument with care he might have been less sanguine that 'the archaic language [of the BCP] could easily have been rendered into current prose' (p.17).

As much as a third of *Anglican Difficulties* concerns 'The Crisis of Authority in the Church', and its lack of a recognized *Magisterium*, or a 'coherent ecclesiology'. The Church should have, as it were, a continuous personality, allowing of development, but the Church of England 'remains as if frozen at the time of the Reformation', its attempt to 're-invent itself in the nineteenth century' being an 'unconvincing enterprise' (pp.viii-ix). The argument is Newman's, of course;[1] indeed there is nothing here which substantively adds to what has been said, sometimes more politely, by Roman Catholic critics since the time of Jewel. Some of us may even dimly recall the equally traditional answers. This is not the place to rehearse these ancient quarrels, beyond remarking that whatever the strength of the case considered in itself, Dr Norman's account of it is everywhere vitiated by an unpleasant animus and by statements which only cast doubt on his judgement.

Maurice Cowling in the first volume of his *Religion and Public Doctrine in Modern England* characterized Edward Norman as one of those 'whose strengths have been negative'. *Anglican Difficulties* is certainly negative, but this does not appear as strength. It is not, I repeat, that the portrait does not include recognizable features—much of what is said is all too familiar—but it is certainly a hostile portrait. Perhaps it is Dr Norman's attempt to cauterize whatever wound he feels on parting from the Church of England. If so, it is a sad book, perhaps, but still in truth not a very good one.

John Scrivener

---

[1] I take Dr Norman's final position to be the Newmanian one that the Church of England has never been a Church except on paper, though at times he is willing to allow that it has had 'sure notes of sanctity' (p.x), and that it 'does actually have a faithfully preserved deposit of orthodox Christian doctrines' (loc. cit.). But it remains unclear whether things have gone wrong only recently with the 'sidelining' of the Prayer Book as its 'teaching authority', or whether 'the plant … was torn up *some centuries ago*' (p.xiii, my italics). At any rate 'making up the content of religion for oneself … is what the Anglican clergy have been doing for centuries', apparently (p.148).

Letters

A SHORTENED PRAYER BOOK

From Mr D. B. TAYLOR, Ffestiniog, Gwynedd

Dr Pym offers the basis of a very sensible procedure in his letter to you. He is right to suggest that if we want a wider use of the BCP, we should take note of how it is actually used and incorporate almost universally accepted changes of practice. Indeed, if revisers of the liturgy had held on to the idea that their main task is not to suggest novelties but to authorize changes that have already taken place, it is likely we would not be in the dire situation in which we now find ourselves.

Everyone will have their pet schemes of how this ought to be done, and I would like to offer one or two modifications of what Dr Pym suggests. In my view what was called Rite B for the Holy Communion is superior to the BCP and most of the changes (perhaps all of them) should be incorporated. The glaring omission in the material he includes is the Litany. True, it is not much used nowadays, but its value is undeniable. The 1928 modifications should be introduced, and there are one or two other small changes that I would like to see: the omission of the phrase 'miserable sinners' throughout, the omission of 'sinners' from 'we sinners do beseech thee to hear us', and the omission of 'good Lord' from the responses from that point on; I would also prefer it to end with the Our Father.

A lot of the occasional prayers are useful, in particular the General Thanksgiving. In addition, you will need the Epistles and Gospels as well as the Collects, and I quite like the inclusion of a Gradual Psalm. Which brings me at once to the worst feature of what Dr Pym suggests, the reduction of the Psalter to 'twenty of the most used psalms'. That is totally inadequate.

The reading of the Psalms in course is probably the single most useful religious observance ever devised. I myself began doing so as a choirboy (1948–52) and have never ceased the practice. One great advantage it offers to the modern world is that it doesn't involve you in any beliefs. It is an infinitely sustaining practice, particularly in times of adversity. If the clergy will not persevere, they have only themselves to blame if they find themselves flagging in morale and commitment.

It doesn't have to be the Coverdale version. I used that up to going to university, but thereafter used whatever translation I was using of the Bible generally—the 1952 RSV up to the end of the seventies, the new Vulgate since then. Whatever version is to be used, the *whole* of the Psalter must certainly be included, as well as Cranmer's very practical division of it for daily use. One does not necessarily require that use of the laity, but one certainly ought to for all the clergy.

From Mrs MARY HOPSON, Lllanrothal, Monmouth

I am interested in the Revd Dr David Pym's suggestion that the Prayer Book Society make available 'at as low a price as possible a fairly slim, attractive and well-presented, perhaps A5, volume' containing the most used parts of the Prayer Book, and in principle support it.

I remember with affection from my early-ish school days abridged versions of *Oliver Twist*, *Ivanhoe* and *John Halifax, Gentleman*. It was these that drove me to read and appreciate the full versions. Perhaps a Prayer Book abridged in some such way as Dr Pym suggests would have a similar effect. But more importantly, in my opinion, it would surely lead to many people's discovery of such vital things as the 'proper' occasional services. They could hardly fail to come upon them as, with even mild interest, they examined the 'new' book.

To suggest that the Litany be included is another way of saying I am fully aware of the many and great difficulties that would stand in the way of the proposed undertaking: there must, for a start, be as many potential versions of the volume as there are members of the Prayer Book Society! But I believe that, given the will, all difficulties *could* be overcome, and that, in the best interests of present and future Anglican worshippers in this country, they *should* be.

TILL DEATH US DO PART

From ELAINE BISHOP, Chichester

Sir Eric need worry no longer about the 'ungrammatical "do"' in 'till death us do part', because it is perfectly grammatical! It is common usage in late (and earlier) Middle English to use the verb 'to do' to mean 'to cause to be done', as for example 'he did build a house', meaning 'he caused a house to be built'. So 'till death us do part' means 'till death causes us to be parted'. And yes, 'do' is right. The indicative mood 'does/doth' would not take into account the uncertainty always connected with the future about which we are ignorant. (For example, we might both die at the same instant, or the Second Coming might supervene before death.) We still use subjunctives occasionally in cases of uncertainty, and they are common in former times, e.g. in Acts 19.2: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost', though I presume modern translations have 'whether there is any …' So, as Sir Eric says 'the Prayer Book makes perfect sense'.

From ANNE KIRKBRIDE, Devizes

May I join in the discussion of that beloved phrase 'till death us do part'? My own feeling is that the 'do', still to be heard in rural Wiltshire, is an auxiliary verb. Its usage seems to imply a habitual or inevitable action, as in 'She d'go' or 'They d'say'.

By the way, the second person singular, 'thee' is not quite dead yet—I have heard it in Devizes Market Place since the turn of *this* century—we should treasure it!

(The above represent a number of letters defending the grammar of 'do part'. 'Depart'—itself presumably subjunctive—is certainly to be found in the Edwardian Prayer Books: OED cites 1548/9 for the 'obsolete' sense 'put asunder'. Procter and Frere quote the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference in 1661 as desiring 'some other words to be used [in the Marriage Service] instead of "worship" and "depart"—which old word, they say, is improperly used'. This was among the points conceded: 'That those words "till death us depart", be thus altered, "till death us do part"'. 'Do part' was presumably intended to be grammatical while remaining as close in sound as possible to the by then familiar 'depart'. Ed.)

RICHARD HOOKER

From the Principal of St Stephen's House, the Revd Dr JEREMY SHEEHY

I read with interest the article by Roger Clarke, 'Richard Hooker: Defender of the Faith' in *Faith & Worship* No.55. I was dismayed to find him writing 'I can recall no mention of Hooker in my training at Cuddesdon twenty years ago', but would reassure him and others of your readers that in my training at St Stephen's House only a little longer ago, I do indeed recall more than the occasional mention of Hooker (and indeed I still occasionally quote from one talk by a member of staff which includes reference to him). And whilst I cannot comment on the situation at Ripon College, Cuddesdon nowadays, I can, as Principal, certainly assure readers that Hooker gets reference made at St Stephen's House, particularly in church history, in ethics, and in our ecclesiology course.

From the Revd Dr BARRIE WILLIAMS

I am sorry to point out an error in Roger Clarke's excellent article on Richard Hooker. Lord Burghley was never Lord Chancellor. As Sir William Cecil he was Secretary of State 1558–72 and, as Lord Burghley, Lord Treasurer from 1572 until his death in 1598. The Lord Chancellor in 1585 was Sir Thomas Bromley, who famously had qualms about the trial and execution of Mary, Queen of Scots; he was succeeded in 1587 by Sir Christopher Hatton, the 'Dancing Chancellor'.

BAKER AND DYKES

From Professor ANDOR GOMME

Your readers have probably had enough of Baker and Dykes for the time being. But may I make a couple of brief points? Professor Wulstan (*Faith & Worship*, No.54) is in a much better position to pronounce on music than I am; but I do wish he wouldn't read *half* of what I say and use it to demolish the whole. One example: I never of course said anything so foolish as to imply that a composer of vocal music should always write in syllabic style, always fitting one note to each syllable: I have myself been bold enough to prepare a performing version of Bach's *St Mark Passion* which necessarily involves a great deal of melisma. What I objected to was Dykes's habit of *filling out the rhythm* by stretching syllables over two notes—without there being any gain in expressiveness or other enlargement of meaning.

And Emma Tristram is horrified at my objection to linguistic inversion—what would I make of Keats or Milton? she asks. Well, I might make of Milton what Keats did: 'I have given up Hyperion—there were too many Miltonic inversions in it—Miltonic verse can not be written in an artful or rather artist's humour … English ought to be kept up' (Letter to Reynolds, 21.9.1819). And a little later, to his brother: 'The Paradise lost though so fine in itself is a corruption of our language … I have but lately stood to my guard against Milton. Life to him would be death to me'.

I apologize by the way for inadvertently referring to 'metrical inversion' when I meant 'verbal'; but I make no apologies for the mixed parentage of 'horrorphilia': I don't think my classics teacher would have been too put out and I know for sure that my professorially classicist father wouldn't: what words does Professor Wulstan recommend in place of 'television' or 'sociology'?