1662 ~ 2012

The Book of Common Prayer 350th year

"THE CHURCH'S BANQUET" CELEBRATING THE 1662 BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

Guide to the Exhibition In Chester Cathedral Library

By

Philip Alexander FBA

Prayer the Churches banquet, Angels age,
God's breath in man returning to his birth,
The soul in paraphrase, heart in pilgrimage,
The Christian plummet sounding heav'n and earth.
George Herbert

PREFACE

This is the third in a series of exhibitions at Chester Cathedral Library designed to open up its treasures to the wider world. The first in 2007, "Treasures of Chester Cathedral Library", was an overview of the collection occasioned by the Library's re-opening, after the choir ceased to use it as a temporary practice room, while their Song School was being built. The second in 2011, "The Greatest English Bible", was a celebration of the 400th anniversary of the King James Version. The present exhibition, in 2012, "The Churches Banquet", marks the 350th anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Of the three exhibitions this is the one I have felt least equipped to do. My background is low church, in a tradition that had no time for liturgy. I subsequently, through college chapel at Oxford, and particularly a college chaplain in the Anglo-Catholic tradition, who introduced me to Compline, grew to appreciate liturgy and ritual. I was confirmed as an Anglican while a student, and ended up married to an Anglican priest.

I taught liturgy as an historian of religion to successive generations of students, through a long academic career, though, paradoxically, it was the magnificent liturgy of the Synagogue, which lies way back at the roots of Christian prayer. If I have learned anything from this experience it is this: one cannot know a liturgy in its essence without living it, and that, in this case, I have not done. This exhibition may strike those who have as idiosyncratic, and possibly sometimes missing the point. It sounds a more personal note than I thought it would, though I still write as an academic historian of religion, from a somewhat external, if engaged, perspective.

Without support the exhibition would have been impossible. The text of the Guide was read and valuable comments made on it by Richard Clark and John Scrivener. In particular I would pay tribute to my wife, Loveday, who helped me formulate my ideas as I went along, and who, because she lives this liturgy day in, day out, has given me an insight into what it is all about. Any mistakes or misunderstandings, however, are all my own, as are the opinions here expressed.

My thanks go to the Dean (Gordon McPhate), the Canon Librarian (Jane Brooke), and the Chapter of Chester Cathedral for allowing me the run of their fine library, and once again indulging my passion for old books. Peter Carrington kindly allowed us to display the Chester Archaeological Society's Copy of the 1400 Prymer. John Scrivener negotiated a generous subvention from the Prayer Book Society to help defray costs. Last but not least, nothing at all would have been achieved without the dedication of the Librarian Peter Bamford, and the library volunteers. I am deeply grateful for their hard work and their good fellowship. It is a pleasure to work with them.

In the exhibition Case One is the flat case by the windows; Case Two is the two-tiered case nearest to the door; Case Three is the two-tiered case farthest from the door.

Philip Alexander 10th January 2012

"THE CHURCH'S BANQUET"
CELEBRATING THE 1662 BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

The publication of the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1662 marks a turning-point in English history. The forms of prayer it contains, imposed by Act of Parliament on the English Church, have remained canonic for the Anglican communion down to the present day. Most of us know the *Book of Common Prayer* as a small volume that can be slipped into a pocket or a handbag, or nestle on a slim shelf in a pew, but its impact on the spiritual and cultural life of English-speaking people has been out of all proportion to its size. Arguably it is the most important book in English after the King James Bible, whose 400th anniversary we celebrated last year.

THE MAKING OF THE 1662 *BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER* (CASE ONE)

Why did a new Prayer Book appear in 1662? What was so significant about this date? The answer lies in the troubled history of England in the 17th century. The reformation of the Church of England, which began in the early 16th century, was bitterly contested. Broadly speaking two parties emerged among those who favoured change – Traditionalists and Radicals. By Traditionalists I mean those who, while rejecting the primacy of the Bishop of Rome (the Pope), and denying certain key Roman doctrines and practices (e.g., transubstantiation, purgatory, the intercession of the saints, the veneration of images, communion in one kind), nevertheless held tradition in high regard, and wanted to keep as close to it as possible. Like the Roman Catholic Church they embraced an episcopalian form of church government, that is to say they held that ultimate authority within the church lay with diocesan bishops. The Radicals, often called "Puritans", though they preferred the term "the godly", thought the Traditionalists had not gone far enough. They advocated returning to Scripture (in contradistinction to tradition) as the sole rule of faith and practice, and preferred a more presbyterian form of church order, which did not recognize bishops (at least not with the hierarchical powers envisaged by Traditionalists), but gave greater autonomy

to local churches and local ministers. The godly tended to look for guidance to Geneva, to the teachings of the great French reformer John Calvin.

Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries Traditionalists and Radicals battled it out for the heart and mind of the Church of England. It was a messy and unedifying spectacle. Both parties were to be found within a single church, and the pendulum of power swung back and forth from one to the other, sometimes even tipping over into outright Roman Catholicism, as under Queen Mary I (1553-1558). The religious settlement reached under Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) steered a middle course between moderate and radical reform, and her successors, James I and Charles I, basically tried to hold her line, though with an increasing bias towards traditionalism. Puritanism, however, remained strong, and received constant succour from across the border in Scotland, where, thanks in no small measure to the influence of John Knox (*c.*1514-1572), who had studied in Geneva with Calvin, presbyterianism had put down deep roots. The Scottish connection was to prove vital, when in 1603 James VI of Scotland became James I of England, and united the two countries under one crown. James made it very clear almost from the moment he entered his new kingdom that he detested presbyterianism ("A Scotch Presbytery", he famously quipped, "agreeth as well with monarchy as God with the devil"), and he would not be party to imposing it on the English.

The Prayer Book was the ground on which the battle between the two wings of the English Church was fought out, because it regulated the public worship of the church, and it was often at this everyday level that the differences between the factions were most evident. The disagreements were as much a matter of "style" (*how* one worships God) – as of "substance" (abstruse theology). In 1637 it was the Prayer Book that plunged these islands into civil war, and Scotland was at the forefront of the action. James I and the English Bishops had tended to handle Scottish sensibilities with kid gloves (though James had managed cautiously to steer the Church of Scotland in a more episcopalian direction), but James's son Charles was less diplomatic, and his lack of moderation was to cost him not only his throne but his head. In 1633 when he was crowned King of Scotland in St Giles, Edinburgh, he provocatively used the full English rite. Not content with that he decided, aided and abetted by his new Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud (on whom more presently), to impose a version of the English Prayer Book on the Scottish Church. He set up a commission to adapt the English Prayer Book for

Scotland, and the new *Book of Common Prayer* for the Church of Scotland was duly printed in Edinburgh in 1637. But when it was first used on Sunday 23rd July 1637 in the High Kirk of St Giles, there was uproar. As the oft-told story goes (commemorated by a plaque in the church), it was sparked off by a feisty Edinburgh market-trader, Jenny Geddes, who hurled a "creepie stool" (a type of folding stool) at the head of the unfortunate Dean James Hannay, while he was reading the collects, shouting, "De'il gie ye colic, the wame o' ye, fause thief; daur ye say Mass in my lug". The disorder spread and flared up into open rebellion against the King. Opposition was focused by a National Covenant, signed in 1638 and subscribed to by all classes of society across the land. The Prayer Book was by no means the only, or possibly even the main, ground of complaint: discontent with Charles's policies had been growing in Scotland for some time on many fronts; but it is indicative of its symbolic power that the liturgy was the match that lit the fuse.

Rebellion spilled over from Scotland into England, where the Parliamentary party, now dominated by Puritans, was increasingly at odds with the autocratic policies of the King and Laud. Civil War broke out in 1642 and ended with the King's defeat, and eventual execution on 30th Jan. 1649. From 1649-53 there was a Commonwealth, and from 1653-59 a Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell. As soon as the so called Long Parliament convened in 1640 demands were heard for it to authorize further radical reform of the Church of England, and these culminated in 1645 when it promulgated a *Directory of Public Worship* to replace the *Book of Common Prayer*. We will have more to say about the *Directory* later: suffice here to note that there is no evidence to suggest that it was anything like universally adopted, despite (eventually) the threat of hefty fines for non-compliance. Parliament hadn't the resources to police its implementation. The King tried to countermand the Parliamentary order with a Proclamation, and there were areas which remained deep down loyal to him, even after his death, but the *Directory*, backed by an Ordinance (not an Act, because the King refused Royal Assent), had the effect of forcing the *Book of Common Prayer* underground, and, to a degree imposing Puritanism on the Church of England. A patchwork of liturgical practice seems to have grown up: some followed the *Directory*, some (surreptitiously) the outlawed *Book of Common Prayer*, and some, services of their own devising. Every man was doing that which was right in his own eyes.

In the late 1650s widespread disillusion with the rule of "the godly" began to set in, and when it became clear that there was no credible successor to Cromwell, who died in 1658 – no-one of the same force of character who could hold the state together – thoughts began to turn towards a restoration of the monarchy. Negotiations were opened between leading figures in the English political establishment and Charles I's exiled son, the later Charles II, who made it clear that, tired of his travels, he was willing and eager to occupy his father's throne. Charles posed as a moderate who had learned from his father's mistakes, and in the Declaration of Breda (1660) he promised to respect "tender consciences". The Puritans were not reassured and a delegation went to see him in Holland to plead with him not to restore the *Book of Common Prayer*, or at least not without revision. The King was non-committal, and when he returned to London the Puritans continued to press him on the matter. A pamphlet war broke out with each side vehemently arguing its case. The situation that faced Charles was not unlike that faced by his grandfather, James I, when he first entered into his kingdom, and Charles handled it in a similar way: he called a conference. In the Worcester House Declaration of 25th October 1660 he expressed clearly his admiration for the *Book of Common Prayer* but promised a balanced commission of divines to look into the matter.

The commission duly met between April and July 1661 in the lodgings of the Bishop of London in the Savoy Hospital on the Strand, and so is known as the Savoy Conference. It was indeed balanced, with eighteen Bishops and eighteen Presbyterians, and an additional nine Coadjutors on each side, to stand in for any of the main members, should they be unable to attend. Two participants, both on the Bishops' side, have strong Chester connections. One was the great Bible scholar Brian Walton, then Bishop of Chester. The Savoy Conference must have been one of the last things he did, because he died on 29th November that same year. The other member with links to Chester was John Pearson (a Coadjutor), later Bishop of Chester (1672-1686), whose tomb stands in the north transept of the Cathedral.

Sheldon, the Bishop of London, took charge, as his predecessor Bancroft had done at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. He expressed his basic contentment with the 1604 form of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and invited the Presbyterians to state their objections. This was a clever ploy which immediately put the onus on to the other side. Instead of the Bishops having

to justify why the Prayer Book should be restored, the Puritans found themselves on the back foot having to justify why it should not. They drew up a list of ninety-six *Exceptions*, some general, some particular. The Bishops replied to each, rejecting all but a handful, none of them of any great weight.

The Savoy Conference reached stalemate, and petered out. But then Convocation, the "parliament" of the Church of England, which had resumed its activities in May, took the matter in hand. It appointed a committee of Bishops to oversee the revision, and to bring concrete proposals to it for debate. The work of revision began in earnest on 21st November and was more or less completed in twenty-two days. On 20th December 1661 the revised Prayer Book was adopted and subscribed by both houses of Convocation in both provinces, Canterbury and York. It may seem astonishing that a work of such complexity was completed in so short a time, but a number of members of the Bishops' commission – notably Cosin, Bishop of Durham, and Wren, Bishop of Ely – had already done much preparatory work, and this helped to expedite the process. Indeed, Cosin's work in particular, contained in the so-called "Durham Book", seems to have become the first port of call for the revisers.

The action now moved to Parliament which began to consider the matter on 14th January 1662. Parliament was more concerned to hammer out a new Act of Uniformity, than to query the Prayer Book that Convocation had commended to it. With a few minor amendments, the new *Book of Common Prayer* was attached to a new Act of Uniformity, which was given Royal Assent on 19th May 1662. Churches were instructed to implement the new liturgy from St Bartholomew's Day, 24th August, of the same year. The choice of date was a public relations disaster, inviting, as it did, comparison with an earlier persecution of "the godly" – the massacre by Roman Catholic mobs of the French Calvinists (the Huguenots) on St Bartholemew's Day 1572.

The first case in the exhibition illustrates graphically the final stages of the revision. Its centrepiece is a first edition of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* printed in London by John Bill and Christopher Barker, "His Majesties Printers" (**Exhibit 1.1**). It is an imposing small folio volume in black letter, handsomely bound, and clearly intended as an "altar" copy, for use by the priest or clerk to lead the service. Smaller formats suitable for personal use were to follow, and had already been produced for earlier Prayer Books.

Oddly this was not the absolutely definitive text of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. That was contained in the manuscript attached by ribbon to the Act of Uniformity itself. There were inevitably misprints in the printed text (printing in the 17th century was notoriously inaccurate). To ensure that an absolutely accurate text was disseminated, copies of the printed text were carefully compared with the manuscript and corrected by hand, certified by Commissioners under the Great Seal, and distributed to every cathedral and collegiate church in the land. The idea probably was that in each diocese the printed text used in parish churches could be corrected by comparison with the local Sealed Book, or if disputes over wording arose, they could be quickly resolved by consulting the same. Chester Cathedral must have received a Sealed Book, but, if it did, its whereabouts is now unknown. Only twenty-six Sealed Books survive, and most have lost their Great Seal.

The wisdom of distributing certified copies was seen in the fact that, alarmingly, the original manuscript copy attached to the Act went missing for a while. Someone cut the ribbon: the Prayer Book got separated and placed elsewhere. In 1870 the Dean of Westminster, A.P. Stanley, one of the Stanleys of Alderley Edge and one of the great churchmen of the Victorian age, instituted a search for it in connection with the report on Prayer Book revision of the Royal Commission on Ritual (1867-1870), set up at the height of the Tractarian controversy (on which more presently), and the missing volume was finally located in the House of Lords Library (in fact it had already been "rediscovered" in 1864, but this was not widely known). To everyone's surprise, discovered with it was a copy of a 1636 black-letter folio *Book of Common Prayer*, with the 1662 revisions neatly marked in it by hand. It seems this was the copy in which the changes approved by Convocation were recorded as the revision progressed, and it formed the basis from which the definitive manuscript attached to the Act was finally written up. In 1871 the Royal Commission on Ritual issued a facsimile of this annotated 1636 Prayer Book, with a preface by Stanley, a copy of which is on display (**Exhibit 1.2**). Also displayed is the 1891 facsimile of the actual manuscript attached to the Act (**Exhibit 1.3**).

And so the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was launched into the world. Its Preface immediately strikes a note of balance and compromise. Once again, in the spirit of the Elizabethan settlement, a middle way was being sought. "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling

of her publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring) sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued; and those many times more and greater than the evils, that were intended to be remedied by such change. So on the other side, the particular Forms of Divine worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged; it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are placed in Authority should from time to time seem either necessary and expedient."

It would take a long time to work out what necessity or expediency lies behind the changes introduced into the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*: suffice to say that they are quite numerous, and they do not all tend in a traditional direction. There was, apparently, no intention simply to turn the clock back. But there are anomalies, probably best explained by the haste with which the revision was done. One of the most obvious of these relates to the Biblical text used. The Gospels, Epistles and Old Testament readings are changed to the King James Version of 1611 (one of the few Presbyterian requests at the Savoy Conference which the Bishops accepted). The 1559 Prayer Book had used the Great Bible text of 1540. But 1662 left the Lord's Prayer as it was, perhaps because its wording had become too sacrosanct to change, and the Psalms were kept in the Coverdale version from the Great Bible. The latter is puzzling. Perhaps the revisers were unsure as to how well the King James version of the Psalms would *sing* (a question hotly debated to the present day), and so thought it best to leave well enough alone.

THE FORERUNNERS AND FATHERS OF THE 1662 *BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER* (CASE TWO, TOP SHELF)

The direct ancestor of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* (facsimile on display: **Exhibit 2.2**), issued in the reign of Edward VI (1547-1553). It was the work of a number of leading bishops of the

time, but by far the most important of these was the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, and it is commonly called "Cranmer's Prayer Book". A substantial portion of it survives in 1662, but even 1549 was by no means the first Prayer Book in England. Cranmer himself refers in his Preface to the "use" of Salisbury, of Hereford, of Bangor, of York, and of Lincoln. These were forms of prayer followed in the great cathedrals of the named cities in medieval times. Liturgical diversity prevailed within the medieval English Church, and one of Cranmer's main aims was to bring it to an end, and to impose a single form of prayer that would be common to all congregations. Of the different "uses" mentioned by Cranmer historically the most important was that of Old Sarum, or Salisbury (Old Sarum's successor). Salisbury was a prestigious cathedral, and its liturgy came to be widely accepted throughout the province of Canterbury, just as the York use became widespread in the province of York. Sarum was only one of a number of regional variations of the Latin rite scattered across western Europe in the middle ages. Before printing was invented, and with communications difficult, it was hard to impose uniformity, though it was tried. The various regional customs had an obvious family likeness and much text in common, but there were, nonetheless, significant differences between them in detail.

Sarum was the starting-point for Cranmer's revision, and when in 1554 Mary instigated reunion with Rome, and an Act was passed abolishing the *Book of Common Prayer*, it was Sarum that was restored. This is illustrated in the exhibition by a copy of the *Sarum Missal* or Mass Book printed in Paris in 1555 for use in the English Church (**Exhibit 2.1**). The fact that it was done in Paris should cause no surprise. The Parisian presses were among the best in Europe at the time, and the edition in question clearly aims at a certain sumptuousness (compare it with the more modest appearance of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*). It may have been felt that the French could do a more worthy job.

What changes did Cranmer make? The first and most obvious is that he translated the liturgy into English. This was a momentous step. The people could now hear the prayers in their own tongue, and respond to them with greater understanding. This was a cardinal principle of the Reformation, one not embraced by the Roman Catholic Church till the 20th century, and only then after bitter controversy. One should not underestimate the linguistic difficulties Cranmer faced. English was undergoing rapid development in his

day: it did not have a settled liturgical style, and it is not the least of Cranmer's achievements that he managed to forge one.

The second major change he introduced was to simplify the Prayer Book. Compared to its predecessors, 1549 was relatively short: it focussed on what Cranmer identified as the core of public worship. This comprised: (1) Two daily services, morning and evening (Matins and Evensong) throughout the year. (2) "The Supper of the Lorde and holy Communion, commonly called the Masse". (3) A lectionary cycle for the public reading of Scripture involving both the Psalms, other parts of the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament (both Gospels and Epistles), to be used at Matins, Evensong and Communion. The pervasiveness of Scripture in Cranmer's scheme of public worship betrays its reformed credentials. It could only have been achieved because there was now a complete Bible in English. The Cranmer Prayer Book presupposes the Great Bible of 1540 which Cranmer himself had overseen, though Miles Coverdale was its translator. (4) Liturgies for various important occasions in the life-cycle: baptism, confirmation, marriage, visitation of the sick, burial, and the purification of women after childbirth. There are other sundries in the Prayer Book but this is its essence. It involves a radical simplification of public prayer. Cranmer's vision as to what constitutes the heart of public worship has remained unchanged in the Church of England right down to the present day.

These elements were, of course, present in the earlier liturgies, along with much else. Cranmer took over many of his texts from existing Prayer Books, but what, finally, he did was to purge those texts, and the rituals that accompanied them, of anything that was deemed now, according to the reformed doctrine of the Church of England, to be unsound. A key issue was the nature of Holy Communion. What happens when the priest consecrates the bread and wine? Does it remain bread and wine, or does it change its substance, and in some way mysteriously, through the act of consecration, *become* the body and blood of Christ? The Roman Catholic Church took the latter view, the English reformers the former, though there were differences of opinion among them as to whether the bread and wine are merely symbols, or whether Christ is present in them, after consecration, really or spiritually, if not materially. The issues may appear abstruse, but they have liturgical consequences. They affect how the priest and congregation behave towards the elements, and determine whether they regard the surface on which they

rest simply as a table or an altar. These questions mattered deeply in Cranmer's day, and wars were fought over them.

It should be remembered that at the very time Cranmer and his successors were hammering out the doctrines and practices of the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church in continental Europe was, in direct response to the challenge of Protestantism, undergoing its own internal reform and clarifying *its* position. This process, which Protestant historians refer to as the Counter-Reformation, effectively limited the Reformation to Europe north of the Alps (Germany, Scandinavia, the Low Countries and Britain), but left the Iberian Peninsula, France, and Italy in the south, and, on the northern fringes, Ireland and Poland, loyal to Rome. The most important manifestation of this internal reform was the Council of Trent, which determined the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church down to Vatican I (1869-70). The first session of the Council met in Trent, in northern Italy, in 1545, the final, twenty-fifth session in Bologna in 1563. Thus it spanned the crucial period of the English Reformation. Cranmer and his collaborators would have been aware of its deliberations, and the drift of its thinking. It forms a backdrop to everything they did.

Interestingly Cranmer's 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* does not take a very emphatic line on the key doctrinal issues. It is cautious and shows its hand more by what it *doesn't* say and *doesn't* do. This was seen as a fault by more radical English reformers. Almost as soon as it was issued it came under attack for not going far enough. It was submitted for censure to two eminent continental Reformers who happened to be in England – the German Martin Bucer in Cambridge, and the Italian Peter Martyr Vermigli in Oxford. They were critical that it was still too Roman, and these criticisms were used to pressurize Cranmer into making further revisions. A second, revised Prayer Book, appeared in 1552 (facsimile: **Exhibit 2.3**), but it was effectively stillborn, because the young king, Edward, an enthusiast for reform, suddenly died, only to be succeeded by his sister Mary, a Catholic, who immediately revoked his Prayer Book, and took the Church of England back to Rome. Mary was succeeded in 1558 by Elizabeth who was a moderate reformer. A new revision of Cranmer's prayer book was at once put in hand. Incorporating some but not all of the 1552 revisions (the young Queen was more traditional than many of her bishops), as well as a few other changes, it was authorized by a new Act of Uniformity. This 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* (**Exhibit 2.4**), which

tried to plot a middle way between tradition and innovation, proved durable. A few minor revisions were introduced under James I as the result of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, and the 1637 *Book of Common Prayer*, which Charles I tried to foist on the Scots, with such disastrous results, introduced some more (though it never became law), but apart from these the text which confronted the revisers of 1662 was to all intents and purposes the Elizabethan *Book of Common Prayer* of 1559.

Many people contributed over the years to the development of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, but three in particular stand out, three "fathers" who more than anyone else engendered it. The first is Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), so much of whose 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* passed over into 1662 (**Exhibit 2.5**). He is probably the single most important figure of the English Reformation. Appointed by Henry VIII, unexpectedly, as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1532, he served his master loyally. He worked tirelessly to build the legal case that would allow Henry to divorce Catherine of Aragon. He infuriated the Pope by annulling the King's marriage to Catherine, and by ratifying his marriage to Anne Boleyn. And he played a murky and discreditable role in Henry's other marital affairs as well. He was one of the prime movers in breaking with Rome and in promulgating the doctrine of Royal Supremacy over the Church. Yet, at the same time, he was a man of considerable piety, energetic if cautious in the reform of the church. He survived into the reign of Edward VI, and when the fifteen-year old king on his deathbed nominated as his successor Lady Jane Grey, a great-granddaughter of Henry VII, and so his first-cousin-once-removed, he backed the nomination. But the Privy Council backed the Catholic Mary, daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. When Mary ascended the throne Cranmer was imprisoned for sedition and heresy. Two years in jail broke his spirit: he began desperately to recant his former views, and to seek reconciliation with Rome. It did him no good. The Queen was implacable and he was condemned to be burned. Given one last chance to recant fully in public, he unexpectedly departed from his prepared sermon, and recanted his recantations, declaring roundly, "As for the pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy, and Antichrist with all his false doctrine". He found in the end the courage and integrity which had so often eluded him: nothing in his life became him like the leaving of it. He died at Oxford a martyr of the Church of England on 21st March 1556, and is commemorated there, along with the two

other Oxford martyrs, Latimer and Ridley, by Gilbert Scott's 1843 Martyrs' Memorial.

A second "father" of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was William Laud (1573-1645) (**Exhibit 2.6**). Laud was a man of considerable intellectual and administrative ability, who rose rapidly through the ranks of the Church in the reign of James I to the highest office of all, Archbishop of Canterbury (1633-1645), under his son Charles. Charles's right-hand man on all matters pertaining to the Church, Laud was a strict authoritarian who saw uniformity as the only true expression of unity. He fearlessly and sometimes brutally resisted Puritan demands, and did everything in his power to impose his vision of doctrine and order on the Church. The story goes that when Charles, having just come to the throne, consulted Laud as to those churchmen who were suitable for promotion, Laud promptly provided him with a list of the leading clergy, with each name tagged either O (Orthodox, and to be preferred) or P (Puritan, and not to be preferred). Along with Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford, he was the architect of a policy to turn Charles I into an absolute monarch, who could rule without Parliament. He forced through a number of changes which took the Church of England in a more high, traditionalist direction. The most visible of these, for the ordinary parishioner, was the moving of the Communion Table from a free-standing position in the body of the church to the east wall, and railing it off.

But Laud overreached himself. As we saw, he backed Charles's attempt to impose more traditional forms of worship on the Scottish Church. When the Scottish Bishops sent their draft revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* to the King for approval, Laud read and emended it. The published text was reviled in Scotland as "Laud's Liturgy". The opprobrium of the Scots spilled over into Whitehall, and Archie Armstrong the King's jester (certainly a northerner, possibly a Scot) is said to have greeted Laud with the words, "Who's a fool now? Does not your Grace hear the news from Stirling about the liturgy?" It may have been about the same time that, asked to say grace, Archie quipped, "Give great praise to the Lord, and little Laud to the devil". Laud, who was sensitive about his height, rather pettily had the jester banished from court. Laud's opponents couldn't help punning on his name. When in 1637 the Puritans William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton, convicted of seditious libel, had their ears cropped and cheeks branded, Prynne told everyone that the brand SL ("seditious libeller") stood for "Stigmata Laudis".

It is important to distinguish between Laud's religious views and his politics. His religious reforms were rooted in the thinking of earlier Anglican divines (such as Lancelot Andrewes), and Laudianism was to have a long and distinguished afterlife in the Church of England. But the insensitive way he implemented his ideas, and his general politics, show a distinct lack of judgement. He managed to goad both the Scots and the English Puritans into rebellion, and bring his master's kingdom crashing down about his ears.

Laud was too deeply implicated in the policies of the King to escape serious retribution when Parliament triumphed. Imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1641, a bill of attainder was finally brought against him in 1645, and he was beheaded on Tower Hill on 10th January of that year, a day on which he is still commemorated in the liturgical calendars of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States of America. Laud can be seen as a "father" of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, not because he lived to see it, but because it marks in some ways a return to Laudian principles. Moreover, his unbending defence of the *Book of Common Prayer* against the attacks of the Puritans probably meant that the text with which the revisers started in 1662 was more traditional than it might otherwise have been. Finally, it should be noted that some of the revisions of the ill-fated 1637 Scottish *Book of Common Prayer*, in which, as we have noted, he had a hand, were incorporated into 1662.

John Cosin (1594-1672), who played an influential part in the Savoy Conference and in the Convocation which oversaw the 1662 revision, is our last "father" of the Prayer Book. Cosin was an uncompromising traditionalist and Royalist, who for much of his life was associated with Durham Cathedral, first as a Prebendary (from 1624), and then as Bishop (from 1660). He was famous for his punctiliousness with regard to ritual, and helped prosecute a fellow Prebendary of Durham, Peter Smart, for preaching a sermon against high church practices. The action was successful and Smart was deprived of his benefice. Cosin later became Master of Peterhouse and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, but fell foul of the Long Parliament for sending the university plate to help the King. He went to Paris, where he acted as chaplain to members of the royal household in exile, returning triumphantly to England when the King was restored in 1660. Elevated to the See of Durham, he proved an energetic bishop, devoting the considerable revenues of his diocese to education and charitable work. His almshouses on the south

side of Abbey Square, Durham, are now a very fine little café that ministers comfort to many a modern "pilgrim"!

Like Cranmer, and other great churchmen of his age, Cosin is a complex character, not easily pigeonholed. Though very high in his own churchmanship, he was implacably opposed to Rome, spending most of his life attacking its doctrines and practices, and while in France he was on friendly terms with the French Protestants, the Huguenots. He seems to have been genuinely anxious to reach accommodation with the Puritans over the revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*, yet if 1662 has moved in a more traditionalist direction, compared with its predecessor, then it is probably largely due to him. His fierce but charitable spirit comes out in his last will and testament, written shortly before he died: "Moreover I do profess", he writes, "with holy asseveration and from my very heart, that I am now, and have ever been from my youth, altogether free and averse from the corruptions and impertinent new-fangled or papistical (so commonly called) superstitions and doctrines, and new superadditions to the ancient and primitive religion and Faith of the most commended, so orthodox, and Catholic Church, long since introduced, contrary to the Holy Scripture and the rules and customs of the ancient Fathers. But in what part of the world soever any Churches are extant, bearing the name of Christ, and professing the true Catholic Faith and religion, worshipping and calling upon God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with one heart and voice, if any where I be now hindered actually to be joined with them, either by distance of countries, or variance amongst men, or by any other let whatsoever, yet always in my mind and affection I join and unite with them; which I desire to be chiefly understood of protestants, and the best reformed Churches: for, where the foundations are safe, we may allow, and therefore most friendly, quietly, and peaceably suffer, in those Churches where we have not authority, a diversity, as of opinion, so of ceremonies, about things which do not but adhere to the foundations, and are neither necessary or repugnant to the practice of the universal Church."

Cosin is represented in the exhibition by a manuscript, in his own hand (written in 1655), of one of his major works, the *Historia Transubstant-iationis Papalis* (1675), published, like many of his writings, after his death (**Exhibit 2.7**). This is an uncompromising attack on a cardinal Roman Catholic doctrine, which was such a weathervane of ecclesiastical allegiance in the 16th and 17th

centuries. This manuscript is a conundrum. Another manuscript in Durham apparently forms the basis of the published text of the *Historia*, but differs in significant ways from the Chester copy, which may be an earlier draft. But how did it get to Chester? We simply don't know. The manuscript has an owner's name, Francis Cholmondeley. This must be Francis Cholmondeley (1636-1713), a scion of the Cholmondeley family of Vale Royal in Cheshire, who was elected to Parliament in 1689, but refused to take the oaths to William and Mary. Imprisoned in the Tower for a time, he remained a stubborn non-juror all his life. Though a man of affairs, he had a long-standing and deep interest in theology, and may well have acquired the copy of Cosin's *Historia* at some point in his studies. Beneath his name are the words, *ex dono authoris* ("from a gift of the author"), but they are not in Francis Cholmondeley's hand, and chronology makes it unlikely that Cosin would have given the manuscript to him. How he acquired it, and how it ended up in Chester Cathedral Library remain unclear.

ST BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY: THE DISSENTERS AND THEIR ALTERNATIVE TRADITION OF PRAYER (CASE TWO, BOTTOM SHELF)

The Act of Uniformity of 1662 required all clergy in the Church of England to use the new *Book of Common Prayer* from St. Bartholemew's Day (August 24th) onwards, on pain of sequestration. Some Puritans, whose consciences would not allow them to comply, quit their parishes, leading members of their flocks with them out of the established Church to found new, independent congregations, where they could worship God in their own way. This event, sometimes called "The Great Ejection", entered deeply into the collective memory of Dissent in these islands, and was memorialized by volumes of farewell sermons preached by the departing ministers.

The number of "Bartholomeans" has always been a matter of dispute. One authority puts the figure nationally at 936, though there is evidence that some of these were later to conform. It is hard to be sure of the numbers, but the secession was certainly substantial, and there can be no question that it marks a serious schism in the English Church, one not fully healed to the present day. But it is important to see it in perspective. Christianity in England was already split. There were still some who adhered to Roman Catholicism, and

followed their own priests and forms of worship as best they could. These communities of Recusants lived a precarious existence under a variety of disabilities (they could not, for example, hold public office), and were sometimes in peril even of their lives. It shouldn't be forgotten that the Reformation never totally eliminated Roman Catholicism from England, as the priest-holes of many old English houses silently testify. Particularly in more remote, rural areas, such as west Lancashire, Catholicism survived in some strength. We tend to think of the Reformation as a glorious chapter in English history, and in many ways it was, but for ordinary folk, as contemporary records show, it could be deeply traumatic. Many felt stripped of the comfort of the age-old forms of piety, and some undoubtedly believed that they were endangering their eternal souls by adopting the new-fangled liturgy. These fears, which boiled to the surface in the West Country prayer-book rebellion of 1549, when Cranmer introduced the first *Book of Common Prayer*, were probably never totally allayed in some minds. And Catholics too had tender consciences. But even within the Protestant camp there were, as we have seen, deep divisions well before 1662.

The Act of Uniformity of 1662 was part of a process, beginning in 1660, which basically reversed the situation created by the Ordinance of 1646 imposing the *Directory of Public Worship* on the English Church. The *Directory* created problems of conscience for supporters of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and from 1648 onwards a considerable number of these were forced out of their parishes. In Prestbury in Cheshire, so local legend has it, the Presbyterians locked Thomas Jeynson, the vicar of St Peter's out of his church, but he continued for a while stubbornly to minister from the vicarage opposite, a black-and-white timbered Jacobean house, known today as the Priest's House (now a NatWest Bank!), and, from an upstairs balcony, to preach to a congregation in the street below. From 1600 onwards the boot was on the other foot. From the moment the King returned (25th May 1660) the new church order which the Puritans had put in place during the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, rapidly, and to some extent spontaneously, unravelled. Bishops began to be reappointed (they had been abolished in 1646). The Prayer Book came back increasingly into use, and an Act for Settling Ministers (1660), ejected 695 Puritans from their livings, and installed the previous conformist incumbents.

This earlier ejection of 1660 was arguably of a different order from that in 1662. It was not so clearly a matter of principle or conscience, but the righting of a perceived injustice – the ejection of conforming clergy by the godly. What happened to the 1660 Puritan ejectees is not always clear: some of them certainly eventually joined the ranks of the Dissenters. The changeover in 1660 seems to have generated some chaos and resentment. This comes out in a famous broadside of the time, *The Asses Complaint against Balaam; Or the Cry of the Country Against Ignorant and Scandalous Ministers* (1661) – a series of verses, addressed by one Lewis Griffin, to "the Reverend Bishops" (**Exhibit 3.3**). Griffin claims to be "neither Presbyterian nor Phanatick, but as true a Son of the Church of England as thyself". The burden of his complaint is that clergy were being restored indiscriminately to their former livings, irrespective of whether or not they were fit to hold office.

> "Into what darknesse will our Church be hurld
> If such as these be call'd *The light oth' World*?
> These that have nought to prove themselves devout
> Save only this, *That Cromwell turnd them out*."

The result of restoring such men will be, Griffin warns, to bring the Church and the King once again into disrepute:

> "But this our tender conscience disapproves,
> That *Ravens* should return as well as *Doves*;
> And *croak* in *Pulpits* once again to bring
> A second Judgment on our *Church* and *King*."

At one point Griffin draws an unfavourable contrast between the incoming clergy and "pious Baxter", a famous 1660 Puritan ejectee, exclaiming, "Would all our Curates were but such as he!" Certainly if Richard Baxter (on whom more presently) was the standard by which people were to be judged, then few clergy of any stripe would have appeared to advantage. The *Asses Complaint* had some force: the records of Consistory Courts in the 17th century contain a distressing number of cases where clergy are accused of scandalous and immoral behaviour, or dereliction of duty. The 1662 ejection was, however, a matter of conscience. Those who refused to conform were acting voluntarily on high principle, and going out into an uncertain future. It marks

a real turning-point in the history of the English Church, and once again the *Book of Common Prayer* was the lightning rod which earthed the storm.

The Dissenters formed new churches which followed a Presbyterian or Independent (Congregationalist) form of worship and governance. Like the Catholic Recusants they suffered under various civil disabilities, though they were somewhat less severely treated. Their persecution was relatively low-grade: gone were the fiery martyrdoms of the 16th century. The penalties against Dissenters were to some degree eased by the Act of Toleration in the first year of William and Mary (1689), and by periodic Acts of Indemnity, which allowed them (but not Catholics) to hold public office. The implementation of the various penal laws was delegated to local magistrates, who had little stomach for applying them to the letter against upstanding members of their own communities. Dissenters were, nonetheless, second-class citizens, subject to an irksome web of discrimination which was not totally swept away till the late 19th century. They were, for example, still liable to Church Rates and Tithes, they could not be legally married except in the Church of England, and they could not, in all conscience, matriculate at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge (the only two English universities, till University College London, founded in 1828, was granted in 1836 degree-awarding powers irrespective of religious allegiance), because to do so they would have had to be communicant members of the Church of England and subscribe to its Thirty-Nine Articles. This latter disability, which affected Catholics and Jews as well as Dissenters, was not finally expunged from the statute book till the passing of the Universities Tests Act in 1871! It led to the establishment of a network of dissenting academies in the 18th century to provide higher education for Dissenters, like the famous Warrington Academy (1756-1782) – the "Athens of the North", which moved to Manchester, and then on to Oxford, and has ended up as a constituent college of the University of Oxford (Harris Manchester College). These academies sometimes outstripped in seriousness and achievement the more ancient, illustrious, better equipped but intellectually more torpid universities.

What was the Dissenting view of prayer, and how did it differ from that of the Bishops? What were the principles for which the Bartholomeans were prepared to give up so much? The obvious place to start is with the *Directory for Public Worship* itself (**Exhibit 3.2**). This was ultimately descended from the *Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments*, published for the use of the

English congregation in Geneva in the 1556, which, according to its title page, had the "imprimatur" of John Calvin himself. Its pedigree, in other words, was impeccably Reformed: it was forged in continental Europe by exiles from the Marian persecution in England. John Knox brought a version of it back with him to Scotland in 1559, and in 1564, under the title *The Book of Common Order*, it displaced the existing English Prayer Book, which for some years had been in use in the Scottish Church (**Exhibit 3.1** is a later printing of this liturgy). The Puritan alternative liturgy of 1584, *A Book of the Form of Common Prayers*, also harks back to Geneva. The *Directory* owes most to the Knox *Book of Common Order*, and this explains why it was so readily accepted in Scotland, and written into law in 1646 by the Scottish Parliament.

From even a cursory reading of the *Directory* several points are immediately clear. It is very short, and much of its content focuses on creating a general framework for public worship. There are, strictly speaking, no prayers given exactly as they are supposed to be said, though suitable themes are listed for some of them. There are two reasons for this. The first is the fear that fixed wording destroys the spontaneity, the heartfeltness and sincerity, that should mark the worshipper's relationship to God. The second is that fixed forms of prayer can make the minister lazy, and prevent him from developing his own gifts in leading his congregation, and especially in developing "the gift of prayer". This latter idea was important to the Puritans. They believed that the ability to pray effectively was a gift of the Spirit, and by simply reciting fixed prayers the cultivation of that gift was stifled. The *Directory* clearly manifests a desire for a degree of uniformity in public worship, but only in terms of the outline: the content was basically down to the individual minister and congregation.

The *Directory* is pervaded by a powerful didacticism: worship is above all an occasion to *teach* the people in clear propositional language about their relationship to God, and the means by which they can make it right. The sermon figures very largely ("preaching of the word, being the power of God unto salvation … [is] one of the greatest and most excellent works belonging to the ministry of the Gospel"), and it is envisaged that it will be preceded and followed by long prayers, again of a heavily didactic nature. Prayer in this setting is seen as an extension of the sermon, a sermon by other means. This is the outworking of a fundamental tenet of Genevan theology, namely that it is through the *word* that the heart is primarily affected, and one is brought to

repentance, and to seek reconciliation to God. Though the Communion, or Supper of the Lord, is to be frequently celebrated, it is a very simple "memorialist" affair, with the communicants sitting in an orderly fashion round or at a table conveniently placed, and it is recommended that it be celebrated after the morning sermon. There is good anecdotal evidence that in many Presbyterian congregations communion was not, in fact, frequent, but was totally overshadowed by the ministry of the word.

Striking is the absence from the *Directory* of any real rubrics, specifying gestures (e.g., making the sign of the cross), or bodily attitudes (e.g., kneeling, standing, processing). These were all frowned upon by Reformed divines as smacking too much of Roman Catholicism. The congregation should enter the assembly in "a grave and seemly manner, taking their seats or places without adoration, or bowing themselves towards one place or other." Scripture was paramount, and was to be read in sequence from Genesis to Revelation (though excluding the Apocrypha), "ordinarily one chapter of each Testament … at every meeting; and sometimes more, where the chapters be short, or the coherence of the matter requireth it." Again a fundamental tenet of Reform theology is manifest here – the belief that Scripture alone is the rule of faith and practice, and public worship should be kept as close as possible to what it clearly sanctions, or can be directly deduced from it.

The framers of the *Directory* have a strong sense of the march of history. In the preamble they speak respectfully of the early English Reformers, and of the *Book of Common Prayer* which they produced, "because the mass, and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the publick worship was celebrated in our own tongue". But this was only a first step; the Prayer Book had outgrown its usefulness: "Howbeit, long and sad experience hath made it manifest, that the Liturgy used in the Church of England, (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the Compilers of it,) hath proved an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed churches abroad." They now felt themselves called upon "by the gracious providence of God" to initiate further reform – to complete the process of purging and building God's house, to "satisfy our own consciences, and answer the expectation of other reformed churches." The anxiety about what the Reformed Churches abroad might think is revealing. This was always a consideration for the Puritan party. We saw how the continental reformers, Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, who happened to be in England, were used by the Radicals to

browbeat Cranmer into a further revision of his 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. Reformers in England (and this affected Traditionalists as well as Radicals) had a bit of an inferiority complex. They were constantly looking over their shoulders, wondering what Geneva or Zurich or other centres of Protestantism in Europe might think of their efforts to set their house in order.

The *Book of Common Prayer* had its defenders. The defence began in the early 1640s, in response to Puritan attacks on the Prayer Book liturgy. In 1641 popular petitions, from all over the country, were presented to Parliament calling on it to defend the *Book of Common Prayer*, episcopacy, and more generally the traditional Church order. Cheshire featured prominently in this movement, thanks in no small measure to Sir Thomas Aston (1600-1645) of Aston, near Runcorn. The Cheshire petitions in favour of conformity were a direct response to vigorous local Puritan anti-Prayer Book agitation, orchestrated in part by Aston's nemesis, Sir William Brereton (1604-1661), of Handforth, near Wilmslow. In 1641 Brereton produced his own petition attacking episcopacy, representing, so it said, Cheshire opinion, and claiming (suspiciously) more or less exactly twice the number of signatories as Aston's petition. Brereton was to go on to serve as a distinguished Parliamentary commander in the Civil War, and was engaged in a number of successful military actions in Cheshire.

The Aston petitions are interesting for a number of reasons. They are essentially from the laity, in the sense that it was lay people who initiated them and made the running. Indeed, they express muted surprise that the clergy and the bishops have not been more active in the defence of traditional church order. But while clearly anti-Puritan, they are not happy with Laud's innovations either. They show how deeply the *Book of Common Prayer* and traditional practices had embedded themselves in the everyday life and affections of ordinary folk. Finally, though composed by laymen, they are learned, and show a high level of understanding of the theological issues involved.

Traditionalist divines were later to take up the cudgels from laymen such as Aston. One of the most doughty of these was Henry Hammond (1605-1660), who published in 1646 *A View of the New Directory and a Vindication of the Ancient Liturgie of the Church of England* (**Exhibit 3.4**). Hammond was a leading royalist cleric, who acted as one of the chaplains to the king, and ministered to

him to the bitter end. A man of integrity, courage and intellectual ability, he gained the respect even of his opponents, and was a theologian of sufficient substance to have a selection of his writings included in the *Anglo-Catholic Library* (1847-1850). He died on 25th April 1660, the very day on which Parliament voted to bring back the King. Rumour had it that if he had lived, he would have been made Bishop of Worcester.

Hammond's *View*, which, in early editions, opened with the King's Proclamation countermanding the Parliamentary Ordinance in support of the *Directory*, offers a sharp analysis which helps clarify the points at issue. He lists twenty-two elements of "our Liturgy" which are conspicuously absent from the *Directory*. Six of these he designates as extrinsic, that is to say they relate to the external structure of the liturgy, and sixteen as intrinsic, that is to say they are specific parts of the service which are missing.

The extrinsic elements are: (1) "The prescribing of Forms, or Liturgy itself." This is a curious charge, which is hard to justify. The *Directory* is not against liturgy *per se*, but offers *a different kind* of liturgy to that found in the *Book of Common Prayer*. It is interesting, however, that from Hammond's high-church perspective the form of public worship prescribed in the *Directory* seems so threadbare as not to be a liturgy at all. (2) "Outward or bodily worship." (3) "Uniformity in performing God's service." This again is an interesting charge. The *Directory* clearly states that it is trying to strike a balance between total freedom of worship and being over-prescriptive, but there is no doubt that the uniformity it achieves relates basically to the general shape of the liturgy; the content is almost totally at the discretion of the local minister, and that is clearly not sufficient to satisfy Hammond's sense of uniformity. (4) "The People's bearing of some part of the service." This is a shrewd observation. What Hammond points out, fairly, is that in the *Book of Common Prayer* the congregation is actively involved in the service in responses of various kinds, e.g., in the Litany, whereas the *Directory* envisages them as essentially passive: they sit and listen to the minister. Their main activity is a mental one of concentrating on hearing and understanding the word. Puritans often derided the congregat-ional responses of the Prayer Book, comparing the passing of the words back and forth between the clerk and the people to a game of tennis! (5) "The dividing of the Prayers into several Collects, and not putting them all into one continued Prayer." This is a structural criticism, which has some force. The *Directory* envisages long prayers covering a wide range of

separate themes. These themes are divided into more "bite-sized", thematic chunks ("Collects") in the *Book of Common Prayer*. (6) "The Ceremonies of kneeling in the Communion, of Cross in Baptism, of Ring in Marriage, etc". These were, of course, the three "shibboleths" which had long divided Traditionalists and Radicals.

Hammond lists the intrinsic elements of the *Book of Common Prayer* missing from the *Directory* as follows: (1) "The Absolution, in the beginning of the Service next after the Confession, and before the Communion, and in the Visitation of the sick." There is, of course, a profound theological reason for this absence in the *Directory* – the desire to avoid any impression that the priest is able to forgive sin. (2) "The Hymns, the Introit, the Te Deum, etc." The only music which the *Directory* seems to envisage is the singing of Psalms. (3) "The use of the Doxology or giving glory to God." Hardly a fair criticism: doxology is envisaged by the *Directory* in the prayers, but Hammond seems to be right that no doxological formula is recommended (e.g., "Glory be to the Father etc."), not even one derived directly from the Bible. (4) "The Confession of the Faith in the Creeds." The framers of the *Directory* would have regarded the classic creeds as inadequate statements of Christian belief, and therefore not worth reciting. (5) "The frequent repeating of the Lord's Prayer, and the Prayers for the King." The Puritans were uneasy about liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer, despite the fact that Christ himself composed it, lest it should become "vain repetition", a form of words deemed effective simply by repetition, without a right attitude of heart. (6) "The observation of the divers Feasts commemorative, not only of Christ, but of Saints departed, and assigning Services, Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels, and Collects to them." (7) "The reading of the Commandments, and the Prayers belonging to that Service." (8) "The order of the Offertory." By Offertory here Hammond means collecting alms for the poor and bringing them during the Communion service to the Priest, who receives them and places them on the Holy Table. Hammond demonstrates the antiquity of this practice. He notes that the *Directory* does refer somewhat vaguely to making a collection for the poor at some point in the service, but he is puzzled as to why the ancient custom of the Offertory has been overturned. An obvious explanation in terms of Reformed theology comes to mind: it was to avoid any possibility that people might think their own good works could in any measure atone for their sins. (9) "Private Baptism." For the *Directory* Baptism is a public act of entry into the visible Church. It has nothing to do with salvation. (10) "A prescript form

of Catechism." The *Directory* was only one part of the total output of the Westminster Assembly, which met between 1643 and 1649 to restructure the Church of England. Along with the *Directory* it issued the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646), and the *Larger* and the *Shorter Catechisms* (1647). There were, then, *two* catechisms associated with the *Directory*, but whether these had been produced by the time Hammond wrote, or whether he was aware that they were being prepared, is a moot point. He was actually nominated as a member of the Westminster Assembly, but like the other episcopalians did not attend. And besides, his precise criticism is the absence of any reference to catechizing *within the Directory itself*: "For the *prescript Form of Catechism*, it is placed by our Church in our *Liturgy*, and as fit to be placed there as *any directions for Preaching* can be in theirs, (which takes up so great a part of their *Religion*, and consequently in their *Directory*)." Hammond was very keen on catechizing: his *Practical Catechism*, published in 1644, was his best known work. (11) "Confirmation." The absence of this is striking, given that the *Directory* envisages infant baptism. Also striking are the absence of (12) "the solemnities of burying the dead," and (13) "thanksgiving after Childbirth." The former are expressly forbidden in the *Directory*: "When any person departeth this life, let the dead body, upon the day of burial, be decently attended from the house to the place appointed for publick burial, and there immediately interred, without any ceremony." The latter is simply omitted. (14) "Communion of the sick." The *Directory* envisages visitation of the sick, but the idea of giving them communion is implicitly rejected. (15) "The Service containing the Commination," i.e., the public denouncing of God's anger and judgement against sinners. (16) "The observation of Lent, and the Rogation, and the Ember weeks." The absence of all of these is a direct corollary of the Puritans' rejection of the traditional concept of a liturgical year.

We cannot elaborate on any of these points in any greater detail here. Suffice to note that Hammond's analysis helps us to see that the *Directory* and the *Book of Common Prayer* represent two profoundly different theologies of worship. The one spare and simple, fiercely focused on the word, and on the individual's inner relationship to God, the other more dramatic and complex, with a strong sense of ritual, tradition and community. These two visions of worship remain largely unreconciled within the Church to the present day.

The exhibition includes two impressive representatives of Dissent. The first is "pious Baxter", mentioned in the *The Asses Complaint*. During the Commonwealth and the Protectorate Richard Baxter (1615-1691) rose to become one of the acknowledged leaders of the Presbyterian party, a great preacher in an age of great preachers. He reached his Puritan views comparatively slowly and held them moderately. He opposed regicide, and he opposed Cromwell. In his remarkable autobiography he states that in the 1650s "I did seasonably and moderately by Preaching and Printing condemn the Usurpation [of power by Cromwell], and … in open Conference declare *Cromwell* and his Adherents to be Guilty of Treason and Rebellion, aggravated with Perfidiousness and Hypocrisie" – this from a leading Puritan, not a Royalist! He worked towards the restoration of the monarchy, and the King saw him as someone worth getting on his side. He was made a royal chaplain, and offered the Bishopric of Hereford, but he declined the preferment on the grounds that he wanted to be free to promote unity in the Church. He worked hard for that unity in 1660, and was willing to accept the Worcester House *Declaration*. Its terms, he told Lord Clarendon, were "such as any sober honest Ministers might submit to", and he vowed to persuade others to conform to it, and to "promote our happy Concord", looking forward to "the day that Factions and Parties may be swallowed up in Unity". But disillusion set in when he realised that the *Declaration* was only a ploy on the part of the King and the Bishops, intended "but for present use, and that shortly it would be revok'd or nullified", a fear realised when the Commons later failed to ratify it.

Baxter was the *de facto* leader of the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, as Rainolds had been at Hampton Court in 1604, but there another, much less constructive side of him, was much in evidence – his disputatiousness. He loved debating, and having the last word. He drove the Bishops to distraction by his endless argument. Robert Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, who later wrote the Preface to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, was reputed to have exclaimed in exasperation that "he had never met with a man of more pertinacious confidence, and less abilities in all his conversation". He played the role on the Presbyterian side that Cosin played on the Bishops': he was diligent and well prepared, and tabled his own draft of a revised liturgy (published without his approval in *A Petition for peace: with the Reformation of the Liturgy* [1661]), which had, however, no chance of gaining episcopal blessing.

Baxter was ejected from his living in Kidderminster in 1660 under the Act for Settling Ministers, but he remained within the Church of England, and was an acceptable preacher in several London churches. In the end he refused to subscribe to the new *Book of Common Prayer*, and left. For the final twenty-nine years of his life he exercised his ministry as best he could as one of the foremost dissenting divines in England. Ill health and constant harassment by the authorities (including an eighteen-month spell in prison) did little to dampen his spirit, or sour his outlook, and some of his best work was done in this period. Baxter the tenacious controversialist was to the fore at the Savoy, but he had a sweeter side which comes out in his more devotional works, such as *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and in his poetry and hymns (he wrote *Ye Holy Angels Bright*). Even in such a scholastic work as his massive *Christian Directory*, a copy of which is on display (**Exhibit 3.5**), passages of great wisdom and moderation can be found, as in the following direction he gives on how to behave in public worship: "'Conform yourselves to all the lawful demands and gestures and customs of the church which you join.' You come not thither proudly to show the congregation that you are wiser in the circumstances of worship than they, nor needlessly to differ from them, much less to harden men into a scorn of strictness, by seeing you place religion in singularities in lawful and indifferent things. But you come to exercise love, peace, and concord, and with one mind and mouth to glorify God. Stand when the church standeth; sit when the church sitteth; kneel when the church kneeleth, in cases where God doth not forbid it." Sanderson totally misjudged Baxter: he was one of the outstanding Christians of his age, and, as *The Asses Complaint* implies, it was the Church of England's loss that it could not find room for such a man.

The second of our representative Dissenters is Matthew Henry (1662-1714). He was not himself one of the ejected, but his father Philip was, from his church in Worthenbury near Wrexham, just over the border from Cheshire. Matthew was born near Malpas in the year his father was dismissed (1662). He became the author of one of the most famous English-language commentaries on the Bible, which has probably never been out of print since it first appeared in the early 18th century. It was almost totally composed while he was a Presbyterian minister in Chester (1687-1712). His meeting-house in Crook Lane (now Crook Street) was opened in 1700. It has long since gone, but he is commemorated by a memorial in the middle of the Grosvenor roundabout, and his study, a two-

storeyed summerhouse, is said to be still standing behind his former residence in Bolland Court, White Friars.

Henry is represented in the exhibition, not by his great commentary but, more appositely to our theme, by a little volume, first published in 1710, entitled, *A Method for Prayer, with Scripture Expressions proper to be used under each Head*, which gives an interesting insight into Dissenting ideas of prayer (**Exhibit 3.6**). These started from a basic antipathy, manifested in the *Directory*, towards fixed forms of prayer. Prayer should be spontaneous, from the heart, a natural outpouring of the individual soul to God. It is essentially an inner attitude, a constant inner dialogue with God. "A golden thread of heart prayer", Henry writes, "must run through the web of the whole christian life; we must be frequently addressing ourselves to God in short and sudden ejaculations." This inwardness "is the life and soul of prayer; but this soul in the present state must have a body, and that body must be such as becomes the soul, and is suited and adapted to it. Some words there must be, of the mind at least, in which, as in the smoke, this incense must ascend."

Now it would be ideal if we could all, out of the abundance of our own hearts, produce the right words for prayer, but Henry is too well versed in the realities of the spiritual life not to know that this is a counsel of perfection. "There are those (I doubt not)," he writes, "who at sometimes have their hearts so wonderfully elevated and enlarged in prayer, above themselves at other times; such a fixedness and fullness of thought, such a fervour of pious and devout affections, the product of which is such a fluency and variety of pertinent and moving expressions, and in such a just and natural method, that then to have an eye to such a scheme as this, would be a hindrance to them, and would be in danger to cramp and straiten them: If the heart be full of its good matter, it may make the tongue as the pen of a ready writer. But this is a case that rarely happens, and ordinarily there is need of proposing a certain method to go by in prayer, that the service may be performed decently and in order; in which yet one should avoid that which looks too formal. A man may write straight without having his paper ruled."

Henry's method is to learn off and use Scriptural passages and phrases appropriate to the particular topic of one's prayer, and the bulk of his book is a digest of just such Biblical expressions topically arranged. At the end he offers some specimen prayers to illustrate his method in action: they are

almost totally pastiches of bits of Bible! Henry seems not to see that such prayers are just as likely as any others to become stiff and dry, and if there is here any implication that prayer is valid simply because it employs words of Scripture, then that is to turn Scripture into incantation, and is the worst kind of formalism imaginable. But the method, in principle, is a good one, and, having been brought up in a tradition of "praying with Scripture", I can testify that it can, if well used, be effective. But supporters of the *Book of Common Prayer* are not going to object to this in principle. They can readily point out that many of the fixed, prayer-book prayers are as full of Scripture as Henry could wish. Why not use both methods – formal, fixed prayer and spontaneous prayer, prayed, if one prefers, "with Scripture" – depending on the circumstances?

There is a certain irony in the fact that Henry's method, so influential on the practice of Dissenting prayer, was, as he himself acknowledges, anticipated by "that bright ornament of the church, the learned Dr Wilkins, bishop of Chester, [who] hath left us an excellent performance, much of the same nature with this, in his discourse concerning the gift of prayer" (Wilkins, *A Discourse Concerning the Gift of Prayer*, London 1655). John Wilkins (1614-1672) was one of the greatest intellects of his age, a scientist as well as churchman, and a founding member of the Royal Society. His *Gift of Prayer* does, indeed, in many ways anticipate Henry's *Method* for cultivating private, individual prayer. He wrote it during the interregnum, when his Puritan sympathies were high, and with it went a companion volume on the other great Puritan "gift" – the gift of preaching – in which he called for a plainer, more direct, less oratorical style (*Ecclesiastes, or, A discourse concerning the gift of preaching*, London 1655). Wilkins was, however, acceptable to the establishment after the Restoration and served as Bishop of Chester from 1668 till his death in 1672. We display his *Gift of Prayer* alongside Henry's *Method of Prayer* to make the salutary point that there can be some surprising meetings of minds across some apparently unbridgeable divides (**Exhibit 3.7**).

DISSEMINATION AND REVISION
(CASE THREE, TOP SHELF)

The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was primarily intended for the Church of England, but today its direct liturgical offspring can be found guiding

Christian worship throughout the world, in a plethora of languages other than English, nearly 200 in all, including Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Inuit. This worldwide reach is reminiscent of the spread of the King James Bible, and came about for similar reasons. It makes the *Book of Common Prayer*, which many would see as quintessentially English, a part of world literature – one of the few truly global books. The Act of Uniformity applied only to the provinces of Canterbury and York, but the province of Canterbury in 1662 included Wales, so the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was automatically imposed there too, and an official Welsh version of it appeared in 1664 (a later print of this is on display: **Exhibit 4.1**). It was taken to Ireland and, with a few additions, became in 1665 the Prayer Book the Church of Ireland (but was not done into Irish till 1712). After the political union of England and Ireland in 1800, the two Churches shared the same Prayer Book – the *Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland*. The first copy to bear this title was printed in Dublin in 1801. No attempt was made to impose it on the Church of Scotland, which continued with its own distinctive forms of worship. The monarchy had learned the lesson of 1637, and did not want again to expose the heads of its Scottish ministers to the risk of contact with "creepie stools".

The *Book of Common Prayer* was carried abroad as the British Empire expanded overseas. It went to Australia, to New Zealand, to South Africa and other British colonies in Africa, to the West Indies and the Caribbean, and to North America – both Canada and the USA. In all these regions – in fact in every part of the British Empire, which at its greatest extent covered a third of the landmass of the world – daughter churches of the Church of England were established, and in each of them the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* became the basis of its liturgy. The United States is a particularly interesting case. Every schoolboy and schoolgirl knows about the voyage of the *Mayflower* and Plymouth Rock (1620): the United States, surely, was founded by *Puritans* fleeing from persecution in England, and Puritan values sank deep into the American psyche. Nevertheless, episcopalianism of the English variety was successfully transplanted to the English colonies in America, and the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* remains the basis of the liturgy of the Episcopalian Church of the USA down to the present day.

This overseas dissemination of the *Book of Common Prayer* engendered two important developments. First, it necessitated its translation into other

languages. It was a fundamental principle of the English Reformation that the people should hear divine service in their own tongue. This involved an emphatic rejection of Latin, the language of the Roman rite. If now the *Book of Common Prayer* was being used by congregations for whom English was not their vernacular, then something had to be done about it: a translation had to be supplied. An example of these early foreign language versions was the Spanish: we have put on display a 1623 London print of this (*Liturgia Inglesa*) (**Exhibit 4.4**). It was presumably intended for Spanish-speaking congregations in the West Indies and the Americas.

Translations into other languages began remarkably early. The 1552 Prayer Book was done into French in 1553, for the benefit of the King's subjects in Calais and the Channel Islands. The first *Book of Common Prayer* in Welsh appeared in 1567, and the first in Irish in 1608. And even in England itself non-English versions circulated. While the parish priest or his clerk was obliged to deliver the service in English, the first Act of Uniformity of Edward VI (1549) had allowed college chapels in Oxford and Cambridge to say any of the Prayer Book services, with the exception of Holy Communion, in any of the three Biblical languages – Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Queen Elizabeth in 1560 removed the restriction on Communion, and extended the privilege to the collegiate schools of Winchester and Eton.

Latin makes the most obvious sense here, since it was the language of scholarship, and many native English scholars may actually have been more fluent in Latin than in their mother tongue. On display is a Latin version of the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* – the *Liber Precum Publicarum* – printed in London in 1574 (**Exhibit 4.3**). This was a revision, first published in 1571, of an earlier, somewhat free Latin rendering by Walter Haddon, which first appeared in 1560, but in turn relied to some degree on a Latin version of the 1549 Prayer Book by Alexander Alesius, commissioned by Cranmer himself. A Latin version would have allowed the English Bishops to parade not only their scholarship but also the Protestant credentials of their liturgy before the eyes of the great continental Reformers. Bucer's and Peter Martyr's censures of the 1549 Prayer Book would have been done on the basis of a Latin translation.

Translations into Greek also appeared at an early date. The first by William Whitaker was published in 1569, a second by Elias Petley in 1638, inspired

apparently by the growing ecumenical dialogue between William Laud and the Greek Patriarch Cyril Lucar, and a third in 1665 by James Duport, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge and Dean of Peterborough. It is the last of these which is on display (**Exhibit 4.2**). I have not seen a complete translation into Hebrew earlier than the one produced by the Jewish convert C. Czerskier in 1830. Revised in 1836 by Alexander M^{c}Caul, Michael S. Alexander, and Johann Christian Reichardt, it was used for mission among Jews, both in London and in the Anglican-German Bishopric of Jerusalem, where Michael Alexander served as the first bishop.

The second development of the *Book of Common Prayer* that occurred overseas was more important. The Prayer Book had to be adapted to local conditions, and local churches were more likely than the mother Church in England to introduce changes and revisions, especially after they gained their independence. The revision of the Prayer Book began in earnest overseas, and these overseas revisions were to prove a useful resource when the Church authorities back home in England got round to revising their own text. This took a remarkably long time to happen. An attempt to revise the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* was undertaken in 1689. The immediate context was the Glorious Revolution. Charles II was succeeded by his brother James II (1685-89). James was a Catholic, and immediately began to promote Catholics to positions of power, and to dismantle the penal laws under which they, and Dissenters, laboured. Both Dissenters and Bishops became alarmed that this toleration was but the prelude to a full-scale attempt to take the English Church back to Rome. The birth of a son to the King (James Francis Edward Stuart) in 1688, displacing James's older Protestant daughters, Mary and Anne, and securing a Catholic succession, led seven leading English noblemen to invite William of Orange, a combative Protestant married to James's daughter Mary, to come and take the English throne. William, who was already contemplating an invasion of England, sailed with a Dutch fleet and army, and, successfully landing at Torbay (4th Nov. 1688), quickly sent James packing. He ascended the throne with his wife to rule as a joint monarchy (1689-94) over the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, though he secured the two latter only after a fight. The arrival of the new king and queen created yet another crisis of conscience for clergy in the Church of England. A number of them (including William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester) felt, having given their oath of allegiance to King James (who was still alive), they could not now

give it to King William, and so quit their livings. Most of the Non-Jurors were high-churchmen, and their withdrawal strengthened the more liberal elements in the Church of England, and paved the way for the dominance of latitudinarianism in the following century.

James had tried to make common cause between Dissenters and Roman Catholics. The Dissenters, because of their deep antipathy to Roman Catholicism, had not played along, but the attempt had caused alarm among the Bishops, and the decision was made in 1689 to set up a Royal Commission to revise the *Book of Common Prayer* in ways that would make it more acceptable to Dissenters. The extent to which the Commissioners, who included Nicholas Stratford, Bishop of Chester (Cartwright's successor), and leading divines of the period such as Tillotson and Stillingfleet, were prepared to go to accommodate dissenting sensibilities was astonishing: in many cases, for example, they were willing to change "priest" or "curate" to "minister". Maybe the sudden upsurge of Roman Catholicism convinced the English Bishops that the reformation of the English Church had indeed not gone far enough. But as the national crisis died down, the project was quietly aborted: Convocation refused to discuss the proposals, and so nothing ever went to Parliament. The draft revision (called the "Liturgy of Comprehension") was hushed up, and its contents were not really known till Parliament ordered its publication in 1854. On display is an 1855 reprint, by Samuel Bagster of London, of the 1854 text (**Exhibit 4.5**).

The Church of England had to wait for over two hundred years before it was to see another official attempt to publish a revised *Book of Common Prayer*. Pressure for revision grew in the 19th century. There were many and complex reasons for this, but one of the most important was the rise of Tractarianism. Tractarianism can be, very roughly, seen as a resurgence of Laudian tendencies within the Church of England, in reaction to the more rationalist and latitudinarian ideas which had prevailed it in the 18th century, but it was Laudianism with an even more pronounced Catholic complexion. The leading light of the Tractarian movement, John Henry Newman (1801-1890), felt, in the end (to the horror, it must be said, of other Tractarians) that he had no option but to go over to Rome. The impact of Tractarianism on the Church of England was enormous. A slew of practices derived from pre-Reformation tradition was introduced into Anglican worship, including the use of vestments, candles and incense. The Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874

tried to moderate this "Ritualism", as it was known, but to little effect. The Ritualists were determined to stand their ground, and the prosecution for Ritualism before an ecclesiastical court, and then, on appeal, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (1888-1890), of the popular and saintly Bishop Edward King of Lincoln had the effect of bringing legal remedies into disrepute.

The alternative was to try and draw the Tractarians within the fold by revising the Prayer Book in ways that would make them more comfortable. A Royal Commission was set up which reported in 1906, and the process of revision then began in earnest. The revision was finally ready in 1927. It was approved by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and by the Church Assembly, but because the Church of England is a state church, it had to gain Parliament's consent before being presented to the monarch, the Church's titular head. The Lords approved it by a handsome majority, but it was rejected in the Commons. Many in the Lower House were swayed by emotional arguments that claimed the revisions were tantamount to the restoration of the Catholic Mass, and implied the doctrine of transubstantiation! In 1928 it was brought back in slightly emended form to both Convocations and the Church Assembly, which again gave it their blessing. Back it went to the Commons which threw it out again. The Bishops then issued a statement asserting the right of the Church to determine its own forms of worship, and in 1929 the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury authorized the Bishops to approve the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer*, despite the fact that Parliament had refused to ratify it. This they did, and the 1928 Prayer Book passed into use in the Church of England, but only as an alternative to 1662, a point made graphically in the early prints by presenting 1662 and 1928 in parallel columns on the page. The Church learned a lesson from this bruising encounter with the Commons, and has not attempted since to ratify changes to its Prayer Book through Parliament, though the Church of England (Doctrine and Worship) Measure of 1974 gives it wide powers to modify its liturgy, but specifically forbids it to revoke the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. For a copy of the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer*, see **Exhibit 4.6**.

Even though the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer* introduced some changes which were widely appreciated, pressure for further revision began to build after the Second World War. From 1965 onwards a number of revised liturgies were

trialled in churches (Series 1, 2, and 3), culminating in the *Alternative Service Book* of 1980 (**Exhibit 4.7**). This was intended to be used, as the title-page indicates, "in conjunction with The Book of Common Prayer". The opening words of the Preface (which distantly echo the opening of the 1662 Preface) immediately clarify the situation: "The Church of England has traditionally sought to maintain a balance between the old and the new. For the first time since the Act of Uniformity this balance is now officially expressed in two books, rather than in one. The *Alternative Service Book* (1980), as its name implies, is intended to supplement the Book of Common Prayer, not to supersede it." The *ASB* was subsequently augmented by *Lent, Holy Week, Easter: Services and Prayers* (1984), and *The Promise of His Glory: For the Seasons from All Saints to Candlemas* (1991), which offered forms of service for specific festivals, "commended by the House of Bishops", but these were strictly optional: the *ASB* is complete in itself. The *ASB* was seen only as an interim measure: it was authorized for use only from November 1980 until the end of December 2000. It was replaced in 2001 by *Common Worship*, which is regarded as a more long-term solution (**Exhibit 4.8**).

Common Worship is then the current end-point of a long process of liturgical evolution which began with Cranmer's first *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549. It differs from 1662, or indeed 1928 or even 1980, in a number of ways. First it is a suite of books, where previous Prayer Books were in one volume. This is not simply because it has much more text, and as a single volume would contain an unwieldy number of pages, but also because this presentation serves to clarify the overall structure of the liturgy. *Common Worship* is strong on structure – whether of individual services, or of the liturgy as a whole. This stress on structure is important because it offers now the possibility of creating different forms of each service. The priest and the congregation can build their own services within fixed frameworks (which include certain unchanging and mandatory bits of text), drawing on an extensive repertory of recognized alternatives. It is the printing of these permitted alternatives that more than anything else bulks out the text. The offering of alternatives is already found at certain points in 1662, and was extended in 1928 (which was alternative to 1662), and even more in the 1980 *Alternative Service Book*, which, besides being alternative to 1662, also offered within *itself* alternatives, later augmented by the separate supplementary liturgies of *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* and *The Promise of His Glory*. But *Common Worship* has taken this element of choice to a totally new level. This makes it unwieldy for congregational use

during the actual service (though experienced priests are nimble enough at finding their way around it). Many churches have solved this problem by printing off "in house" their own booklets for specific services, which incorporate all their preferred options – a process made easier by the fact that the various elements can be copied and pasted from electronic versions available online. One curious consequence of this is that few people in the pew now ever experience *Common Worship* as a book or even as a series of books, but only as a collection of leaflets produced for specific services.

There are other obvious differences from 1662. One is the diversity of language within *Common Worship* as a whole. The main services of 1662 (Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, and Holy Communion) are, with some alterations, included in it as permitted alternatives: these are still in their original 17th century English (though spelling and punctuation have long since been modernized); and other "traditional language" services are authorized under *Common Worship* in their 1928 or Series 1 form (e.g., Matrimony, as at the recent royal wedding). The remaining alternatives, however, are in modern speech, an innovation which had already come in with the *Alternative Service Book*. It should be borne in mind that the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* remains *in toto* canonical for the Church of England (and is still widely used and loved) – a status clearly affirmed by the Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure of 1974. Another distinctive feature of *Common Worship* is the extent to which it includes commentary which explains to the user exactly what is happening and why. This is a rather startling innovation. Over the centuries 1662 acquired some classic commentaries, but they never had any kind of official status, and were never printed in *official* service-books for use in church.

Common Worship is an impressive achievement, but why does it take the form it does? Clearly its over-arching philosophy is to recognize, regularize, indeed, celebrate diversity. Within defined limits it seeks to allow a wide range of viewpoints to flourish and to find forms of worship with which they are comfortable. This is remarkable: it is as if in 1662 they had included in the *Book of Common Prayer* authorized alternatives that would have satisfied both a Richard Baxter and a John Cosin. Indeed, some have sensed an uncanny resemblance between A Service of the Word in *Common Worship* and the 1545 *Directory*, in the sense that both offer only a minimal outline of a service! The introduction in *Common Worship* notes how new this is in Anglican liturgy: "A

Service of the Word is unusual for an authorized Church of England service. It consists almost entirely of notes and directions, and allows for considerable local variation and choice within a common structure." It is sometimes claimed that this diversity is only returning to the diversity of the pre-Reformation English Church, but this is to miss the point. There were certainly different uses in England in the middle ages, but they were regional variations. In any given region you would follow the local use. If you were in York, you would not follow Salisbury or Hereford, or vice versa. You didn't have the option of choosing which use you adopted. But that is, in effect, what *Common Worship* now offers. Two churches, within the same town, can, within certain limits, chose to follow somewhat different forms of prayer.

Many of the alternatives and variations contained in *Common Worship* represent customs that have grown up over many years in the actual performance of public prayer in the Church of England. At least since the 19th century the *performance* of the *Book of Common Prayer* has been, to say the least, creative. Rigidly minimalist implementation of the text has probably been the exception rather than the rule, and this fact testifies to how alive the tradition has been. *Common Worship* has drawn on this experimentation and tried to embrace the best of its accumulated practice, to codify and canonize it. The variety of custom was always there: it is the *canonizing* of it that marks a striking new departure.

There was another source of change that has deeply affected the development of the Prayer Book, and that is liturgical scholarship. Cranmer and other early "fathers" of the *Book of Common Prayer* were deeply knowledgeable about the different liturgies of the Christian Church, including those being developed by the continental Reformers, but it was not till the 18th century that the *scholarly* study of this subject truly began. It gathered pace in the 19th century with texts in many languages – not just Latin and Greek, but Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and Slavonic – being collected, edited, translated, and compared. The historical evolution of the liturgy, particularly its earliest phases, was clarified, and its roots in Jewish prayer explored. This study revealed beautiful prayers and valuable customs that could profitably be adapted to the English rite. The influence of scholarship is, perhaps, most clearly seen in the 1928 revision. The thirty years or so that preceded it saw a flurry of scholarly publications, many sponsored by the Alcuin Club, a society dedicated to the study of Anglican liturgy. The general quality of this research

was high, and much of it remains valuable to the present day. Two exhibits serve to represent this world of scholarship, which has been such an important inspiration and resource to liturgists. The first is a volume of the pioneering collection of oriental liturgies (*Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, 2 vols, Paris 1715-1716) by the French Roman Catholic savant, Eusebius Renaudot (1648-1720), which opened the eyes of western scholars to the riches of the Prayer Books of the Syriac and Coptic churches (**Exhibit 4.9**). The other is a copy of the 1882 edition of the *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* by William Maskell (1814-1890), a convert from Anglicanism to Rome, who helped lay the foundations for the serious historical study of the pre-Reformation English liturgies (**Exhibit 4.10**).

COMMON *VERSUS* PRIVATE PRAYER (CASE THREE, BOTTOM SHELF)

The *Book of Common Prayer* regulates the *public* worship of the Church of England, the worship in which the common people as a congregation take part. But this is not the only occasion for prayer in the Christian life. Prior to 1549 the liturgies had been scattered across a number of different service books – Missals, Breviaries, Processionals, Pontificals, Antiphonals, and so forth. Cranmer strove to get everything he thought of as of primary importance into one volume, but he left things out. A separate *Ordinal*, giving the rituals for ordaining bishops, priests and deacons, was produced with Bucer's help in 1550, but even with this added, much still escapes the net. It is important to grasp that the *Book of Common Prayer* is only one peak, albeit a majestic one, in the vast landscape of Christian prayer.

One area that it did not specifically cover was private prayer, and this developed its own traditions and Prayer Books. In the later middle ages the custom of private devotions began to develop. It arose fundamentally through lay people appropriating to themselves aspects of the monastic discipline of prayer. The life of monks and nuns was one of constant prayer, and at a number of points in the day and the night (up to eleven or twelve in all) they would gather with their brothers or sisters to say the appropriate office. This regime was obviously too demanding for ordinary folk, but they began to adopt elements of it. Some Christians have no difficulty in engaging in

spontaneous prayer, but many like help, and so prayer books devoted specifically to private prayer began to evolve. They became known as "Books of Hours" (an allusion to the canonical monastic hours of prayer), or "Primers".

The typical contents of a late medieval primer are: (1) A Calendar of Church Feasts; (2) A passage from each of the Four Gospels; (3) The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary; (4) The fifteen Psalms of Degrees; (5) The seven Penitential Psalms; (6) A Litany of Saints; (7) An Office for the Dead; (8) The Hours of the Cross; (9) A selection of other prayers. An example of just such a Primer is the edition of the 1400 Latin Primer on display (**Exhibit 5.2**). But the form evolved and many variations developed. As time went by there was increasing crisscrossing with the contents of the *public* daily offices. The 1545 English Primer of King Henry VIII (facsimile on display: **Exhibit 5.3**) had the following contents: (1) The Calendar; (2) The King's Highness' Injunction; (3) The Prayer of our Lord; (3) The Salutation of the Angel; (4) The Creed, or Articles of Faith; (5) The Ten Commandments; (6) The Matins; (7) The Evensong; (8) The Complene; (9) The Seven Psalms; (10) The Litany; (11) The Dirige (the Office for the Dead); (12) The Commendations; (13) The Psalms of the Passion; (14) The Passion of Our Lord; (15) Certain godly prayers for sundry purposes.

Though use of Primers was limited by literacy and cost, it was widespread: they were popular among the urban middle class, the rural gentry, and the aristocracy, some of whom commissioned beautifully illuminated copies: the Book of Hours became one of the key religious texts on which illuminators and illustrators exercised their gifts. A rather fine manuscript example belonging to the Cathedral Library is on display (**Exhibit 5.1**). There is intriguing evidence to suggest that women were particularly devoted to the Primer, and it has come to be seen by historians as offering a rare glimpse into their spiritual life. Primers became repositories of family history, and records of birth, marriage and death were often written into them, as they were later into family Bibles. There are examples of wills in which mothers very specifically pass on their treasured Primers to their daughters.

It is clearly much more difficult for Church authorities to regulate the private religious lives of individuals, and long after the Reformation many were still using pre-Reformation Primers. The doctrinal subtleties implied by some of

these, and the reasons why they were no longer deemed acceptable by their spiritual guides, probably went over the heads of ordinary people. Some families seem to have used handwritten Primers which had been passed down for generations. The Church authorities detected a problem here – a potential impediment to the progress of reform. It should be borne in mind that the Reformation, to begin with, was not a mass movement: it was top down, and many ordinary Christians felt confused and disorientated when the traditions, prayers and practices, from which they and their forebears had gained comfort, were changed or even banned. As we have already noted, serious and spontaneous revolts broke out, particularly in the West Country, against Cranmer's Prayer Book, with ordinary people demanding the restoration of the old ways.

Official Primers were issued. At least three of these appeared in the reign of Henry VIII alone, in one of which (the 1545 mentioned above) the King himself had a hand. It is difficult to draw a hard and fast distinction between private Primers and public Prayer Books. On the one hand, elements of both individual and group prayer are mixed up together in the Primers, and group prayer, in basic liturgical form, is indistinguishable from public prayer, in the sense that in both someone leads a group of people in worship. And on the other hand, public Prayer Books can easily be adapted for private devotions: the *Book of Common Prayer* has often been used in this way, by laity as well as clergy saying their office. So the boundaries are blurred. Parts of the early, English Primers anticipate Cranmer's 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. The Old Sarum Primer, a full Latin, unreformed Primer, was reissued during the reign of Queen Mary, and a series of more Protestant Primers again under Elizabeth (a 19th century edition of the latter is on display: **Exhibit 5.4**) – all testimony to the desire of the authorities to regulate *private* as well as *public* prayer. But the traditional primer, for some reason, began to fall out of fashion towards the end of the 16th century. Perhaps as the Reformation and the *Book of Common Prayer* began to take hold among the common people, later in Elizabeth's reign, the Primer came to be seen as a quintessentially Catholic style of devotion: in its classic form it has much about Mary and the Saints (contrast Henry's Primer); and so it fell out of favour.

Private prayer, however, and prayers within the family, by no means ceased. Pious Christians were encouraged to say private prayers morning and evening, and in some larger households family and servants would gather in

the evening to be led in an act of worship by the head of the house, before retiring to bed. Various new collections of prayers began to emerge to meet this need. One source of these was the private devotions composed by great spiritual leaders of the Church. Crafting a prayer that can give voice to some of the deepest longings of the human heart is a great gift, akin in many ways to poetry, and Christians have recognized that some people have been particularly good at it. They were often seen as persons of exemplary piety themselves, but they also had a way with words: the Church of England has always valued highly beauty in liturgical language. A number of collections of such prayers are on display in the exhibition. First there is a little volume composed by Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626) – his *Preces Privatae et Quotidianae* (**Exhibit 5.5**). Andrewes was one of the great scholars and churchmen of the Jacobean era. He played a significant role in the King James Bible, and was admired as a preacher and English stylist. T.S. Eliot uses a passage from one of his sermons as the opening lines of his *Journey of the Magi*: "A cold coming we had of it,/ Just the worst time of the year/ For a journey, and such a long journey:/ The ways deep and the weather sharp,/ The very dead of winter." Andrewes' prayers are in Latin and Greek, and so the publication was clearly intended for clergy and scholars. It may seem an affectation to pray in these languages, but one should bear in mind how comfortable a scholar of Andrewes' calibre would have been in using them. Indeed he might have felt in speaking to his God that he could achieve greater fluency in Latin than in his native English.

Two other 17th century collections of private devotions, by William Laud and John Cosin, are also on display (**Exhibits 5.6** and **5.7**). From a little later comes the *Sacra Privata* of Thomas Wilson (1663-1755), Bishop of Sodor and Man (**Exhibit 5.8**). Wilson haled from the Wirral, and was educated at the King's School, Chester. He was ordained priest in Chester in 1689 by Bishop Nicholas Stratford, founder of the Blue Coat Hospital. His *Sacra Privata* does not seem to have been published till 1781, but it was popular in the 19th century and reprinted a number of times. Like Andrewes, Laud and Cosin he was from the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England, and was the subject of an admiring biography by John Keble (1863). Not long after Wilson's *Sacra Privata* appeared, William Dawes composed his *Duties of the Closet, Being an earnest exhortation to private devotion*. Dawes (1671-1724) became one of the leading churchmen of his day – chaplain to William III and to Queen Anne, Bishop of Chester 1708-1714, Archbishop of York 1714-1724. Written before he

was twenty-one, the *Duties of the Closet* went through a number of editions. On display is the 6th edition of 1731 (**Exhibit 5.9**).

New private prayers continued to be written in the 18th century. Dr Samuel Johnson (1709-1984), the famous lexicographer, was an assiduous composer, whose efforts were widely admired. He sanctified every aspect of his life with a prayer. I like the following from 1768, connected with his arduous labours on his great English Dictionary: "Almighty God, giver of all knowledge, enable me to pursue the study of tongues, that I may promote Thy glory and my own salvation. Bless my endeavour as shall seem best unto Thee; and if it shall please Thee to grant me attainment of my purpose, preserve me from sinful pride; take not thy Holy Spirit from me, but give me a pure heart and humble mind through Jesus Christ. Amen." As someone who, like Johnson, regards scholarship as a vocation, I am touched by this. It would be hard to find in the great *public* prayers of the Church anything that catches precisely enough the intimacy and particularity of the situation envisaged here.

There was a veritable explosion of manuals of private devotion in the 19th century, both for individual and family use, with much energetic reprinting of the earlier collections of Andrewes (now done into English), Laud, Cosin, Wilson, Johnson, and others. One of the most celebrated of the new manuals was *The Christian Year* by John Keble. First published in 1827 as an adjunct to the *Book of Common Prayer* (and so envisaging the latter in use for *private* devotion), it had reached its 40th edition by 1852. What is common to all these works is that they contain new liturgical compositions, by a single author, and they are not formally structured into a liturgy, still less anything like an office. What they offer are fundamentally *resources* for private prayer, whether said individually or in a group.

The 20th century, however, was to see a remarkable reappearance within Anglicanism of something akin to the older Primer tradition. Again Tractarianism, and more broadly Anglo-Catholicism, played a role in this, as it did in the revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Particularly important was the refounding of Anglican religious orders. Henry VIII had made an end of religious orders in the Church of England with the dissolution of the monasteries in 1536, and apart from the Little Gidding community (1626-1657), established by the remarkable Nicholas Ferrar (1592-1637), the friend of George Herbert, there were no significant orders in Anglicanism till the latter

half of the 19th century, but then they began to reappear – orders such as the Community of the Holy Name (1865), the Community of the Resurrection (1892), and the Society of St Francis (1905). These, together with the Retreat Movement, which emerged in the 1920s (the Chester Retreat House opened in 1925), brought into being *lay* communities that sought to live communally close to the old monastic ideal of perpetual prayer.

They needed appropriate liturgies. The Sisters of the Community of the Holy Name, a group of whom occupied the Chester Retreat House till quite recently, developed their own *Daily Office* (**Exhibit 5.10**), as did the Society of St Francis. The latter's *Office* was to prove especially influential. A version of it, published in 1992 under the title *Celebrating Common Prayer* (**Exhibit 5.11**), was commended to Anglicans everywhere by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, George Carey in the following terms: "The fundamental purpose of *Celebrating Common Prayer – The Daily Office SSF* is this: to help the Church as a whole to pray together daily in a reflective and structured way. … I hope many Christians will use it to engage in a common pattern of daily prayer which will unite us all in prayer and praise and allow us to feed on a common diet of psalmody and canticle. … Although the services are conceived for corporate use, they can also be adapted easily so that people may use them when alone. … We need to recognize … that there are many occasions when people may have need of a structured form of prayer when they are on their own … It is this – the recovery of a joyful partnership in common prayer – which is at the heart of this welcome proposal." This would serve as a fair description of the old Primer tradition. The semantics of the word "common" here are clear. The prayer is common because it can be offered by all Christians, priest and laity alike. It is common because it is structured, and, transcending single authorship, draws on a wide range of Biblical and non–Biblical texts from very different times and very different places, both traditional and modern. Christians who use it, even on their own, are thus participating in a *communio sanctorum* across time and space. Unlike much private devotion of the 18th and 19th centuries this is prayer not marked by individualism but by commonality and a striving for universality.

Celebrating Common Prayer strongly influenced *Common Worship: Daily Prayer* (2005), one of the suite of liturgies which go to make up the contemporary Anglican Prayer Book. The return to tradition in a broad sense is thus evident in the development of both private and public prayer in the Church of

England at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century. Increasingly, it seems the two intersect, and the boundaries between them have become blurred. One interesting aspect of this turn to tradition (one, it must be said, not so evident in the content of *Celebrating Common Prayer* or *Common Worship: Daily Prayer*) has been the discovery of the liturgies of the Celtic Church: scholarly study of these has been surprisingly belated, lagging well behind work on the Greek, Syriac and Coptic rites. Many of the Celtic prayers, in Latin and Old Irish (particularly the evocations of the power of God and nature), are not only magnificent in their own right, but for some have the added attraction of expressing a spirituality which can be seen as indigenous to these islands, in the sense that it predates not only the Reformation, but the coming of the Roman mission as well.

EPILOGUE: SOME LESSONS OF 1662

This little exhibition has been conceived not just as an exercise in nostalgia and antiquarianism, but, like its sister exhibition on the King James Bible last year, as an attempt to stimulate thought. As I worked on it many thoughts crowded into my mind. Here are a few.

I was struck by how utterly central prayer is to religious life. As an historian of religion I knew this in the abstract, but I was impressed to see it in action. Liturgy *is* the religious life in a way that no other activity is, and yet it is one on which I, as a university teacher of religion, spent comparatively little time. I talked to my students about the history, scriptures, theology, and institutions of various religions, but very little about their prayers. Yet prayer seems to be one of the most universal, most elementary forms of religious life, found in all the major religions. We seem "hard-wired" for prayer in the way that we are "hard-wired" for language. But it remains for most of us a mysterious activity, and many find it difficult.

I was struck by the extraordinary dynamism of the Anglican tradition of prayer. It is full of tension and contradiction. The creation of a Prayer Book was precisely intended to channel the natural chaos, which bubbles up from the ground. This is what 1662 was trying to do. It was what Cranmer was

trying to do in 1549. And in both cases the prayer books were imposed by Acts of Uniformity.

There are advantages and drawbacks to this. The advantages are, first that a fixed Prayer Book provides people with appropriate words in which to express their deepest thoughts. Though the *urge* to pray seems universal, the *words* in which to do so do not always come to mind. Many people are tongue-tied when it comes to prayer. This, too, is a simple fact, because in *all* religious traditions there exist hallowed forms of words in which people pray. The Gospels tell of how Jesus' disciples asked him to teach them how to pray, and he gave them an appropriate form of words. Some people have the gift of spontaneous prayer, but this is the exception rather than the rule.

A second advantage of fixed forms of prayer is that, if widely adopted, they promote the communion of saints. I may be praying on my own in private, but if I use a form of words that I know is being used by my brethren and sisters throughout the world, and has been used by them from time immemorial, it can create an almost mystical sense of union with all believers. It is a way of tapping into that most mysterious of social phenomena – collective memory and collective identity. There is no more powerful expression of the unity of the body of Christ than praying together, when everybody says, or follows, or assents to the same well-known words. Individual prayers, in the sense of prayers composed by individuals, expressing their own thoughts in their own words, however well and sincerely put, cannot achieve that powerful sense of communion. This is recognized even within traditions which do not place a high value on fixed forms of prayer. Matthew Henry, as we saw, commended a system of "praying with Scripture", i.e. using as much as possible passages of Scripture in prayer. These Scriptures serve the same function as fixed prayers: they are well known and sanctified forms of words.

A final advantage of fixed forms of prayer is that repetition has its own value. It structures time and experience, and is, therefore, comforting and reassuring. Just as music has no meaning without repetition, so life for us has no meaning without repetition. There are the great cycles of life and nature, morning and evening, the seasons, birth, marriage, puberty and death, but those have no meaning in themselves: they need to be given meaning, and that is precisely what religion sets out to do, and it does so through appropriate prayers. It is

precisely the fact that the words do not change ("Lighten our darkeness", "Dust to dust") that mediates the experience for us, and gives us comfort.

But there is also a debit side to fixed forms of prayer. If the forms are not sufficiently universal, then instead of promoting the communion of saints, they can become a means of excluding saints. There can be nothing more divisive, more sectarian, in religious life than Prayer Books. They can become shibboleths to determine whether any Christian is or is not "one of us". As we have seen, wars have been fought over them. This is shameful. And there can be no doubt the danger does exist that repetition can be become *vain* repetition – the mumbling of the same words again and again without any attention to their meaning, the implication being that it is the words themselves, without attitude of heart, that does something. This reduces prayer quite literally to mumbo jumbo – a magical incantation. Tibetan Buddhism has carried this idea to its logical conclusion by mechanizing the repetition of prayer. The prayer is inscribed on a wheel, and by simply spinning the wheel the prayer is activated. The worshipper doesn't even have to say the words! There is a complex theory behind this practice, but it would not be accepted for one moment by the great traditions of prayer in the Abrahamic faiths. There the doctrines of prayer stress the importance of what in Hebrew is called "intention" (*kavvanah*) – praying with attentiveness to the words and with a right attitude of heart.

Coming from a low church tradition which puts a high premium on spontaneity, I always tend to assume that Anglicanism, with its fixed patterns of prayer, is going to have a big problem with "vain repetition", but am constantly surprised how little this seems to be the case. Taken as a whole, despite regular attempts to pin it down, the tradition is remarkably dynamic, anarchic even. There are, I think, at least two reasons for this.

The first is that prayer is performative. It is not simply words – it is words *performed*, and any words performed by different people in different places and times are inevitably going to be performed in different ways. Each with their own performance will interpret the text in different ways. A simple analogy may help. Different singers will interpret a Schubert song in different ways: they will put different aspects of themselves and their feelings into it. The same performer may even give quite different renderings on different occasions. The words and the music remain the same, but the results can be

very different. Exactly the same is true of liturgy, and this can keep fixed words fresh.

Anthropologists of religion stress that prayer is not just words, but words plus gestures. It is the complex of words-plus-gestures that is the real "text" of the prayer. This seems to be universal. I come from a very minimalist liturgical tradition that avoided ritual as much as it could: it was the words that mattered, yet in our church, when it came to prayer, we still bowed our heads and closed our eyes. That simple gesture was a vital element of the prayer. In our exhibition we can only represent the words, but go to Evensong or Eucharist in the Cathedral and you will see the full "text". The words, without being changed, can be transformed by the way that they are performed. This is very obvious from the transformation of public worship in the Church of England effected by the Anglo-Catholics in the 19th century.

The second way staleness can be mitigated is by the sheer quality of the words themselves. There may be parts of a liturgy where the wording wears out, and simply has to be replaced, but the greatest prayers are like the best lyric poetry: their language is timeless; it is not limiting, not narrowly and pedantically didactic, but symbolic and suggestive, capable of bearing a range of different meanings. Constant use and repetition does not exhaust such texts, but opens up in them vistas we have not seen before. They are tablets on which we can inscribe and re-inscribe our own deepest hopes and fears.

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. The Making of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (Case One)

1.1 The Book of Common Prayer, London 1662
1.2 Facsimile of the 1636 Black Letter Prayer Book with the 1662 Changes, Oxford 1871
1.3 Facsimile of the Original Manuscript of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, London 1891

2. Forerunners and Fathers of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (Case Two, Top Shelf)

2.1 Missale Sarisburiensis, Paris 1555
2.2 Facsimile of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, 1896
2.3 Facsimile of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer
2.4 Edition of the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, London 1890
2.5 A Volume of Thomas Cranmer's Collected Works, Oxford 1833
2.6 A Volume of William Laud's Collected Works, 1847 (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology)
2.7 Ms of John Cosin's *Historia Transubstantiationis Papalis* (1655)

3. St Bartholomew's Day: The Dissenters and their Alternative Tradition of Prayer (Case Two, Bottom Shelf)

3.1 The Scottish Book of Common Order (1896 edition)
3.2 The Directory for Public Worship, London 1645
3.3 The Asses Complaint, 1661
3.4 Henry Hammond, A View of the New Directory, Oxford 1646
3.5 Richard Baxter, A Christian Directory, London 1673
3.6 Matthew Henry, A Method for Prayer with Scripture Expression, Berwick, 1781
3.7 John Wilkins, The Gift of Prayer, London 1655

4. Dissemination and Revision (Case Three, Top Shelf)

4.1 Welsh Book of Common Prayer, 1664, reprinted Oxford and London 1820
4.2 Greek Book of Common Prayer, Cambridge 1665
4.3 Latin Book of Common Prayer, London 1574
4.4 Spanish Book of Common Prayer (Liturgia Inglesa), London 1634
4.5 1689 Book of Common Prayer, London 1855
4.6 1928 Book of Common Prayer
4.7 Alternative Service Book 1980
4.8 Common Worship 2001
4.9 Eusebius Renaudot, Liturgiarium Orientalium Collectio, Paris 1716
4.10 William Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae , 2nd ed., Oxford 1882

5. Common *versus* Private Prayer (Case Three, Bottom Shelf)

5.1 A ms Book of Hours
5.2 Prymer c. 1400, ed. Littlehales, London 1891
5.3 Facsimile of Henry VIII's Primer, London 1546, reprinted 1710
5.4 Elizabethan Primers, Parker Society, Cambridge 1851
5.5 Lancelot Andrewes, Preces Privatae et Quotidianae 1675, reprinted Oxford 1853
5.6 William Laud's Private Devotions 1667, reprinted Oxford 1855
5.7 John Cosin's Private Devotions, Oxford 1967
5.8 Thomas Wilson, Sacra Privata, London 1847
5.9 William Dawes, The Duties of the Closet, 6th edn, London 1731
5.10 Daily Office C·H·N, Derby 1988
5.11 Celebrating Common Prayer, 1992.

FOR FURTHER READING

Brian Cummings (ed.), *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2011)

Joseph Ketley (ed.), *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552: with other documents set forth by authority in the reign of Edward VI* (Parker Society; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 1844)

William Maskell, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England according to the uses of Sarum, Bangor, York and Hereford and the Modern Roman Liturgy arranged in Parallel Columns* (Pickering: London, 1844)

F.E. Brightman, *The English Rite*, 2 vols (Rivingtons: London, 1915)

David N. Griffiths, *The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer* (British Library: London, 2002)

Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey (Oxford University* Press: New York, 2006)

Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998)

Francis Procter and W.H. Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (Macmillan: London, 1901)

Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (Macmillan: London, 1988)

Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1992)

_____ *Marking the Hours: English People and their Prayers, 1240-1570* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 2011)

Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2007)

Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (rev. edn; Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1993)

Diarmid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700* (Allen Lane: London, 2003)

_____ *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1996)

_____ *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Allen Lane: London, 1999)

Richard W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy of Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2009)

Bryan D. Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland 1603-1662* (Ashgate: London, 2002)

The Book of Common Prayer 350th year

You are not here to verify,
Instruct yourself, or inform curiosity
Or carry report. You are here to kneel
Where prayer has been valid. And prayer is more
Than an order of words, the conscious occupation
Of the praying mind, or the sound of the voice praying.
And what the dead had no speech for, when living,
They can tell you, being dead: the communication
Of the dead is tongued with fire beyond the language of the living.
Here, the intersection of the timeless moment
Is England and nowhere. Never and always.

T.S. Eliot **" Little Gidding**

Chester Cathedral Library
&
The Prayer Book Society

MMXII