JEMS - Journal of Early Modern Studies

Firenze University Press
www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems

Citation: J. Denton (2022) 'till death us do part': The Afterlife of Early Modern Religious English. *Jems*: 11. pp. 39-64. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-13428

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

Editors: D. Pallotti, P. Pugliatti (University of Florence)

'till death us do part' The Afterlife of Early Modern Religious English

John Denton
University of Florence (<jdenton58@hotmail.com>)

Abstract

In 2011 and 2012 two important anniversaries were commemorated by church services, sermons, round tables, conferences and documentaries, during which hyperbolic acclamation (aka *AVolatry*) was showered on the so-called King James Bible (KJB), also known as the Authorized Version (AV), on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of its publication (1611) and the Book of Common Prayer (BCP) on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of its last official edition (1662), which is still in use (if so desired). Tributes were paid to the translators of the Bible and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, who is considered to be the main author of the 1549 and 1552 editions, upon the latter of which subsequent editions published after his execution are based. These cornerstones of the liturgy of the Church of England, which, until the early nineteenth century, was the predominant church in the land, were claimed to have made an enormous contribution to the development and embellishment of the English language. However, one of the main aims of this article is to argue that this contribution deserves more critical scrutiny. When these two texts first appeared, the BCP in 1549, imposed on an unwilling people in place of the traditional Latin liturgy, was challenged by a serious rebellion, which was crushed with extreme violence by government forces. The KJB was considered to be nothing more than a new edition of the last (1602) printing of the Bishops' Bible; in the words of the translators themselves: '… we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one … but to make a good one better'. The consecration of these two texts as 'timeless classics' was largely the work of the nineteenth century. In the second half of the twentieth century they were mostly replaced by contemporary versions. The 'thou God' has become the 'you God'.

Keywords: *AVolatry, Book of Common Prayer (BCP), Church of England (C.of E.), King James Bible (KJB), Thomas Cranmer*

1. *Till Death Us Do Part*

The title of this article is one of the best known statements from Cranmer's BCP. One good opportunity for the examination of

the stages through which the editions of the BCP passed from 1549 to 1662 is by comparing the wedding vows, since they were in the vernacular, together with other sections, even in the pre-Reformation Latin rites, so that the couple, in this case, could understand what they were swearing to:[1]

Sarum Rite (Brook 1965, 198; Brightman 1921, vol.2 804):

Quod si puella sit, discoopertam habeat manum, si vidua tectam. Vir eam recipiat in Dei fide & sua seruandam, sicut voluit coram Sacerdote, & teneat eam per manum suam dexteram in manu sua dextera, & sic det fidem mulieri per verba de presenti ita dicens, docente Sacerdote. (Renwick 2021, 98)

I *N.* take the [thee] *N.* to my wedded wyf to haue and to holde, fro this day forwarde for better: for wors: for richere: for poorer: in sykenesse and in hele: tyl dethe vs departe if holy chyrche it woll [will] ordeyne, and therto I plight the my trouthe.

Manum retrahendo.

Deinde dicat mulier docente Sacerdote.

I N. take the N. to my Wedded housbonder to haue and to holde fro this day for warde for better: for Worse: for richer: for pouere: in sykenesse et in hele: to be bonere and buxum in bedde and at te borde tyll dethe vs departhe if holy chyrche it wol ordeyne and ther to. I plight the my trouthe.

Manum retrahendo.

'To be bonere and buxum, in bed and at the borde' meant something like 'to please her husband in bed at night and be an obedient housewife and cook ('borde' referring to the kitchen cupboard) during the day. Clearly Cranmer adapted the above English text to meet his standards of humanist decorum (especially removing any reference to bedtime activities) adding 'love and cherish' but also expecting the wife 'to obey' her husband and moving the vow for both parties in a more evangelical direction by replacing 'holy church' with God. 'Departhe', here means 'separate' (MacCulloch 2016, 420-421).

BCP 1549:

I *N.* take thee *N.* to my wedded wife, to haue and to holde from this day forwarde, for better, for wurse, for richer, for poorer, in sickenes, and in health, to loue and to cherishe, til death vs departe: according to Goddes holy ordeinaunce: And therto I plight thee my trouth.

I *N.* take thee *N.* to my wedded husbande, to haue and to holde from this day forwarde, for better, for woorse, for richer, for poorer, in sickenes, and in health, to loue and cherishe, and to obey, till death vs departe: according to Goddes holy ordeinaunce: And thereto I geue thee my trouth. (Cummings 2011, 66)

[1] Since the 1552, 1559 and 1604 versions concerning this point are very close, comparison has been limited to the pre-Reformation Latin rites, 1549 and 1662. The BCP texts are taken from Cummings 2011. The exhaustive catalogue of the editions of the BCP is Griffiths 2002.

BCP 1662:

I *N.* take thee *N.* to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part, according to Gods holy ordinance; and thereto I plight thee my troth.

I *N.* take thee *N.* to my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love, cherish and obey, till death us do part, according to Gods holy ordinance; and thereto I give thee my troth. (Cummings 2011, 436)

The only difference in this post-Cranmerian version, apart from the updating of the spelling, is the replacement of an obsolete verb (plight), while maintaining the rhythm of the phrase, with a morpho-syntactic lexical shift in the subjunctive mood and a non-emphatic periphrastic 'do' (which was already somewhat old-fashioned; Nervalainen 2006, 108; Barber 1997, 263-264).

One of the distinguishing features of the C. of E. is its close links with the monarchy, on the basis of the principle 'cuius regio, eius religio' (i.e., 'whose realm, their religion' – meaning that the religion of the ruler is adopted by his/her subjects). This inevitably means that important religious royal (which also means state) ceremonies are held in important C. of E. churches. This, of course, is true of the enormously popular royal weddings.[2] Interestingly the two most recent weddings reflected different attitudes to religious English. William and Kate (Westminster Abbey 29 April 2011) chose traditional language i.e., an adapted version of the 1662 BCP:[3]

I *N.* take thee, *N.* to my wedded husband/wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse; for richer, for poorer; in sickness and in health; to love and to cherish, till death us do part, according to God's holy law; and thereto I give thee my troth.

Harry and Meghan (St George's Chapel Windsor Castle 19 May 2018) chose the version in the latest C.of E. Prayer Book: Common Worship (2000), which replaces all but one obsolete item:

I, *N*, take you *N*, to be my wife/husband, to have and to hold from this day forward; for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part; according to God's holy law. In the presence of God I make this vow.

For the replacement of this obsolete, but very familiar item[4] we must turn to the American BCP (1979):

In the Name of God, I, *N.*, take you, *N.*, to be my husband/wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, until we are parted by death. This is my solemn vow.

[2] The William-Kate wedding attracted a national TV audience of 27 million, while Harry and Meghan's was 18 million.

[3] They chose the second version described in the C. of E. Wedding Ceremony Words 2015: 'A service from the Book of Common Prayer (1662) is also a legally approved service. There is also a slightly updated version of the 1662 service, known as 'Alternative Services: Series One' (1928). The language is still old and traditional.

[4] *Till Death Us Do Part* was a hilarious British television sitcom that aired on BBC1 from 1965 to 1975. The title was enough for everybody to know that it dealt with the life of a married couple.

The former Bishop of London Richard Chartres in a sermon for the 350th anniversary of the 1662 BCP (2012) referred to the lack of comment on the part of regular journalists on the language choice by William and Kate, while, in the weeks after the royal wedding on 20 April 2011, the *Church Times* published several letters from members of the clergy shocked by the fact that 'the language of the liturgy remained buried in the past' and that 'once again the opportunity to present the church in a more up to date way was missed' (Chartres 2012). It seems that Harry was showing his unconventional style while his more conservative brother was under the influence of his father. Charles is notorious for his dislike of modernity whether it be in language or architecture. He even asked the Dean of Windsor to compose the following prayer in (semi) pseudo-Tudor English, especially for the service of prayer and dedication in St George's Chapel after his civil marriage to Camilla:

> O God our Father who, for them that love thee, makest all things work together for the good; we thank thee that, of thy faithfulness, thou dost come out to meet us on our pilgrimage of life. Stay with us now and grant that, as we learn to love thee more, we may deepen our dedication to thy service, and find in thee the fullness of eternal life.[5]

2. *The Transition from Latin to the Vernacular*

In the list of Audio-visual materials in the *Works Cited* section there is a recording of a live Tridentine Mass for the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (25 March) recorded in November 1994. It offers a rare experience of a Mass in which most of the spoken parts are merely whispered (*tacite voce*) by the celebrant, and thus only just audible even to those standing near him. It provides a good idea of what it was like to be present at a sung mass of the Sarum Rite, in pre-Reformation England. Although the recording is modern, the traditional Latin Roman Mass was very similar to the Sarum Rite and had not changed for many centuries. A careful check of the relationship between audible (i.e., intoned and sung parts) and inaudible (basically whispered) ones gives a ratio of 65% inaudible to 35% audible. Since in the early sixteenth century practically nobody, except the clergy involved and the choir, had access to printed mass texts, and, in any case, only a few worshippers knew any Latin,[6] everything had to be accepted by the laity on trust. This situation came to an abrupt end with the 1549 BCP, which was 100% audible and in English, though, as we shall see, not everybody was satisfied with this new situation.

'The experience of worship in late medieval cathedral and parish church' research project (The Experience of Worship [2003-2014]), headed by John Harper and Sally Harper of Bangor University, (see also Harper *et al.* 2016), is a fascinating close up of what it was like to be a worshipper at Salisbury Cathedral – the birthplace of the Sarum Rite – and a small Welsh country church around the year 1535, well into the reign of Henry VIII, when, despite the break with Rome and the Act of Supremacy of 1534, (albeit with the Pope's name crossed out of the missals!) the full Catholic Latin Rite was still the norm and remained so until the King's

[5] The parts underlined are non-contemporary English. For this and other examples of pseudo-Tudor English in liturgical contexts see Denton 2008, 416.

[6] A curious case of what is known as 'dog Latin' (i.e, words that sound like Latin but are not) is the conjuror's 'hocus pocus', according to Archbishop Tillotson (1684, 34): 'In all probability those common juggling words of *hocus pocus* are nothing else but a corruption of *hoc est corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the priests of the Church of Rome in their trick of Transubstantiation'. The anti-Catholic bias of the Archbishop of Canterbury (1691-1694) is evident in his insinuation that the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation is nothing more than a trick.

death in 1547. The rich audio-visual material in the excellent website provides full length enactments of Sarum Rite rituals, including processions, sung masses and offices made possible by a very generous grant.

Peter Marshall brings up the question of 'whether "Henrician Catholicism" should be regarded as a tautology or an oxymoron' (2005, 22). The King would have had no doubts about opting for the former. And yet Eamon Duffy, in his influential study (2005, 379-477), devotes three chapters to the 'attack on traditional religion', the first two covering the years 1533/4-1539 and 1539-1547 (Henry VIII), while the third (448-477) covers the reign of Edward VI. The break under Edward was radical (especially with the introduction of the 1552 BCP following the more cautious 1549 edition), and belongs to the European phenomenon known as Reformation i.e., replacement of the traditional Catholic liturgy with vernacular texts, rejection of transubstantiation, auricular confession, prayers for the dead, communion in only one kind instead of both the bread and wine for the laity, prayers to saints, and purgatory, etc. As far as what is known as far as (what some scholars call) the 'Henrician Reformation' is concerned, the only real similarity is the break with Rome, and is thus something of a misnomer. Rather than Protestant, the English Church under Henry was basically Catholic without the Pope.

Henry was flanked in church affairs by Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer, both of whom were evangelical sympathizers and he allowed himself to be diverted along this line to some extent, but not too far. As has already been mentioned, he clung to the solid Catholic faith he had been brought up in. The Latin Sarum Rite Mass and other traditional ceremonies were the core of religious observance from the Chapel Royal to the smallest rural parish church.[7] As late as 1544, a new edition of Sarum Rite service books beginning with the Breviary, but going no further, incorporating post break with Rome adjustments (*Portiforium secundum vsum Sarum nouiter impressus, et a plurimis pergatum mendis. In quo nomen Romano pontifici falso ascriptum omittitur, vna cum aliis que christianissimo noster regis statuto repugnant*) (Anonymous 1544a),was printed by Grafton and Whitchurch. Cromwell was a keen promoter of making the Bible in English available to the faithful and Henry encouraged him in this venture, as long as the translation used was not the one by the heretic Tyndale (who had been executed in Flanders in 1536) and whom Henry detested, among other reasons, because he had criticised his divorce (Denton 2010, 147-150). Henry was flattered by comparison with Old Testament Kings handing down the Word of God to the people (and he is depicted thus on the title page of a number of English Bibles published at the time). As a consequence, injunctions were issued in 1536 and 1538 ordering the setting up of a large copy of the English Bible in every church for private reading.[8] At the same time, the evangelically-minded Bishop of Salisbury Nicholas Shaxton ordered the Epistle and Gospel at High Mass to be read in English, and, in 1543, an order in convocation provided for the reading of one chapter from the English Bible at Matins after the *Te Deum* and at Vespers after the *Magnificat*. Ironically, the versions by Coverdale (1535, second edition 1537), Rogers ('Matthew') (1537) and Taverner (1539 – a 'pirated edition') were heavily indebted to Tyndale. Nevertheless, they were granted licences by the King, who obviously had not done his homework, but relied on the advice of Cranmer and Cromwell. There was an attempt to reduce the evangelical character of the first edition of Coverdale and the result was the second edition (1537) removing most of the controversial glosses, which eventually became the Great Bible (1539, second edition 1540 with a preface by Cranmer).

[7] We are fortunate in being able to read the account of life in the parish of Morebath in this period, written by the parish priest (Duffy 2001).

[8] The standard history of the English Bible is Daniell 2003.

Far from leading to an atmosphere of harmony, the presence of the Bible in churches was actually often the source of trouble. Opponents of the traditional Latin Rite began reading from the Bible in a loud voice, ostensibly to help the illiterate, but thus disturbing the celebration going on in the chancel and this led to violent clashes. News of these disturbances reached the King's ears and his reaction was the *Acte for thadvauncement of true Religion* (1543; Luders *et al.* 1810-1828, III, 894-897) forbidding reading of the English Bible by: 'women … artificers prentisers journeymen serving men of the degrees of yomen or undre, husbandmen nor laborers' – the only exceptions being: 'everye noble man and gentleman being a householder ...' and 'everye merchaunte man being a householder and occupying the seate of merchaundayse' and 'everye noble wooman and gentlewooman in private' (896). He had previously come firmly down on the side of traditional Catholicism with the *Act of Six Articles* (1539; Luders *et al.* 1810-1828, III, 739-743, meant to abolish diversity of opinion) which decreed the obligation to accept: 1) Transubstantiation; 2) Communion in one kind (i.e, bread) for the laity; 3) no clerical marriage; 4) vows of chastity; 5) private masses; 6) need for auricular confession.

After the fall and execution of Cromwell in 1540, Henry relied increasingly on Cranmer who, being something of a liturgical tightrope walker, had managed to keep his head (literally, unlike Cromwell) for advice in religious matters, showing some flexibility after the traditionalist clampdown. The most significant result was the English Litany commissioned by the King in need of popular support for his war with France. On 23 May 1544, a solemn procession took place in St Paul's Cathedral, during which Cranmer's litany was sung for the first time in a musical setting by Thomas Tallis (1505-1585).[9] The new litany was a much revised version of the traditional *Litaniae Sanctorum*. The Latin text contains the names of 69 saints + 3 attributes of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Cranmer reduced this part to:

Holy virgin Mary, mother of God our Sauyour Jesu Chryst
Praye for vs
All holy Aungels and Archaungels and all holye orders of blessed spirites
Praye for vs
All holy patriarkes, and Prophetes, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, & Virgins, and all the blessed company of heauen
Praye for vs. (Anonymous 1544b)

That he had included this part only to satisfy his royal master, emerges from the fact that he cut it from the version of the litany in the first BCP after the King's death, seeing that praying to the saints was unacceptable to evangelicals.

He also had a hand in the King's Primer (Butterworth 1953, 291-303), printed by Grafton in 1545,[10] which was mostly traditional in content, though the fact that it was in English is a sign of encouragement for the young to learn their prayers in their own language, and this included the Hail Mary, which two years later, after the King's death, would soon be forgotten.

The reign of the boy King Edward VI, the 'Young Josiah, Biblical destroyer of pagan idols' marked the beginning of the first true European style Reformation in England and break with traditional liturgy and doctrine, albeit by stages. Nevertheless, from the Continental point of view, the new English National Church was still somewhat anomalous, with its bishops, two archbishops, collegiate churches and cathedrals with their deans and chapter of canons.

[9] A beautifully performed version of the litany as originally written for this special occasion is available on the CD 'Thomas Tallis Songs of Reformation' listed in the Audio-visual Sources.

[10] Ten English editions, two Latin-English and one Latin edition.

The new religious setup was in the hands of Protector Somerset (1547-1549) and Archbishop Cranmer, the latter no longer engaged in measures in contrast with his evangelical convictions. The first stage consisted in the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel at High Mass (still in Latin) in English from the 'Great Bible' (1547), followed by an English Communion text to be inserted in the Latin Mass (1548), the climax being the publication of Cranmer's BCP entirely in English in 1549.

Liturgical texts are performative in nature (Lukken 1992) and thus contain numerous rubrics addressing the celebrant. The difference between those in the Latin Sarum texts and those of the BCPs is considerable. A typical Sarum rubric consists of directions on posture and gesture as well as voice level, for example: '… accedat Sacerdos ad altare, et dicat in medio altaris tacite voce, inclinatoque corpore et junctis minibus …'.[11] A typical rubric from the BCP has quite different emphasis: '*Then shalbe read ii lessons distinctly with a loude voice, that the people maye hearen … The minister that readeth the lesson standing and turning hym so as he maye beste be hearde of all suche as be present*'. This foregrounding of audibility is not surprising in a completely new situation in church services which had up to then been mostly inaudible and what could be heard incomprehensible. However, this does not mean that this new situation was welcomed with open arms; far from it. One novelty which will not have been well received was what followed (or rather did not follow) the consecration of the bread and wine: '*These words before rehersed are to be saied, turning still to the Altar, without any eleuacion, or shewing the Sacrament to the people*' (Cummings 2011, 31). Perhaps to render the transition less traumatic for the faithful, deprived of their gaze upon the elevated bread and wine, Cranmer did include (in 1549 only) an *epiclesis*, or invocation of the Holy Spirit (taken from the Eastern Orthodox Rite), marked in the printed text by two crosses (a multimodal sign indicating signs of the cross by the celebrant over the Eucharistic elements):

> Heare vs (O merciful father) we besech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl✠esse and sanc✠tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be vnto vs the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe.

Another transitory characteristic of this 1549 BCP is the inclusion of what amounts to an English translation of the ordinary (i.e., the fixed parts) of the Latin Mass under the title: *The Supper of the Lorde, and the holy Communion, commonly called the Masse*. This is the first time (and the last) that the word Mass would be used to describe a mainstream C. of E. service.[12] Cranmer was not particularly interested in church music, but he did envisage singing with the participation of 'clerkes'. However, he will have insisted on his well-known principle of a musical setting that was 'not full of notes, but, as nere as may be, for euery sillable a note' (quoted by MacCulloch 2016, 330). To see the difference between the Mass settings of the great composers of the florid polyphonic Latin church music of the first half of the sixteenth century, it is enough to compare the setting of the word 'Benedictus' which follows the Sanctus: 'Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini' with the English translation in the BCP set to music by John Merbecke (c. 1505-1585): 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'.[13] In the 'Missa O Michael' set by John Taverner (c. 1490-1545) the word 'Benedictus' (4 syllables)

[11] <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Sarum/Ordinary.htm>, accessed 1 February 2022.

[12] Except for the popular use of 'Midnight Mass' on Christmas Eve and usage by the 'Anglo-Catholic' wing of Anglicanism since the mid-nineteenth century.

[13] *The Booke of Common praier noted*, London Grafton 1550.

is given 99 notes, taking up 16 bars and taking 1 min. 15 secs. to sing. The word 'Blessed' (2 syllables) in the setting by Merbecke is unsurprisingly given 2 notes (!).

The Edwardian regime will have expected the people to welcome the new liturgy in their own language, but they were wrong, especially in the South-West, which was the scene of a major armed rebellion. The rebels demanded the return to the traditional liturgy and ceremonies and they were answered by a sarcastic, hostile message to 'the ignorant men of Devonshire and Cornwall' from Cranmer (Cranmer 1549; MacCulloch 2016, 438-440) and by savage reprisals by government forces (Duffy 2005, 468; Marshall 2017, 333).

A less overt way of challenging the liturgical reform, especially by older priests who had been celebrating the Latin mass for many years was by 'counterfeiting the mass' (Haigh 1993, 176) i.e., by following traditional paralinguistic, vestimentary and kinesic codes, while lay folk continued with their traditional devotions and silent reading of their primers, even though the evangelical reformers aiming to 'subsume private devotion within the public liturgy of the church' (Targoff 2001, 4) made this more difficult. However, this kind of passive resistance was made more difficult by the far more evangelical second BCP of 1552, a product of the new regime following the fall and execution of Somerset.

Some differences between the two BCPs can be illustrated by extracts from the service of Matins (later Morning Prayer) preceded by the Sarum text which was Cranmer's source:

Sarum Rite

Incipiat serutium hoc modo
Domine labia mea aperies.
Chorus respondeat
Et os meum annunciabit laudem tuam.
Sacerdos statim
Deus in adiutorium meum intende.
R
Domine ad adiuuandum me festina.
Gloria patri et filio et spiritui sancto
Sicut erat in principio et nunc et semper
Et in saecula saeculorum. Amen. (Brightman 1921, vol. I, 132-133)

BCP 1549

An ordre for Mattyns dayly through the yere
The priest beeyng in the quier, shall begynne with a loude voyce the Lordes prayer, called the Pater noster.
…
Then lykewyse he shall saye.
O Lorde open thou my lippes.
Aunswere
And my mouth shall shewe forth thy prayse.
Priest
O God, make spede to saue me.
Aunswere
O Lorde, make haste to helpe me.
Priest
Glory be to the father, and to the sonne, and to the holy ghost.
As it was in the beginning, is nowe, and euer shal be: worlde without ende. Amen.
Prayse ye the Lorde.
And from Easter to Trinitie Sonday
Alleluya (*Ibid*.)

BCP 1552

An ordre for Morninge prayer dayly throughout the yeare
Then shall the Minister begin the Lordes prayer with a loude voice
Then lykewyse he shall saye.
O Lorde, open thou our lyppes.
Aunswere
And our mouth shal shewe forth thy prayse.
Prieste
O God, make spede to saue vs.
Aunswere
O Lord, make haste to helpe vs.
Prieste
Glory be to the father, and to the sonne: and to the holy ghost.
As it was in the beginning, is nowe, and euer shalbe: worlde wythout ende. Amen.
Prayse ye the Lorde. (*Ibid*.)

The differences between the two English versions are subtle but significant, beginning with the introduction of the term 'Minister' and the replacement of the traditional name 'Matins' (one of the chanted monastic hours) with a more homely term. The pronominal switch from singular to plural is particularly significant as it involves both minister and congregation, though the latter had a passive role: in the words of a somewhat hostile source, 'a monotone dialogue between curate and clerk' (Duffy 2005, 465).

3. *World Without End*

'Prayer Book prose has seeped into the collective consciousness more profoundly than that of any other book written in English, even the Bible'. (Cummings 2011, ix)

This statement, linked with the hype surrounding the 350th anniversary of the 1662 BCP, can find some justification, albeit with less emphasis, with regard to one of the most memorable of Cranmer's phrases, which is the title of this section. It is not clear whether he actually invented it, but it certainly began to appear in texts associated with him, especially with the Great Bible (1539, 1540), the bible version used in the first two BCPs (1549, 1552) and in some evangelical primers (especially the King's Primer of 1545; Burton 1834; Butterworth 1953) continuing with the Bishops' Bible (1568) and finally the KJB (1611).

The source is the Latin Doxology (more precisely the Lesser Doxology):

Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto. Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

Cranmer: Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

The phrase in question meaning 'for ever and ever' (which is now preferred in contemporary liturgical texts) entered 'the collective consciousness' providing the title for several films, novels, comics and even three rock groups. Pride of place is occupied by Ken Follet's international bestselling historical novel (2007), set in the fourteenth century in England, followed by a popular TV adaptation (2012).

From the late sixteenth century onwards, writers could count on their readers' or audiences' knowledge of the BCP and KJB when quoting phrases from them, especially while church attendance (which meant C. of E. at least until the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century) was compulsory.[14] Unsurprisingly, Shakespeare is a prime example:

Qu. A time, methinks, too short
To make a world-without-end bargaine in. (*Love's Labour's Lost*, 5.2, 754-755)[15]

Nor dare I chide the world without end houre,
Whilst I, my sovereign, watch the clock for you (Sonnet 57, 5-6)

Charles Dickens also counted on his readers' knowledge of the BCP when describing the school and other institutions in imaginary industrial Coketown with their materialistic attitude, where facts have become the content of a new religion, appropriately represented by a parody of the BCP doxology:

The M'Choakumchild school was all fact, and the school of design was all fact, and the relations between master and man were all fact, and everything was fact between the lying in hospital and the cemetery, and what you couldn't state in figures, or show to be purchaseable in the cheapest market and saleable in the dearest, *was not*, *and never should be, world without end, Amen*. (1854, 168)

He also imitates the obsessive use of the conjunction 'and', a stylistic feature of the KJB.

Samuel Beckett in his play *Happy Days* has the despairing protagonist mumble a half-forgotten prayer invoking eternal life so that she will not have to face death. To achieve this effect he also turns to Cranmer:

… *Long pause.*
WINNIE *(gazing at zenith).* Another heavenly day.
(Pause. Head back level, eyes front, pause.
She clasps hands to breast, closes eyes. Lips
move in inaudible prayer, say ten seconds.
Lips still. Hands remain clasped. Low.) For
Jesus Christ sake Amen. *(Eyes open, hands*
unclasp, return to mound. Pause. She clasps
hands to breast again, closes eyes, lips move
again in inaudible addendum, say five seconds.
Low.) World without end Amen. *(Eyes open,*
hands unclasp, return to mound. Pause.) (1961, 8)

In *Hamlet* (Scene 18, 213) Shakespeare uses a Cranmerian phrase from the Nicene Creed ('And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead'), when Laertes, jumping into his sister Ophelia's grave, says to the gravedigger: 'Now pile your dust upon the quick and the dead …'. Shakespeare's audience would have understood the reference to the Creed and the meaning of 'quick' (i.e., 'living') and thus Laertes' wish to be buried with his sister's corpse. A modern audience could be somewhat perplexed.

The study by Swift is particularly persuasive when dealing with links between *Macbeth* and the rite of baptism in the BCP (2012, 193-246), not only in Macbeth's and Lady Macbeth's

[14] A fascinating anthology of references to the practice of Anglican liturgy as described in English literature is Taylor 1993.

[15] Shakespeare quotes are from Taylor *et al.* 2016.

obsession with washing the blood from their hands. Furthermore, the knocking at the castle door that follows King Duncan's murder recalls the words spoken by the minister during the rite: 'Knock, and it shall be opened unto you' and 'Open the gate unto us that knock; that these infants may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing'. When Lady Macbeth cries, 'Out, damned spot' (5.1.30), Swift refers again to baptism, which cleanses every 'spot or wrinkle'(Bishops' Bible 1568, Eph 5.27: 'To make it vnto hym selfe a glorious Churche, not hauyng spot or wrinckle, or any such thyng: but that it should be holy, and without blame').

In a lighter vein we turn to a witty parody by Jane Austen, in *Pride and Prejudice*, where, as a parson's daughter she and her readers (who will all, if married, have participated in a BCP wedding ceremony) were familiar with the words describing the purpose of matrimony. Austen's version is an outrageous parody: Mr Collins makes his marriage proposal to Elizabeth Bennet:

> My reasons for marrying are, first, that I think it a right thing for every clergyman in easy circumstances (like myself) to set the example of matrimony in his parish. Secondly, that I am convinced it will add very greatly to my happiness; and thirdly—which perhaps I ought to have mentioned earlier, that it is the particular advice and recommendation of the very noble lady whom I have the honour of calling patroness. (1813, 148)

All her readers will have noted that he made no mention of love for or the happiness of his bride to be, and actually was interested, above all, in the approval of his noble patroness Lady Catherine de Bourgh.

The real reasons for marriage are set out in the BCP as follows:

> First, It was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name. Secondly, It was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry … Thirdly, It was ordained for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity. (Cummings 2011, 435)

Occasionally the above-mentioned 'collective consciousness' can get things wrong. Probably the most famous case is the attribution to Neville Chamberlain of the phrase 'Peace in our time'. Even a philologist like Stella Brook (1965, 195) linked it with the versicle 'Give peace in our time, o Lord' from the liturgy for Morning and Evening Prayer in the BCP. The phrase was allegedly used by Chamberlain from the balcony of number 10 Downing St. after his return from the disgraceful betrayal of Czechoslovakia at the 1938 Munich conference. The problem is that the media made a mistake with a preposition! What he actually did was to quote Disraeli, who, on his return from the Congress of Berlin in 1878 said 'I have returned from Germany with peace *for* our time'. The misunderstanding no doubt arose from familiarity with the versicle in the BCP in which Cranmer translated the seventh century hymn: 'Da pacem, Domine, in diebus nostris. Quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis, nisi tu Deus noster' as:

> Priest. Give peace in our time, O Lord.
> Answer. Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God. (BCP 1662, Cummings 2011, 255)

To conclude, a few words about the relationship between the faithful and a liturgy in a language they did not understand. In Italy the first mass in Italian was celebrated in Rome by Pope Paul VI on 7 March 1965. The reception of what they could hear of the Latin mass which the majority could not understand is the subject of a fascinating study by Gian Luigi Beccaria.

One interesting result is that two common words in contemporary Italian are the end product of this misunderstanding: 'visibilio' (2002, 110-111) means a large quantity. Actually it is the result of reciting the Creed in very approximate Latin at the words: 'visibilium omnium et invisibilium' misunderstood as meaning something like 'a lot of things'. The other example is 'repulisti' (107) from Psalm 43 *quare me repulisti?* (Why did you abandon me?) Because of the word sounding something like 'ripulire' (to clean) this word in contemporary Italian means something like a thorough cleaning operation. At least from 1965 Italians can not only hear most of the mass but also understand it!

4. *From the Birth of the KJB to the Rise of AVolatry*

On his way to London, after the death of Elizabeth, King James VI of Scotland, now also James I of England, was met by a delegation of the Godly (aka Puritan) wing of the Church of England and presented with the so-called millenary petition (owing to its alleged 1,000 or so signatures) in the hope that he would apply the austere Presbyterian church set-up in Scotland to his new Kingdom. They were to be disappointed, since James was delighted with the prospect of becoming the head of a Church like that left by Elizabeth. He had had enough of the rigours of Scottish Presbyterianism.

He did, however, agree to hold a three-day conference starting on 14 January 1604 at Hampton Court Palace to discuss the matter. We have a detailed account of the proceedings by William Barlow dean of Chester (Barlow 1604). The Bishops' group was led by Richard Bancroft (at the time bishop of London and from November 1604 to 1610 archbishop of Canterbury) and the Puritans by John Rainolds (president of Corpus Christi College Oxford). On the second day a well-known remark by the King, clearly illustrating his stance on Church government, is recorded twice: 'rouing their calling & vse in the Church, and closed it vppe with this short Aphorisme, No Bishop, no King' and 'But if once you were out, and they in place, I knowe what would become of my Supremacie. No Bishop, no King, as before I sayd'. (Barlow 1604, 27 and 62). The only concrete decision to emerge from the conference followed a proposal by John Rainolds to undertake a new translation of the Bible.

Although the bishops present were satisfied with the version of the Bible read in churches and bearing their name (the so-called Bishops' Bible – first edition 1568, last edition 1602), the King agreed to a new translation (which was to bear his name long after his death, particularly in the USA, while Britain prefers the term 'Authorised Version') mostly because he wanted a more accurate, better researched and less controversial version in contrast with the so-called Geneva Bible (first edition 1560, last edition 1640) which he disliked owing to its 'anti-monarchical' reputation.[16] An example of the King's consequent dislike of polemical marginal notes, which are frequent in the Geneva version, is given below:

Dan. 3:19
Geneva: Then was Nebuchad-nezzar ful of rage, and the forme of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego: therefore he charged and commanded that they shulde heate the fornace at once seuen times more than it was wonte to be heat.
Marginal Note: This declareth that the more, that tyrants rage, & the more witty they shewe them selues in inuenting strange and cruel punishements, the more is God glorified by his seruants to whome he

[16] In 1579 it was published in Scotland and dedicated to the then James VI, but that does not mean that it met with his approval.

giueth constancie to abide the crueltie of their punishment: for euer he deliuereth them from death, or els for this life giueth them a better.

Under the leadership of Bancroft a list of procedures (here in modern spelling) for the six separate companies of a total of 54 scholars meeting in Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge was drawn up following the King's instructions (Campbell 2010, 35-46; Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 176-181):

1. The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.
2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, as near as may be, accordingly as they are vulgarly used.
3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word church, not to be translated congregation.
4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent Fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogies of faith.
5. The division of chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.
6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed, in the text.
7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another.
8. Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter, or chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their parts what shall stand.
9. As any one company hath dispatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously, for His Majesty is very careful in this point.
10. If any company, upon the review of their book, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof, note the place, and withal send their reasons, to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the General Meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.
11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned man in the land for his judgment on such a place.
12. Letters to be sent from every Bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as; being skilful in the tongues; have taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford.
13. The Directors in each company to be the Deans of Westminster and Chester for that place, and the King's Professors in Hebrew or Greek in either university.
14. These translations to be used; when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's; Matthew's Rogers'; Coverdale's, Whitchurch's [i.e. the Great Bible]; Geneva. (Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 179-181)

A later instruction:

… three or four of the most ancient and grave divines, in either of the universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned … to be overseers of the translations … for the better observation of the fourth rule. (181)

Despite all these detailed instructions most scholars now agree that the differences between the text of the KJB and Tyndale's translation are rather limited. One widely accepted analysis (Nielsen and Skousen 1998) gives Tyndale's contribution to the KJB New Testament as about 84 % of the text, and for the Old Testament as about 76 %. Below there is a sample from a well-known passage in St. John's gospel first in Tyndale followed by the KJB. The similarities are very striking:

John 14:1-9
Tyndale [1] Let not youre hertes be troubled. Beleue in God, and beleue in me. [2] In my fathers housse are many mansions. If it were not so, I wolde haue tolde you. I go to prepare a place for you. [3] And yf I go to prepare a place for you, I will come agayne, and receaue you euen vnto my selfe that where I am, there maye ye be also. [4] And whither I go ye knowe, and the waye ye knowe. [5] Thomas sayde vnto him: Lorde we knowe not whither thou goest. Also how is it possible for vs to knowe the waye? [6] Jesus sayde vnto him: I am the waye, the truthe and the lyfe. And no man commeth vnto the father, but by me. [7] If ye had knowen me, ye had knowen my father also. And now ye knowe him, and haue sene him. [8] Philip sayde vnto him: Lorde shew vs the father, and it suffiseth vs. [9] Jesus sayde vnto him: haue I bene so longe tyme with you: and yet hast thou not knowen me? Philip, he that hath sene me, hath sene the father. And how sayest thou then: shew vs the father?

KJB [1] Let not your heart be troubled: yee beleeue in God, beleeue also in me.[2] In my Fathers house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would haue told you: I goe to prepare a place for you.[3] And if I goe and prepare a place for you, I will come againe, and receiue you vnto my selfe, that where I am, there ye may be also.[4] And whither I goe yee know, and the way ye know.[5] Thomas saith vnto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest: and how can we know the way? [6] Iesus saith vnto him, I am the Way, the Trueth, and the Life: no man commeth vnto the Father but by mee.[7] If ye had knowen me, ye should haue knowen my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and haue seene him [8] Philip sayth vnto him, Lord, shew vs the Father, and it sufficeth vs.[9] Iesus saith vnto him, Haue I bin so long time with you, and yet hast thou not knowen me, Philip? he that hath seene me, hath seene the father, and how sayest thou then, Shew vs the father?

Seven years later, after the companies had completed their tasks, which were followed by a nine month long period occupied by general meetings in London, when texts were read aloud to test speakability. In an age of widespread illiteracy the ear was foregrounded rather than the eye for a text that was to be read in churches. The completed translation was finally published in 1611:

THE HOLY BIBLE, Conteyning the Old Testament, AND THE NEW: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations diligently compared and reuised by his Maiesties Speciall Comandement. Appointed to be read in Churches. Imprinted in London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie. Anno Dom. 1611.

The printing history for the first hundred years or so is characterised by a number of embarrassing disasters[17] (Campbell 2010, 105-113). The first edition that is virtually identical in spelling and punctuation to modern versions is the impeccable 1769 edition by Benjamin Blaney in Oxford, as illustrated by comparing editions before and after:

Matt.1:20 But while hee thought on these things, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared vnto him in a dreame, saying, Ioseph thou sonne of Dauid, feare not to take vnto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceiued in her, is of the holy Ghost.

Blaney: But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

[17] The worst is to be found in the so-called 'wicked Bible' of 1631 which printed at Ex. 20:14 'thou shalt commit adultery' (Campbell 2010, 110, figure 19).

The kowtowing dedicatory epistle to King James is followed by one of the most significant documents in the history of Early Modern translation theory: 'The Translators to the Reader' by Miles Smith (Bishop of Gloucester from 1612) (Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 181-198). As was common at the time, the translation process is presented by Bishop Smith in metaphorical terms (Denton 1992 and 2016, 23-31):

> Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtaine, that we may looke into the most Holy place; that remooueth the couer of the well, that wee may come by the water, euen as Iacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which meanes the flockes of Laban were watered. (Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 185)

Another well-known passage illustrates the translators' approach in contrast with both the Puritans and Papists:

> Lastly, wee haue on the one side auoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes, who leaue the olde Ecclesticall words, and betake them to other, as when they put washing for Baptisme, and Congregation in stead of Church: as also on the other side we haue shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their Azimes, Tunike, Rational, Holocausts, Præpuce, Pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sence, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may bee kept from being vnderstood. But we desire that the Scripture may speake like it selfe, as in the language of Canaan, that it may bee vnderstood euen of the very vulgar. (Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 198)

The reference to Papists concerns the Roman Catholic translation produced at the English college in Douai and completed in 1578 in Reims. A comparison of the KJB and the Douai/Reims version needs no further comment:

> Num.6:17
> KJB: And he shall offer the ramme for a sacrifice of peace offerings vnto the Lord, with the basket of vnleauened bread.
>
> Douai-Reims: The ramme he shal immolate for a pacifique hoste to the Lord, offering withal the baskette of azymes.

The remarks by Smith on the view that the translation he was presenting to readers was a cross between a new translation and a new edition of an already existing one (i.e., the 1602 edition of the Bishops' Bible) did not mean that it would immediately replace existing bibles read out in churches, which it did not. Even though the Bishops' Bible had a poor reputation for accuracy, it continued to be used in churches and the Geneva Bible was still extensively used in private households for private reading, its last edition, dating from 1640, as a handy study bible. Although the KJB proclaims that it is 'appointed to be read in churches' there is no trace of any official edict to this effect. The KJB was gradually purchased by the parishes, where it remained in exclusive use until the mid-twentieth century and after that on a more selective basis (e.g., during choral evensong in cathedrals):

> Truly (good Christian Reader) wee neuer thought from the beginning, that we should neede to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one … but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principall good one, not iustly to be excepted against; that hath bene our indeauour, that our marke. (Rhodes *et al.* 2013, 194)

The translation method chosen was what the most influential translation theorist, at least in the field of biblical translation, called 'formal equivalence'.[18]

Luke 15: 11-14
Εἶπεν δέ Ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχεν δύο υἱούς. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐτῶν τῷ πατρί Πάτερ, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας: ὁ δὲ διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον. καὶ μετ᾽ οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγὼν πάντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακράν, καὶ ἐκεῖ διεσκόρπισεν τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ζῶν ἀσώτως. δαπανήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὰ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι.

And hee said, A certaine man had two sonnes:
And the yonger of them said to his father, Father, giue me the portion of goods that falleth to me. And he diuided vnto them his liuing. And not many dayes after, the yonger sonne gathered al together, and tooke his iourney into a farre countrey, and there wasted his substance with riotous liuing. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land, and he beganne to be in want.

The English translation of the beginning of the parable of the Prodigal Son from St. Luke's Gospel features 8 occurrences of the conjunction 'and' as against the Greek δέ (3) and καὶ (4). This type of parataxis is excessive by normal English standards, even in the seventieth century. The author of the Gospel was not a native speaker of Greek but was arguably influenced by the need for repetition of the conjunction which in Semitic languages is a marker of formal style.[19]

Since the mid-eighteenth century, the KJB or Authorized Version has been the object of what David Norton calls 'AVolatry' (i.e., an object of unlimited devotion), a good example of hyperbole being the phrase 'the noblest composition in the universe', apparently placing the KJB beyond the planet Earth (!) (Norton 2000, 256; Hamlin 2015, 469) coined by Samuel Jackson Pratt (1777). By the first half of the twentieth century (Norton 2000, 400-404) and later, if the celebrations of its 400th anniversary in 2011 are anything to go by, this trend shows no signs of decline. The anniversary was marked by documentaries (e.g., 'KJB The Book that Changed the World' – Lionsgate docudrama 2011, 'When God Spoke English: the Making of the King James Bible' – BBC 4 documentary 2011), round tables, conferences and publications. During the special service in Westminster Abbey on 16 November 2011 in the presence of the Queen, the broadcaster of the ceremony, Melvyn Bragg, called the King James Bible the 'DNA of the English language', and that, as hyperbole, is difficult to beat.

It is often claimed that the KJB has extensively influenced the English commonly used today by speakers who are unaware of a specific idiom being of biblical origin, examples being 'to give up the ghost', 'to be the salt of the earth', 'a law unto him/herself' 'by the skin of one's teeth' (a Hebrew expression), etc. A recent study by David Crystal (2010) labels 257 phrases from the KJB as contemporary English idiom. However, when checking them against previous translations, the surprising result is that only 18 belong exclusively to the KJB. Furthermore, as far as lexical creativity is concerned, Shakespeare coined about 1,000 new words, the KJB only about 40.

[18] The dichotomy formal vs dynamic equivalence first appeared in Nida 1964. The question will be further discussed in Section 5.

[19] Strong 1890 gives 2,532 occurrences of καί in the Greek New Testament with 848 in St. Luke (the highest number).

5. *Crisis for Cranmer and King James: The 'great leap forward' from Thou to You*

The BCP and KJB were originally written in the standard Early Modern English (albeit in a somewhat formal register) of the time, i.e., over a span of roughly 100 years (1549-1662),[20] within the dates of the appearance of the first and fifth editions of the BCP and the first edition of the KJB (1611). The BCP was partly based on translation of Latin liturgical texts and partly original writing by Thomas Cranmer (1549 and 1552) (with some later contributions to the 1662 edition). The KJB, in line with its predecessors, was partly based on English translations from the Latin Vulgate and then from the Hebrew and Greek sources available to the early modern translators. In the subsequent three centuries (roughly 1662-1980) the religious linguistic situation of the C. of E. remained basically unchanged. The problem was, however, that the surrounding linguistic environment had changed beyond recognition. Post-early modern church goers and Bible readers were faced with a language that had become ever more problematic to say the very least. Arguably the most striking feature was the contrast between the single and plural forms of the second person pronoun, which was not only a question of singular vs plural (thou-you), but also of the choice of either on power, solidarity and (more subtle) attitudinal and emotional grounds (Walker 2007; Mazzon 2010), as well as occasional switches between the two (Ronberg 1992, 80). An extension of pronoun switching is investigated in an innovative study (based on, as is often the case, a Shakespeare play) by Clara Calvo (1992) linking pronoun switching with a change of topic or crossing a boundary. In the latter case, this boundary could be between the worldly (you) and the sacred (thou).

For the early modern Bible translators the universal practice with second person pronouns was source text singular: thou/thee, source text plural: ye/you, irrespective of the social status of the addressees. Thus in Gen 47.3 Joseph presents some of his brothers to Pharoah:

Tyndale Pentateuch 1530: And Pharao sayde vnto his brethren: what is your occupation? And they sayde vnto Pharao: feaders of shepe are thi seruauntes, both we and also oure fathers.

KJB 1611: And Pharaoh said vnto his brethren, What is your occupation? And they said vnto Pharaoh, Thy seruants are shepherds, both wee and also our fathers.

In the liturgical context, however, the idea of a common belonging to a Christian fraternity predominates, best symbolized by the ritual 'thou'. Unsurprisingly, God as our Father is also addressed with the T form (e.g., Lord's Prayer), thus endowing 'thou' with a strong religious connotation. Nevertheless, in the BCP, in less sacramental 'core' services, close attention is also paid to contemporary (i.e., mid-sixteenth century) address conventions, as can be seen in the ceremony known as the Churching of Women, in which the woman concerned is addressed with the non-committal 'you'.

The two more relevant parts of the BCP I shall now examine in this perspective are the Catechism as a prelude to confirmation and one section of the Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons (The Ordinal).

[20] The ill-fated BCP of 1927-1928 was an example of doctrinal not linguistic modification. Since the C. of E. is an Established Church, Parliamentary approval was required for the so-called Deposited or Proposed BCP (a state of affairs, i.e., political interference in church matters previously deplored by the Oxford Movement), which had been accepted by the organs of church government. However, it was rejected by the House of Commons in December 1927 and a revised version suffered the same fate the following year. The main problem seemed to have been an innovation by way of allowing the reserved sacrament, which to many non-conformist MPs smacked of 'popery' (Spinks 2006).

The catechism to be learnt by the young in a question and answer format was included in the first BCP and appeared basically unchanged in all subsequent editions:

> Question. What is your name? Aunswere. N. or M. Question. Who gaue you thys name? Aunswere. My Godfathers and Godmothers in my baptisme, wherein I was made a member of Christe, the childe of god … (Cummings 2011, 59)

> Question. What doest thou chiefely learne in these articles of thy beliefe? (Cummings 2011, 60)

What is striking in this fragment is the abrupt shift from 'you' to 'thou' which continues throughout. Stella Brook's frequently cited (and now somewhat dated) study of the language of the BCP has this to say:

> That part of the catechism which goes back to 1549 employs both you and thou and the fluctuation is too haphazard to be explained by the assumption that the children are sometimes addressed collectively, sometimes individually. (1965, 54)

If we look at the exchanges in the light of a passage from the worldly to the sacred, then 'haphazard' does not explain the shift. Brook implies that the distinction between you and thou had become 'blurred' by this time, arguably a very unsatisfactory explanation at such an early stage. The matter of fact questions use 'you' while those dealing with the sanctity of confirmation use 'thou'.

Similar remarks can be made about the pronoun switches in the Ordinal, first published separately from the BCP in 1550 and only totally integrated into it in 1662. I have chosen to concentrate on the order for the consecration of bishops. The candidate for a bishopric is presented to the presiding archbishop by two bishops who address the latter, as his rank requires, with 'you'. The archbishop then puts a series of questions to the candidate, using the respectful 'you' to a person of high status, though not yet a member of the Episcopal hierarchy. Significantly, the switch to 'thou' is linked with the liturgical gesture of 'laying on of hands' and admittance of the candidate to full membership of the hierarchy. The giving of the Bible might at first sight appear to present more problems, there being a switch from 'thou' to 'you' about half-way through. Actually this can be explained by a topic division. In the 1550 version, the bishop places the Bible on the new bishop's neck, in accordance with traditional Catholic practice. Then in the second separate section hands over the staff of office, a less 'sacred' gesture, coinciding with the switch to you. In the version linked with the new 1552 edition of the BCP the two sections are joined. The Bible is handed over and no mention is made of giving the new bishop a staff.

Crisis for Cranmer and King James is the title of a collection of articles edited by an eminent scholar in the field of the sociology of religion, who was also an Anglican clergyman (Martin 1980, followed by Martin and Mullen 1981). It challenges the growing trend towards updating sacred liturgical and biblical texts and argues in favour of the retention of tradition.

It was only from the second half of the twentieth century that the linguistic winds of change began to blow (Buchanan 2006a), at least as far as the BCP is concerned The Bible was a somewhat different matter, undergoing a light breeze at the end of the nineteenth century, via a stronger wind of change in the mid-twentieth century to a gale in the second half of the century!

A major problem for modern readers of the original KJB text is not differences in spelling and punctuation, since this aspect of the text from the 1769 Blayney edition onwards had been modernized. This process did not, however, cover lexical items no longer in current usage or terms that had undergone a change in meaning. A classic example of the latter case is the word

'prevent' not only present in prayer texts ('prevent and follow us, O Lord') but also in the KJB, as the example from 1 Thess. 4: 15 shows:

KJB: For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.

Apart from the problem with 'asleep', which here means 'dead', 'prevent' with the meaning of 'come before' is incomprehensible for the average modern reader (or listener). This can only be resolved by a translation into contemporary English, such as that in the 1966 Good News Bible:

GNB anglicised version: What we are teaching you now is the Lord's teaching: we who are alive on the day the Lord comes will not go ahead of those who have died.

From the late nineteenth century the need was widely felt for a revision of the KJB text, going beyond Blayney's cosmetic edition. A series of more invasive modifications (Campbell 2010, 212-235) began with the Revised Version (RV NT 1881, OT 1885) in which it was made clear that the revisers' aim was 'to improve the text not to replace it'. The Byzantine Greek 'Textus Receptus' was replaced for the revision by more authentic Greek texts; since the revision was philological, no attempt to update the text linguistically was contemplated. To illustrate the various stages of revision we will return to the text of the Parable of the Prodigal Son (in this case the final verses: Luke 15: 29-32):

KJB Blayney edition 1769: 29 And he answering said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: 30 But as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. 31 And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. 32 It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

RV 1881: 29 But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine: and [*yet*] thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: 30 but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. 31 And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. 32 But it was meet to make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive [*again*]; and [*was*] lost, and is found.

Clearly the revisers were conscious of the fact that this was a text that would be read in church to a congregation (it is the second lesson for evensong on Ash Wednesday), who would be used to hearing the solemn tones of the KJB. Listening to this version they probably would not have noticed much difference.

The next revision was the Revised Standard Version (RSV NT 1946, OT 1952), an entirely American enterprise:

RSV 1946: 29 But he answered his father, "Lo, these many years I have served you, and I never disobeyed your command; yet you never gave me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends.
30 But when this son of yours came, who has devoured your living with harlots, you killed for him the fatted calf!" 31 And he said to him, "Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours. 32 It was fitting to make merry and be glad, for this your brother was dead, and is alive; he was lost, and is found".

While the RV had kept the use of 'thou' forms and verb endings, not only when addressing the Deity, the RSV used 'you' for humans and 'thou' only for the Deity.

RSV1952: Ex. 4:10 But Moses said to the LORD, 'Oh, my Lord, I am not eloquent, either heretofore or since thou hast spoken to thy servant; but I am slow of speech and of tongue'.

Although this version dates from the mid-twentieth century, several obsolete constructions survive, most noticeably 'this your brother', just enough to supply those nostalgic for the classic KJB with a whiff of what they admired so much.

After this, we come to the revised revision, i.e., the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV 1989), in which 'thou' has disappeared even for the Deity and the morphosyntax and lexis are contemporary, albeit a little stiff, as can be seen from two extracts, one from the Old Testament and the other from the New Testament:

NRSV 1989: 29 But he answered his father, "Listen! For all these years I have been working like a slave for you, and I have never disobeyed your command; yet you have never given me even a young goat so that I might celebrate with my friends. 30 But when this son of yours came back, who has devoured your property with prostitutes, you killed the fatted calf for him!" 31 Then the father said to him, "Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours. 32 But we had to celebrate and rejoice, because this brother of yours was dead and has come to life; he was lost and has been found".

NRSV 1989: Ex. 4:10 But Moses said to the LORD, 'O my Lord, I have never been eloquent, neither in the past nor even now that you have spoken to your servant; but I am slow of speech and slow of tongue'.

The expression 'killed the fatted calf', despite its unusual verb morphology ('fatted'), is still acceptable, owing to its status as an idiom (Crystal 2010, 184 and 277) which simply means 'to celebrate a special event with food and drink' (not necessarily involving calves). A version of the parable which has shaken off the influence of the KJB is provided by the Good News Bible (1966) very much under the influence of Nida's dynamic or functional equivalence (Nida 1964; Nida and Taber 1969; De Waard and Nida 1986)[21]

GNB anglicised version 1966: (29) But he spoke back to his father, "Look, all these years I have worked for you like a slave, and I have never disobeyed your orders. What have you given me? Not even a goat for me to have a feast with my friends! (30) But this son of yours wasted all your property on prostitutes, and when he comes back home, you kill the prize calf for him!" (31) "My son," the father answered, "you are always here with me, and everything I have is yours. (32) But we had to celebrate and be happy, because your brother was dead, but now he is alive; he was lost, but now he has been found".

The above version seems to target readers rather than listeners in church e.g., the kind of reader who exclaimed: 'this must not be the Bible, I can understand it' (Nida and Taber 1969, 7). An equally contemporary version could arguably be seen as more suitable for the context of a church service:

REB 1989: (29) But he retorted,"You know how I have slaved for you all these years; I never once disobeyed your orders; yet you never gave me so much as a kid, to celebrate with my friends. (30) But now that this son of yours turns up, after running through your money with his women, you kill the fatted

[21] Nida's well-known dichotomy (i.e., privileging content over form) is discussed in Pym 2014, 8-9 and 31. In De Waard's and Nida's 1986 volume, 'dynamic' was replaced by 'functional'. Despite the fact that the authors state that the difference between the two terms is minimal, their traditionalist detractors in clerical circles, who favoured literal translation (i.e., formal equivalence) implied that the contested dynamic equivalence had been dropped, showing how unreliable the authors were. I was informed by (now the late) Professor Nida, during a conversation at a conference held at the Catholic University of Milan in 2005, that he had protested about this misinformation, but to no avail.

calf for him." (31) "My boy," said the father, "you are always with me and everything I have is yours. (32) How could we fail to celebrate this happy day? Your brother here was dead and has come back to life; he was lost and has been found".[22]

To return to the question of parataxis already mentioned in Section 4, i.e., the Semitized Koiné Greek used by the writers of the New Testament, reflecting a high level of formality, which, when transferred to the translated text has a childish effect (Nida and Taber 1969, 14; Denton 1990, 183). In the parable examined, as in other similar texts, the conjunctions καὶ and δέ in first and second position respectively, introducing the verses when literally translated as 'and' and 'but' in particular are highly deviant in modern English. Taking the complete parable (Luke 15: 11-32), the statistics for the Greek text, the KJB and its revisions are as follows:

δέ and καὶ and their English translation in initial position:
Greek text: καὶ 8 δέ 12: total 20 (22 verses)
KJB and 16 but 2: total 18 (22 verses)
RV and 12 but 6 total: 18 (22 verses)
RSV and 10 but 3 so 2 total: 15 (22 verses)
NRSV and 1 but 5 so 2 total: 8 (22 verses)

By the late twentieth century, the last of a series of revised C. of E. services (Alternative Services Series 3 1973-1979) established the principle that the Church favoured contemporary language for worship, addressing the Deity as 'you' being only the most visible and most publicized sign of this turning point. By this time, Communion, rather than Morning or Evening Prayer, had become the main Sunday service in parish churches. Choral Evensong continued (using the 1662 BCP and the 1611 KJB) mostly in cathedrals and Oxbridge College Chapels and has a loyal following for the live BBC broadcasts.[23]

1980 saw the publication of the Alternative Service Book (ASB), intended as an alternative to the 1662 BCP, but actually replacing it in very many situations. After twenty years the ASB was replaced by the group of texts known as Common Worship (CW, from 2000 onwards),[24] which is now the most authoritative point of reference for contemporary C. of E. liturgy. Protection of the BCP encouraged the setting up of several Prayer Book Societies for the defence of traditional Anglican worship (Mullen 2000; Dailey 2011, the latter being the less polemical of the two), and pleas were made for the maintenance of 'a sacred [i.e., non contemporary] language of worship' (Spurr 1995; Toon and Tarsitano 2003); what Buchanan calls 'the liturgical antiquities of the Church of England' (2006b, 266).

Contemporary Anglican service books contain very limited, but none the less significant elements of a 'post-modern collage' (akin to the historical features conspicuously displayed in an otherwise contemporary setting in post-modern architecture). The obvious example of this phenomenon is the retention in CW of the traditional version of the Lord's Prayer:

[22] The Revised English Bible replaced the New English Bible, which had been published in 1961 (and had also used 'thou' for the Deity and 'you' for humans). The criteria followed in the new translation are illustrated in Coleman 1989; see also Denton 2008, 410.

[23] This is the oldest live outside broadcast in the BBC's history. The first broadcast was from Westminster Abbey on 7 October 1926, and it is still going strong on Radio 3 every Wednesday afternoon.

[24] There are, among many other innovations, forms of service for Candlemas, Ash Wednesday and Holy Week and Easter, not present in the 1662 BCP.

Our Father, who [which] art in heaven,
hallowed be thy name;
thy kingdom come;
thy will be done;
on [in] earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our trespasses,
as we forgive those who [them that]
trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation;
but deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom,
the power and the glory,
for ever and ever. Amen.

This lightly adapted version of the traditional text (the square brackets enclosing the 1662 BCP variants) comes from the 1790 Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (which was not subject to interference from Parliament in Westminster, after the 1776 Declaration of Independence). The ASB had tried out a more modern version of the prayer, which was widely challenged, to the extent that the above traditional version was printed alongside the unpopular modern version in the second edition of the ASB in 1992 (Denton 2008, 420).

A much more serious problem was presented by the updating of the collects, considered the greatest achievement of Cranmer's liturgical style (MacCulloch 2016, 417-420). Maintaining them as they appear in the 1662 BCP was out of the question, owing to their high number; so they had to be updated. The problem was that they all begin by addressing the Deity, followed by a relative clause which is somewhat awkward in contemporary English (Ferguson 1976; Denton 1990, 185). Most of the collects first appeared in Latin in the Sarum missal and were translated by Cranmer, while 24 of them are original compositions.

Let us take as an example the Collect for Epiphany (6 January):

Sarum Rite:

Deus qui hodiérna die unigénitum tuum géntibus stella duce revelásti: concéde propícius, ut qui jam te ex fide cognóvimus: usque ad contemplándam spéciem tue celsitúdinis perducámur. Per eúndem …

BCP 1549:

O God, which by the leading of a starre diddest manifest thy onelye begotten sonne to the Gentiles; Mercifully graunt, that we, which know thee now by faith, may after this life have the fruicion of thy glorious Godhead; through Christe our Lorde. (Gibson 1910, 52-53)

BCP 1662:

O God, who by the leading of a star didst manifest thy only begotten Son to the Gentiles: Mercifully grant, that we which know thee now by faith, may after this life have the fruition of thy glorious godhead, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.* (Cummings 2011, 282)

Common Worship 2000:

O God, who by the leading of a star manifested your only Son to the peoples of the earth: mercifully grant that we, who know you now by faith, may at last behold your glory face to face; through Jesus

Christ your Son our Lord, who is alive and reigns with you, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.

The relative clause post-modifying the addressee is quite normal in many European languages, including Italian, but the same is not true of contemporary English. There are, however, ways of avoiding this and we can turn for help to post-Vatican II Roman Catholic translators (O'Collins and Wilkins 2017):[25]

God of mystery, on this day you revealed your only Son to the nations by the guidance of a star. We know you now by faith; lead us into that presence where we shall behold your glory face to face … (40)

The above is actually a translation submitted by the Commission for English in the Liturgy (ICEL) in 1998 and rejected by the Vatican.

The official translation authorised by the Vatican authorities now in use since 2010 and hotly contested in progressive Catholic circles (it is even said that Pope Francis is in favour of looking into the question again) reads as follows:

O God who on this day revealed your Only Begotten Son to the nations by the guidance of a star, grant in your mercy that we, who know you already by faith may be brought to behold the beauty of your sublime glory …

6. *Epilogue*

I should like to conclude with a brief description of a visit to a major centre of Anglican Liturgical Excellence i.e., Westminster Abbey, before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. It took place on a Sunday in Advent in 2018 and the service was Sung Eucharist. Walking through the main west entrance I paused to look at the statues of 10 Christian martyrs on the façade. It is a line-up of an ecumenically correct selection, with no reference to inter-denominational struggle: no Protestants killed by Catholics and no Catholics killed by Protestants (so no Thomas Cranmer burnt alive in 1556 and no St. Margaret Clitherow crushed to death by heavy weights in 1586); instead, the martyrs were modern, including St. Maximilian Kolbe starved to death in Auschwitz in 1941 and St. Oscar Romero gunned down in a church in El Salvador by a far right terrorist in 1980.

Entering the Abbey I saw two large icons (NB not statues!), one of Christ and the other of the Virgin Mary. There were candle holders in front of them where visitors could place lighted candles. The communion service from Common Worship, which is linguistically very close to the post-Vatican II English Mass, was celebrated by a priest wearing a violet chasuble (the liturgical colour for Advent) and the high altar frontal was in the same colour. The celebrant kissed the altar and censed it with a thurible. The Bible was also censed before the Gospel was read. After the consecration the celebrant elevated the host in the form of a large wafer and then the cup of wine above his head. The ordinary of the service ('Kyrie', 'Gloria' etc.) was sung in Latin because it was in a setting by Palestrina, and during communion the Latin hymn 'Pange Lingua' was sung, followed by 'Ave Verum Corpus'. The Bible readings were taken from the

[25] It is interesting to note that in the debate on English translation of the Latin rites the Roman Catholic commission held a vote on the you-thou question. The result was 7 for You and 1 for Thou (on this and other examples of inter-denominational cross-fertilisation on linguistic issues see Jasper 1989, 286-307).

New Revised Standard Version (1989). After the service small groups were allowed to enter the shrine of St. Edward the Confessor behind the mock Gothic High Altar, where members of the congregation were asked to respond 'Holy Edward Pray for us' to the priest's prayers. They were also told they could write short messages to the saint on slips of paper.

Now imagine for a moment Archbishop Cranmer witnessing all this. He would no doubt have exclaimed 'What happened to my Reformation?'

Works Cited

Audio-visual Sources

A recent audio-visual website offers a magnificent series of masses and processions following the rite of Sarum set in c.1535, on which see the first part of Section 2: The Experience of Worship (2003-2014), <www.experienceofworship.org.uk>, accessed 1 February 2022.

An audio CD (Herald HAVPCD189) is a recording of a live Tridentine Mass for the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (25 March) recorded in November 1994, performed by the Schola Gregoriana of Cambridge directed by Mary Berry. It offers a rare experience of a Mass in which most of the spoken parts are merely whispered (*tacite voce*) by the celebrant, and thus only just audible to those standing near him.

Audio CD Thomas Tallis Songs of Reformation (Obsidian CD716) 2017, Alamire directed by David Skinner. A fascinating example of how a Roman Catholic composer adapted his style to Cranmer's requirement of 'one syllable one note'.

Video (also on YouTube) David Crystal, The Influence of the King James Bible on the English Language. A Lecture by the author of *Begat* at the British Council on 18 July 2011.

Printed Sources

Anonymous (1544a), *Portiforium secundum vsum Sarum: nouiter impressus*, Londini, Per Richardum Grafton et Edwardum Whitchurch

Anonymous (1544b), *An exhortacion vnto prayer tghought mete by the kynges maiesty … Also a letanie with suffrages*, Imprynted at London, by Thomas Petyt.

Austen Jane (1813), *Pride and Prejudice,* London, Thomas Egerton.

Barber Charles (1997 [1976]), *Early Modern English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Barlow William (1604), *The svmme and svbstance of the conference, which, it pleased his Excellent Maiestie to haue with the Lords, Bishops, and other of his Clergie, (at which the most of the Lordes of the Councell were present) in his Maiesties Priuy-Chamber, at Hampton Court. Ianuary 14. 1603*, London, Windet.

Beccaria G.L. (2002), *Sicuterat: il Latino di chi non lo sa: Bibbia e liturgia nell'italiano e nei dialetti*, Milano, Garzanti.

Beckett Samuel (1961), *Happy Days a play in two acts*, New York, Grove Press.

Blunt J.H., ed. (1872 [1866]), *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, London, Rivingtons.

Brightman F.E., ed. (1921 [1915]), *The English Rite: Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, Rivingtons, 2 vols.

Brook Stella (1965), *The Language of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, Deutsch.

Buchanan Colin (2006a), 'The Winds of Change', in Hefling and Shattuck, eds, 229-238.

Buchanan Colin (2006b), 'Preserving the Classical Prayer Books', in Hefling and Shattuck, eds, 261-267.

Burton Edward, ed. (1834), *Three Primers put forth in the reign of Henry VIII. Viz. I. A Goodly Prymer 1535; II. The Manual of Prayers, or the Prymer in English 1539; III. King Henry's Primer 1545*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Butterworth C.C. (1953), *The English Primers (1529-1545)*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Calvo Clara (1992), 'Pronouns of Address and Social Negotiation in *As you Like it*', *Language and Literature* 1, 5-27.

Campbell Gordon (2010), *Bible: The Story of the King James Version, 1611-2011*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Chartres Richard (2012), *350th anniversary of the 1662 BCP*, <https://www.london.anglican.org/articles/350th-anniversary-of-the-1662-bcp/>, accessed 1 February 2022.
Coleman Roger (1989), *New Light & Truth: The Making of the Revised English Bible*, Oxford-Cambridge, Oxford University Press-Cambridge University Press.
Cranmer Thomas (1549), *Answer to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels, Devon, 1549*, in J.E. Cox ed. (1846), *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 163-187.
Crystal David (2010), *Begat: The King James Bible and the English Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Cummings Brian, ed. (2011), *The Book of Common Prayer. The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Dailey Prudence, ed. (2011), *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present and Future*, London-New York, Continuum.
Daniell David (2003), *The Bible in English: Its history and influence*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press.
Denton John (1990), 'The Need for Compromise: The Modernization of Religious English', in J. Aitchison, T. Frank and N. Pantaleo eds, *English Past and Present*, Fasano, Schena, 177-195.
Denton John (1992), 'Metaphors the Elizabethans Translated by. Aspects of late 16th. century English translation metalanguage' in C.N. Avila, N. Pantaleo and D. Pezzini eds, *Early Modern English: Trends, forms and texts,* Fasano, Schena, 255-271.
Denton John (2008), 'A Pronoun's Last Stand: Lexico-grammatical Features of Religious English at the Turn of the 21st Century', in G. Iamartino, M.L. Maggioni and R. Facchinetti eds, *Thou Sittest at Another Boke: English Studies in Honour of Domenico Pezzini*, Monza, Polimetrica, 409-423.
Denton John (2010), 'Hail Mary Goes Underground: Public and Private Religious Discourse in 16th Century England', in N. Brownlees, G. Del Lungo and J. Denton eds, *The Language of Public and Private Communication in a Historical Perspective*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 135-160.
Denton John (2016), *Translation and Manipulation in Renaissance England*, Firenze, Firenze University Press.
De Waard Jan and E.A. Nida (1986), *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*, Nashville, Nelson.
Dickens Charles (1854), *Hard Times For These Times*, *Household Words: A Weekly Journal*, 211, 165-188.
Duffy Eamon (2001), *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press.
Duffy Eamon (2005 [1992]), *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c.1580*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press.
Ferguson Charles (1976), 'The Collect as a Form of Discourse', in W.J. Samarin ed., *Language in Religious Practice*, Rowley, Newbury House, 101-109.
Gibson E.C.S. (1910). *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, London, Dent.
Griffiths D.N., ed. (2002), *The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer, 1549-1999*, London, The British Library.
Haigh Christopher (1993), *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors*, Oxford, Claredon University Press.
Hamlin Hannibal (2015), 'The Noblest Composition in the Universe or Fit for the Flames? The Literary Style of the King James Bible', in Killeen *et al.*, eds, 469-482.
Harper Sally, P.S. Barnwell and Magnus Williamson, eds (2016), *Late Medieval Liturgies Enacted: The Experience of Worship in Cathedral and Parish Church*, London, Routledge.
Hefling Charles and Cynthia Shattuck, eds (2006), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Jasper R.C.D. (1989), *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy, 1662-1980*, London, SPCK.

Killeen Kevin, Helen Smith and Rachel Willie, eds (2015), *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Luders Alexander, Sir T. Edlyn Tomlins, J. France, Sir W.E. Taunton and J. Raithby eds (1810-1828), *Statutes of the Realm …*, London, Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, 11 vols.
Lukken G.M. (1992), 'Liturgy and Language: An Approach from Semiotics', *Questions liturgiques* 73, 36-52.
MacCulloch Diarmaid (2016 [1996]), *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press.
Marshall Peter (2005), 'Is the Pope Catholic?', in E.H. Shagan ed., *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religion, Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 22-48.
Marshall Peter (2017), *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press.
Martin David, ed. (1980), *Crisis for Cranmer and King James*, *PN Review* 13, special issue.
Martin David and Peter Mullen, eds (1981), *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy*, Oxford, Blackwell.
Mazzon Gabriella (2010), 'Terms of address', in A.H. Jucker and I. Taavitsainen, eds, *Historical Pragmatics*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter Mouton, 351-376.
Mullen Peter, ed. (2000), *The Real Common Worship*, Denton, Edgeways Books, Brynmill Press.
Nevalainen Terttu (2006), *Introduction to Early Modern English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
Nida E.A. (1964), *Towards a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden, Brill.
Nida E.A. and C.R. Taber (1969), *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden, Brill.
Nieslen John and Royal Skousen (1998), 'How Much of the King James Bible is William Tyndale's?', *Reformation* 3, 49-74.
Norton David (2000), *A History of the English Bible as Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
O'Collins Gerald with John Wilkins (2017), *Lost in Translation: The English Language and the Catholic Mass*, Collegeville, Liturgical Press Academic.
Pym Anthony (2014 [2010]), *Exploring Translation Theories*, London-New York, Routledge.
Renwick William, ed. (2021), *Manuale ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum*, Hamilton, The Gregorian Institute of Canada.
Rhodes Neil, Gordon Kendal and Louise Wilson (2013), *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, London, Modern Humanities Research Association.
Ronberg Gert (1992), *A Way with Words: The Language of English Renaissance Literature*, London-New York, Edward Arnold.
Spinks Bryan (2006), 'The Prayer Book "Crisis" in England', in Heffling and Shattuck, eds, 239-243.
Spurr Barry (1995), *The Word in the Desert: Anglican and Roman Catholic Reactions to Liturgical Reform*, Cambridge, The Lutterworth Press.
Strong James (1890), *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, Cincinnati, Jennings and Graham.
Swift Daniel (2012), *Shakespeare's Common Prayers: The Book of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Age*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Targoff Ramie (2001), *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England*, Chicago, the University of Chicago Press.
Taylor Gary, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, Gabriel Egan, eds (2017), *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works, Modern Critical Edition*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Taylor Norman, ed. (1993), *For Services Rendered: An Anthology in Thanksgiving for the Book of Common Prayer*, Cambridge, The Lutterworth Press.
The Experience of Worship (2003-2014), *Religion and Society Research Programme, Bangor University*, <www.experienceofworship.org.uk>, accessed 1 February 2022.
Tillotson John (1684), *A Discourse against Transubstantiation*, London, M. Flesher.
Toon Peter and L.R. Tarsitano (2003), *Neither Archaic nor Obsolete: The Language of Common Prayer and Public Worship*, Philadelphia, The Prayer Book Society of the U.S.A.
Walker Terry (2007), *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues,* Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Wedding Ceremony Words (2015), <https://www.yourchurchwedding.org/article/wedding-ceremony-words/>, accessed 1 February 2022.

Erasable and Hidden Texts