BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Davis, Isabel (2016) Prosthesis and reformation: the Black Rubric and the reinvention of kneeling. Textual Practice 30 (7), pp. 1209-1231. ISSN 0950-236X.

Downloaded from: https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/13111/

Usage Guidelines:
Please refer to usage guidelines at https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Isabel Davis

Prosthesis and Reformation: the Black Rubric and the reinvention of kneeling†

Image:

Figure one: The Black Rubric © The British Library Board, RB.23.b.1976 (Sig Bxi verso and opposite page).

Abstract:

This essay considers the Black Rubric, a last minute clarification on kneeling at the sacrament of communion, inserted into the second edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1552. The Black Rubric is considered in this article as a textual prosthesis, in the terms laid out by David Wills in his book, *Prosthesis*. This essay uses Wills' thesis to emphasise the material format of the Black Rubric as a textual object more than has been the case in prior scholarship. However, at the same time, this article uses the example of the Black Rubric to modify and add intricacy to Wills' account of the Reformation as a process of prostheticisation, breaking up and renovating arrangements inherited from the medieval past. In particular the Black Rubric forces a qualification of Wills' conclusion about the degree to which print technologies created a distance between text and the human body and foregrounds, more than Wills does, the process of authorising Protestantism as a religion of the state.

Keywords: David Wills, Prosthesis, Black Rubric, *Book of Common Prayer*, kneeling, Protestant Reformation, John Knox, Thomas Cranmer.

> Wheras it is ordeined in the boke of Common prayer, in the administracion of the Lordes Supper, that the Communicantes knelyng, should receiue the holy Communion, [...] lest yet the same knelyng might be thought, or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoracion is doen, or ought to be doen, either unto the Sacramentall bread or wine there bodily receiued, or unto any reall and essencial presence there beyng, of Christes naturall fleshe and bloude.[1]

This quotation is extracted from the so-called Black Rubric, a last-minute rider attached to the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*, clarifying the meanings of kneeling at communion (figure one, p. 00). With this statement, the Black Rubric stripped out the established meanings of kneeling, a familiar and markedly liturgical gesture. Although kneeling at communion was retained and a point of apparent continuity, its meanings were radically re-written; it was, the Rubric spells out, no longer the gesture for acknowledgment of the transubstantiated host. Yet the Rubric was never part of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's original plan for his prayer book, being a later and, at least initially, stuck-in extra. Although in its first manifestation just a slip of paper, it is hard to overestimate the Black Rubric's shaping power over the *Book*, liturgical form, both in the Edwardian Church and beyond, and the lives to which the rite gave structure.[2] Indeed, according to the nineteenth-century historian Peter Lorrimer: 'there is nothing in the whole English liturgy which is […] more Protestant than the "Declaration"', as he calls the Black Rubric.[3]

In this article I offer an account of the Black Rubric as a textual prosthesis, in the sense described by David Wills in his book, *Prosthesis*. Wills suggests that a text stands in for its referent or a translation for what it translates in the way that a prosthesis supplants an amputated limb. A prosthesis relates, in different ways, both to the absent limb and to the body of the amputee. Artificially joined, mechanical and mimetic, a prosthesis occupies the same space as a phantom limb: 'a metallic specter to haunt the well-sewn surface of originary flesh'.[4] Wills' metaphor foregrounds materiality, describing a relation between 'matters of two putatively distinct orders' – flesh and metal, for example – which, for all their material difference, are nonetheless hard to separate because their relationship is defined both by imitation and dependency.[5]

Furthermore, Wills identifies the pairing of rhetorical and medico-technological contrivance within the English word 'prosthesis' itself. Before it referred to an artificial stand-in for an absent body part,

'prosthesis' was a grammatical term, denoting letters and syllables which were added in front of words.[6] Wills argues that, '"prosthesis" first edges its way into the English language in a period [ie the mid-sixteenth century and, more specifically, 1552-3] when knowledge in general and the disciplines of rhetoric and medicine in particular are being not just rearranged but prostheticised – broken apart and artificially reconstructed'.[7] In an extension to his argument about the mid-sixteenth century, Wills suggests that the *Reform*ation – noticing the literal sense within the word – is a 'case in point in the structural history of prosthetisation', an 'artificial construction', breaking up and *re-form*ing what had gone before.[8] Wills argues that Reformation prostheticisation is particularly declared, rather than historically anomalous; Reformers explicitly used the lexicon of cutting and substitution, of surgery and prosthetics to discuss the grammatical revolutions forced by Protestantism.

Wills' brief textual example from the Reformation is Martin Luther's ninety-five theses, purportedly nailed to the church door in Wittenberg in 1517.[9] This essay uses the different case study of the Black Rubric to explore the prostheticised Reformation, an example much closer in date than Luther's theses to the mid-century confluence which Wills otherwise describes. My conclusion in this essay is double: first, I argue that the idea of prosthesis illuminates the Black Rubric as a textual artefact, stressing, much more than previous scholarship has done, its physical relation to the *Book* and, by extension, the world: its re-inscription of gesture and its articulation of reformed Eucharistic theology. The Reformation, as many agree, presented a 'crisis of representation' and considering the Black Rubric as a prosthesis, literally affixed to the *Book of Common Prayer*, admits its proper place within that crisis.[10] If, as Brian Cummings describes it, the *Book of Common Prayer* is a 'physical embodiment of a revolution of religious practice', the Black Rubric is a curious artificial limb upon which that body had to rely.[11]

Secondly, the example of the Black Rubric adds intricacy to Wills' idea of prosthesis, modifying it in several of its parts: the supersession of one age by another, the dismantling of prevailing epistemologies and the intervention of text technologies. In particular, this article challenges Wills' account of printed text as, unlike manuscript, radically distanced from the body. Conversely, I stress the handmade and error-

prone aspects of print production. Further, I add contours to Wills' rather flat understanding of Protestantism as a single movement. Shifting between France and England, Wills conflates conflicting discursive strands which actually competed to set the character of the international reformed Church; Wills' understanding of Protestantism overlooks the process of authorising that movement as a religion of the state.

***

In April 1552 a sealed copy of the revised *Book of Common Prayer* was with the clerk of parliament, ready for printing and distribution; the 1552 Act of Uniformity, printed at the front of the prayer book, states that the new version should be in use in parish churches on the following All Saints' Day, 1 November.[12] Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurche, the King's Printers, had begun work over the summer months and the first copies were already on sale but the press was stopped by order of the Privy Council at the end of September, who insisted on a delay 'until certain faults therein be corrected'.[13] The delay was caused by a row over kneeling at the sacrament whose principle protagonists were John Knox, who strove for abolition, and Thomas Cranmer, who defended its retention. The trigger for suspending the press is thought to be an influential sermon delivered before the King and Privy Council, probably by Knox, which inveighed against kneeling at the sacrament.[14] The ensuing quarrel can be tracked in letters sent by both Knox and Cranmer to the Council – Cranmer's is dated 7 October and Knox's to sometime before the 27th – but also another sent by Knox to his old congregation in Berwick in the spring of the following year, commenting on the settlement.[15] On 27 October, just days before the *Book* was to come into use, the Council issued an order that Thomas Goodrich, Lord Chancellor, should 'cause to be joined unto the Book of Common Prayer lately set forth a certain declaration signed by the King's Majesty, and sent unto his Lordship touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion'.[16] On this order, printing resumed with the said 'declaration', now often known as the Black Rubric, pasted in to subsequent volumes. The notice was also sent on to those who had already bought the *Book*, to affix themselves.[17] In

later print runs the Black Rubric was incorporated into the body text, becoming the fourth of seven rubrics following the order of communion.

Changes to liturgy, as with other innovations wrought by Reformation, were justified by means of a denunciation of medieval and contemporary Catholic practice as corrupt and at variance with God's word. However, Protestant self-differentiation was haunted by the strange resemblance of the new to the old. As Wills writes of Protestant iconoclasm:

> By rejecting the image as a form of idolatry it [ie Protestantism] sought to return to a form of divine presence that preceded figural representation. But the existence of the artificial image was a condition of possibility of Protestantism's iconoclasm; it was able to depart from orthodoxy only because there never was a presence untouched by representational departures.[18]

A similar case might be made for the preference for the vernacular over Latin, both for scripture and liturgy. Like its iconoclasm, the Reformation's vernacular revolution generated a fantasy of authenticity and unmediated access to God, of interpretive emancipation beyond ecclesiastical Latinity. However, this vision of a return to the divine presence proliferated anxious justifications of the continued dependence on man-made, that is prosthetic things – rites and ceremonies, books and texts. As Wills notes in *Prosthesis*, distinguishing '"necessary" contrivance' from '"willful" artifice' is hard to do and, accordingly, Reformation innovation was attended by a fraught controversy about what practices or words should be cut away and what 'devices' should take their place.[19] Indeed, how could man-made forms be legitimated at all? The troubling recognition of necessary artifice existed alongside a dream of naturalisation. The effusion of words, just when the paths to truth had purportedly been cleared, engulfed reformed debate in fears of a return to older, rejected cultures of figuration that turned out to be all too proximate.

The *Book of Common Prayer* was an instrument, if not an engine of the Reformation in England and was itself prosthetic in Wills' sense. Liturgical books had always, of course, stood in for the embodied rite they described. Liturgy and liturgical books were not the same thing but were hard to distinguish; what was written was liturgically enacted. The new *Book of Common Prayer* replaced a diversity of Catholic missals, breviaries and primers just as, correspondingly, the English service replaced older Latin rituals. If in 1549

an ecology of books was replaced by a single volume, that volume was not meant to gather supplements or extra textual apparatus; every new version thoroughly supplanted the last, even if it reinstated older redactions or wrote out recent additions.

Each new edition was a prosthetic substitute which both cancelled and yet resembled what had gone before. In its use of the vernacular, the first 1549 edition represented a profound shift in ritual practice. However, after 1552 it would be recognised as merely a staging post on the road to more drastic reform. Although the first edition translated, through that act it also paradoxically perpetuated the forms of the toppled Sarum Use. In contrast, the second edition more thoroughly rewrote the inherited text and rethought liturgical acts, objects and their meanings. For example, the second edition more radically voided the communion elements of their substantial divinity by, for example, insisting on their resemblance to other food. Yet, for all its difference, the 1552 edition continued the task begun by the 1549 *Book*, of naturalising new liturgy in parishioners' lives, augmenting the effect of translation, which brought Church liturgy into parishioners' present and immediate understanding.

The Black Rubric is a metonym for the technics of common prayer thus described. Like words in English, kneeling was made radically ordinary by the Rubric's clarification of Eucharistic theology. Yet, although the Rubric was designed to settle the question of whether medieval liturgical practice had really been cut away, confusingly it also brought no appreciable difference; substituted arrangements looked strikingly similar to what had gone before. Human bodies would move in the same ways but now with corrected meanings, articulating the new grammar of Eucharistic theology which dislocated Christ's body from the communion elements. Furthermore the Rubric materially disrupts the *Book* into which it is tipped and, as a residue of dispute, indeed a dispute shadowed by violence, also threatened the uniformity of the Protestant communion which the *Book* described, the *common*-ness which was its *raison d'être*. The Black Rubric attempted to salve, but also permanently recorded, a point of soreness between Protestant positions, a corollary of the competition to set the character of the new English rite.

On the question of whose victory the Rubric represents, Diarmaid MacCulloch writes:

> The idea that this addition to the text was a victory for Knox and a defeat for Cranmer started very early [ie 1554 …] However, it is mysterious why any less partisan observer has ever regarded this text as symbolizing a defeat for Cranmer. The rubric exactly represents his Eucharistic theology as it had been openly expressed since 1548.[20]

In one sense MacCulloch is right: after all, the Rubric enabled Cranmer's position on kneeling, retaining it at the sacrament, and Knox himself articulated a disappointment about its retention. The Rubric did little more than resign Knox to his defeat. He tells his ex-congregation in Berwick that he will comply with the injunction, and that they should too, if

> magistrates mak known (as that they have done if ministers were willing to do thair dewities) that kneling is not reteyned in the Lord's Souper for maintenance of anye superstitioun, […] but onlye for uniforme order to be kept, and that for a tyme, in this Church of England.[21]

Grudgingly Knox accepts the expedient. Whilst his first parenthesis – 'if ministers […]' – grumbles its mistrust of those ministering the sacrament and charged by the Rubric to re-educate their congregations, his second – 'and that for a tyme' – is more optimistic, holding on to a hope that the godly prince will wake up and finish the work of reform.

However, the uniformity of the *Book* mattered, and this MacCulloch misses. Although the Rubric did not disrupt Cranmer's Eucharistic theology, it did disrupt the integrity of his *Book*. As Lorrimer notes '[a]ll readers could see at once that [the Black Rubric] was an extra leaf, and that the insertion of it had been an afterthought carried into effect at the last moment'.[22] The Rubric was deforming, extraneous, superfluous and untidy and yet it was to be inserted even amongst the pages concerning the central ceremony of the rite, the communion service, which was meant to actuate spiritual unity.

In his letter to the Privy Council, Cranmer complains that amendments will necessarily be external to the authorised *Book*, which was, he said: 'past by Act of Parliament, and sealed with the great seal [...] read and approved by the whole State of the Realm, in the High Court of Parliament, with the King's majesty his royal assent'.[23] Amendment threatened to break 'the bridle of obedience and [...] the bond of all Princes' laws'.[24] Correspondingly, whilst the Act of Uniformity *looks* as if it is part of the *Book*'s added-on

prefatory matter, as Peter Blayney describes it the situation is rather the other way around: the first sealed copy of the *Book* was literally attached to a copy of the Act, and, when it went to print, the whole *Book* became, and was explicitly understood as thus 'annexed and joyned' to the *a priori* authority that gave it being.[25] For Cranmer, amendment was external to the law that animated the rite. Thus the inclusion of the Black Rubric over-rode his principal objection. The Black Rubric was a postliminary, included reluctantly and with none of the exuberant wit that attends the contemporary 'Renaissance collages' recently described by other scholars of the material text.[26] Cranmer regretted and resisted it as an addition which threatened his project with hybridity and instability and which resembled the inconsistency of the medieval liturgical books that he intended his to replace.[27]

In his edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*, Brian Cummings suggests that the loose-leaf Rubric always appears in the same position in relevant volumes, but this is far from being the case.[28] The scale of production of the *Book of Common Prayer* – a copy went into every parish church and others into private use – prevented a stable positioning of this single leaf. When it appears, it shifts and moves, depending on the local decisions of individuals charged with the task of attaching this unruly appendage to a huge number of volumes, some of which were already in distribution. For example, the British Library has fourteen copies of the 1552-3 *Book of Common Prayer*, my sample for this essay, three of which have the Rubric as a loose leaf; only one of those three has it where Cummings suggests it will be found and closest to where it would eventually be assimilated: after the communion service and with the original rubrics (C.36.l.18; STC 16279). One of the others (C.36.l.16; STC 16281) presents it *before* the order of Communion and separately from the other rubrics, as if given greater precedence over them and, indeed, the service itself. Interestingly this positioning does not look like a one-off mistake, given that a copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library (PML 17309.1; also STC 16281), according to the library's catalogue, also has the Rubric before the communion, between Signatures N and O. Yet this apparent consistency is not found in either the copy in St John's College Cambridge library (A.4.12(1); STC 16281), which either never acquired or has lost its annexed notice, or the Bodleian Library copy (Bodleian Douce C.P. d.1552.2; STC 16281, digitised for Early

English Books Online), which is an idiosyncratic and, so, incomparable composite of print and manuscript in which the Black Rubric is written in by hand. Figure one is a photograph of the Rubric in the other British Library example (RB.23.b.1976; STC 16281.5; p. 00) where it appears as part of the paratext, before the prices at the back. A comparable copy in the Huntington Library (STC 16281.5, digitised for Early English Books Online) has the Black Rubric after the communion service where it is usually said to be, although peculiarly on the verso side of the insert, facing the beginning of the baptism service which follows in the *Book*.

Obviously enough, when the Rubric is appended to a book as an inserted slip, it disrupts the volume's pagination.[29] However, the foliation is also disrupted in several places in those volumes in which the Rubric has taken up its eventual position. Whilst the pagination is erratic elsewhere in these copies, too, it is notable that one of the consistent sites of disruption is around the Black Rubric, indicating that a vestigial insecurity attends its incorporation.[30] The settlement of this numbering issue, however, still did not resolve the Rubric's place in the *Book*: it was excised in 1559 and re-assimilated, although radically revised, in 1662. In the nineteenth century, the Black Rubric acquired its evocative but paradoxical name because it was printed in black rather than red letter, distinguishing it from true, literally-rubricated rubrics which instructed on how to conduct the liturgy; the Black Rubric then became an external aside, rather than an integral part of the rite.[31] Even in the twentieth century the Rubric held an uncertain place; a draft revision of 1927 puts it after the 1662 communion service, whereas the 1928 version placed it after the exhortations. The Rubric is a prosthesis which is repeatedly and uncomfortably affixed.

Cranmer's 'Preface' to the *Book of Common Prayer* sets itself against the 'greate diuersitie' of liturgical texts produced predominantly in a manuscript culture: 'curates shall nede none other bokes for their publyke seruice, but thys boke' unlike in 'tyme paste' (a ii verso). David Wills argues that printing divorced the hand from the word, establishing text as more distinctly prosthetic in the age of printing.[32] However, the Black Rubric reminds us that print production renewed the relationship between the hand and the codex book; books were still sewn and pasted by hand. Furthermore of course, type and image were hand

set and pressed. The printing process, for all its difference from manuscript production, still relied on manual work and its larger scale amplified and solidified the quirks that work by hand admitted. For example, some of the copies of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* unaccountably included, presumably instead of a printer's emblem, a full-page woodcut of the Virgin Mary with her Latin names and emblems from Canticles, carried over from the printed Sarum primers which the *Book of Common Prayer* was intended to displace but which print had already made irrepressible.[33] Readers, and especially lay readers, are wilful creatures and their diverse tastes drove a mixed market for devotional materials which, despite being packaged into 'lines', nonetheless became similarly mixed in printers' premises.[34]

Furthermore, even 'correct' texts found mixed use. Consider, for example, the British Library copy of the 1552 prayer book which carries numerous manuscript erasures of King Edward in favour of Queen Mary (C.25.l.3; STC 16285); the pronouns are also accordingly changed from masculine to feminine in spite of Marian precept which would repeal the book and reintroduce the Sarum Mass. Another copy (C.24.a.2) replaces Edward with James, despite its being superseded by an Elizabethan edition in 1559. The Black Rubric is an expression of anxiety about such misuse, an anxiety produced in tension with the fantasy of correctness and transparency which printing falsely fed.

Dispute did not only jeopardise the *Book*, it also threatened to translate into Church services. Cranmer notes that communicants should be kneeling during the two prayers before, and the two after reception of the sacrament. In his letter to the Privy Council Cranmer says he knows of no 'inconvenience' – that is, disagreement – about why kneeling during those prayers should be changed. If communicants were to kneel for those, then get up to receive the sacrament and then kneel down again immediately afterwards, the effect would 'rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament'.[35] Current dissent – 'inconvenience' – would then, if kneeling at the sacrament were to be abolished, be translated into congregations' inverted rising and lowering, the most sacred parts of the rite being incongruently attended by the least reverent postures. Tellingly the 'Preface' to the *Book of Common Prayer* uses the same word, 'inconveniences', for the multiple versions of the Latin rite; the row risked the

resurrection of a medieval culture of 'inconvenience' with its 'manyfolde chaungynges of the seruyce' (a ii recto-verso), which was evident in its cluttered textual forms.

One of the ways the Black Rubric readmitted medieval textual untidiness was in its unnecessary repetition. The notice on kneeling duplicated the opening of a new preamble added to the 1552 book: 'Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some reteined'. This was appended to ease transition from the more modest reforms of the 1549 edition but also, crucially, to justify continuity; it, too, was already doing the work which the Rubric would do. This preface on ceremonies, like the Black Rubric, stressed that the need for 'unitie and co[n]corde' trumped 'innouacions and newe fanglenes', but did not rule out future renovation: ceremonies '(upon iuste causes) may be altered and chaunged, and therefore are not to be estemed equal with gods law' (a iiii verso). Yet, when it comes, the Rubric does not concede kneeling as adiaphorous but prioritises uniformity above all, hanging on to an ideal which the row about kneeling hardly helped to achieve.

The indifference expressed in the 1552 preface 'Of Ceremonies' is also notably absent from Cranmer's letter of objection to the Privy Council. He protests that '[i]f such men [as protest kneeling at the sacrament] should be heard – although the book were made every year anew, yet it should not lack faults in their opinion'.[36] These limitless imagined annual revisions are nothing to the ramifications, however, of removing kneeling and capitulating to Knox's scripturalism: 'take away the whole Book of Service; for what should men travell to set in order in the form of service, if no order can be got but that is already prescribed by Scripture?'. Because it brooks 'such men' as Knox, the attachment of the Rubric opens the prospect of the *Book*'s infinite reissue, which staves off but does not remove the graver threat of its complete negation.

When it comes, the Rubric opens by setting itself an impossible task of avoiding unavoidable misunderstanding:

> Although no order can be so perfectly deuised, but it maie be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmitie, or els of malice and obstinacie, misconstrued, depraued, and interpreted in a wrong part: and yet because brotherly charitie

> willeth, that so muche as conueniently maie be, offences should be taken awaie: therfore, we willyng to do the same (O i recto).

The vernacular translation of liturgy reinvented communicants as readers and yet they might be incompetent or sinful and accidentally or deliberately mistake the plain sense. The fiction of the mid-sixteenth-century reform movement, that even lay readers could now immediately apprehend true forms – the right meanings of gestures, the natural substance of the communion elements, the true nature of Christ's presence – was troubled by the fact of readerly (mis)interpretation.

This statement resembled and nearly repeats another which starts the *Book*'s original 'Preface', devised for the first edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* and duly carried into the second: 'There was neuer anye thynge by the wytte of man so wel deuised, or so sure established, whiche (in continuaunce of tyme) hath not been corrupted' (Sig a ii recto). However, in the reworking, an observation – 'there never was anything' – becomes a prodromal condition – 'no order can be so perfectly deuised' – to which any attempt at reform is depressingly subject. The opening to the Rubric has none of the economy of the similar point in the 'Preface'; its *enumeratio* and *synonymia* make it swelling and excessive; there are four causes of erroneousness and three close synonyms for misinterpretation as if, in the time between their respective composition, the problem of corruption and misconception has become aggravated. The Rubric is also more pointedly trained on the question of reading; diversity of interpretation is now an especially selected category of degeneration.

The corresponding statement from the 'Preface' was itself a reworking, a translation from Cardinal Quiñones Roman Breviary (1536) which was commissioned, although later suppressed, by the Catholic Church: 'There was never anything by man so well devised which could not later be rendered more perfect by the added insight of many'.[37] Cranmer's modification for the 'Preface' turns Quiñones' defence of liturgical revision upside-down, into an invective against perceived Catholic accretions but also holds within it a broader pessimism about ensuring a correct reception for anything. Thus the 'Preface' to the *Book of Common Prayer* measures the considerable distance between contemporary liturgy and what was

instituted in the early Church. If even the arrangements made by the Church Fathers had decayed, what hope was there for contemporary liturgists? A similar pessimism is carried into the Rubric but is newly fixed to the problem of lay reading.

Both of these quotations, from the opening to the Black Rubric and the 'Preface', deploy the same word 'deuised', demonstrating a self-consciousness that the new *Book* and the rite it describes are prosthetic. In the sixteenth century, 'devise' and its nounal form, 'device', were closer than their Modern English counterparts to their cognates 'divide' and 'division'.[38] In using it Cranmer self-declaredly creates a 'device', partitioning the past and the present, rather than rebuilding one within the other; his work was analogous to, but was not a faithful reconstruction of that of the Church Fathers. The word 'device' had always had a figurative application, as when it was used in heraldry for instance, but in the context of Reformation its less material sense, of something feigned or untrue, was gathering an increasingly pejorative weight.[39] 'Devised' translates Quiñones' 'elaboratum' and the 'Preface' might have made the argument that devising or division was a Catholic practice, corrupting or departing from the truer arrangements of the primitive Church. Instead the 'Preface' owns the word and thus articulates an admiration for, as much as a correction of Quiñones' project which centred a revised rite on scripture, just as Cranmer did albeit on scripture in vernacular translation.

Knox uses the negative sense of 'device' when he advises his Berwick supporters on how to follow the Rubric without compromising their consciences. He suggests that, whilst outwardly compliant, they should be always

> thristing and praying, in the mean season, that God of his great mercy for Christ his Sons saik please so to move and illuminatt the harts and ees of magistrates and rulers that they mott understand and see Christis institutioun to be most perfitt, and men's *devises* and wisdom in maters of religioun ever to have displeased God; that by contemplation thereof they may studie to eradicate and pull out all such plants as the hevinlie Father hathe not planted.[40]

Knox's discussion is also cut through with an explicit awareness of the confectedness of ritual. The image of plants pulled up from their roots is from Matthew 15.13 and it was often used in this context; Thomas Becon, Cranmer's personal chaplain, uses it for example in his 'Diuersitie between Gods word and Mannes

Inuention' in which he described how to differentiate man's dead 'inventions' from God's living word.[41] Knox turns the quotation into a prayer for 'magistrates and rulers' who could be, but in his view are not yet exactly, agents of God.

The Rubric, though, was very explicitly a 'device' and, as such, principally concerned with division:

> Wheras it is ordeined in the boke of Common prayer, in the administracion of the Lordes Supper, that the Communicantes knelyng, should receiue the holy Communion, whiche thyng beyng well ment, for a significacio[n] of the humble and gratefull acknowlegyng of the benefites of Christe, giuen unto the worthye receiuor, and to auoyde the prophanacion and disorder, whiche aboute the holy Communion might els ensue, lest yet the same knelyng might be thought, or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoracion is doen, or ought to be doen, either unto the Sacramentall bread or wine there bodily receiued, or unto any reall and essencial presence there beyng, of Christes naturall fleshe and bloude. For as concernynge the Sacramentall bread and wine, thei remaine still in their uery naturall substaunces, and therfore maie not be adored, for that were Ydolatrye, to be abhorred of all faithfull Christians: and as concernynge the naturall body and bloud of our sauiour Christ, thei are in heauen, and not here, for it is against the truthe of Christes true naturall body, to be in mo places then in one, at one tyme. (O i recto-verso)

More space is given here to the task of stripping out than to in-filling. The Rubric's denial of transubstantiation is prolix, repetitive even, as it empties kneeling at communion of its medieval referent. This denial surgically separates each thing from others, using the key word 'naturall', which is repeated four times. Just as the communion bread and wine remain fixed and stable matter, so the act of kneeling must be understood in the correct way, as only itself. The phrase 'reall and essencial' is a strong one and is contradicted by a great deal of work on Cranmer's complex and changing understandings of a real presence. [42] It was sufficiently disliked to be altered in 1662 to 'corporeal'. Whilst detaching scholastic theories of essence, which arguably it mischaracterises, the Black Rubric also cuts close to reformed orthodoxy and its own 'reall'.[43] Kneeling is a transitive act and the Rubric's out-cutting risked leaving the gesture ungrammatical. In case the gesture looked inauthentic or insincere, therefore, the Rubric allows kneeling to indicate gratitude for Christ's 'benefits', a word which is judiciously broad. The rest of the passage indicates what kneeling does not mean and what it will avoid, rather than enable or create. The

question of how Christ was present at communion was not to be answered on a single leaf and consensus was thus largely achieved over what could be annulled, rather than what should be set in its place.

Both Cranmer and Knox's central charge against the other is that their proposed arrangements are inauthentic inventions, dangerously remote from God's word and dangerously close to idolatrous pre-Reformation or contemporary Catholic forms. At the same time they both accept that necessarily there is a devised or prosthetic element within their own proposals which they authorise with recourse, in Knox's case, directly to scripture and, in Cranmer's, a state machinery whose divine institution is described in scripture. If the Black Rubric bridged these positions, it did so uneasily. Knox's objection, which he severally repeats, is that kneeling is already '*joyned* with certan dangears' and not least the perceived aura of the communion elements.[44] In Knox's view, kneeling is self-evidently a relic of confected Catholicism. Indeed, it is so obvious that even a Catholic would see it:

> 'Your knelying, which you have of us,' shall the Papystes say, 'hath no more firmament in Godde's worde than our ceremonies that ye have abolyshed. The profit that cometh of your knelyng is nowhere in Godde's word expressed, but only in the imagination of your awne braynes'.[45]

Knox gives his imaginary Catholic his scripturalism as a base from which potentially to re-authorise the whole panoply of abolished ceremonies. Pitting God's word against the imagination of Protestant 'braynes' makes kneeling weightless and rootless; it might just as easily be removed as retained.

Knox recommends instead a more radical amputation than that which is set out in the *Book*. If kneeling is retained, he writes to the Privy Council,

> The idolatour is permytted to do that thinge that his heart most thresteth after, that is, to adore and wershippe suche thynges as, there, be subjecte to his senses – which Christeane charitie no wyse maye abyde. For albeit that in man's powre it lyeth not to porge their hearts from idolatry, yet ought the cyvill magistrate to cut awaye all externall appearance thereof to the uttermost of his power.[46]

Medical language, of surgery and purgation, dominates Knox's assessment. Idolatrous hearts thirst after an error which he says, just beyond this passage, 'feedythe the same in the heartes of men'.[47] Cutting away the source of false nourishment will serve the same purpose as a more difficult purgation, a purgation which

the Rubric says it attempts for 'brotherly charitie'. For Knox, 'charitie' is less tolerant; 'the cyvill magistrate' should recognise the limitations of his power over hearts nurtured by error, attending instead to the excision of external forms that will constrain those hearts anyway.

Cranmer's 'Of Ceremonies', also uses the language of out-cutting:

> Of suche Ceremonies as be vsed in the church, & haue had their beginning by ye institutio[n] of man: some at the first were of Godly entent & purpose deuised, and yet at length turned to vanitie & supersticio[n]: some entred into the church by vndiscrete deuocio[n], and such a zeale as was without knowledge, & for because thei were winked at in the beginning, thei grewe daily to more & more abuses: whiche not onely for their vnprofitablenesse, but also because thei haue much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut awaie, & clene reiected. (a.iii.verso)

Medieval ritual accretion is intricately imagined here: the corruption of good, indeed divine intentions are distinguished from newer additions; in time, man-made institutions take on an aggressive monstrous or cancerous quality, growing 'daily' not just 'more' but 'more *& more*'. Eyes are the affected organ; a complacent tolerance, figured as winking, later culminates in a complete blindness to God. The purity and completeness of the right surgical response to this metastasis is signalled in the unnecessary emphatic adjective 'clene'. Yet the *Book*'s claim, comprehensively to 'cut awaie & clene reject...' Catholic artifice, was not quite true in the case of kneeling at the sacrament. Instead, the Black Rubric attempts a more intricate and intimate re-education, by replacing the old with a disturbingly close replica.

The contemporary surgeon Ambroise Paré, to turn to a figure that is central to David Wills' assessment of sixteenth-century medical innovation, would write later in the century of extraneous growths and cancers:

> for we know whether or no, the externall parts are affected with a tumor against nature, by comparing that with his naturall which is contrary. For comparing the sound part with the diseased, wee shall easily judge whether it be swollen, or no.
>
> But because it is not sufficient for a Chirurgion onely to know these general signes (which are knowne even to the vulgar) he must attentively observe such as are more proper and nere.[48]

Everybody, even 'the vulgar', can read off the difference between the healthy and the diseased body. The problem for Cranmer was that there was no comparative healthy body; he would have to rely on more occult indicators, beyond 'general signes', and try to carry the 'vulgar' reader.

By removing Christ's natural body from the rite and downgrading the elements of the communion to the status of tokens but, at the same time, retaining kneeling, Cranmer moved the service of communion into the terrain of Catholic image theory, which placed an onus on the viewer, kneeling before an image, to worship aright. In his search for good readers, Cranmer implicitly expects to mobilise the distinctions which were already well known, in Paré's words, 'even to the vulgar' in relation to the icon. This, for example, is a quotation from Reginald Pecock's defence of image worship from the middle of the fifteenth century:

> ydolatrie is neuere doon, saue whanne a man takith a creature for his God and worschipith thilk creature as for his God; but so doith no man with eny ymage now in Cristendoom, aftir that the man is come into ȝeeris of discrecioun and is passid childhode, and which is not a natural fool. Forwhi, if of eny of hem it be askid, whether this ymage is god in heuen, which made al thing, and which was euer withoute bigynnyng, and was therfore eer this ymage was maad; he wole seie anoon, that this ymage is not he, but that this ymage is the ymage of him.[49]

Like the Rubric, this acknowledges there will be those who misread, although Pecock makes their number dismissively small, supposing they could only be children or 'natural fool[s]'. Just as the Rubric does, Pecock also locates God firmly in heaven; images are only themselves and do not represent God's physical relocation. For Pecock there is an obviousness about the distinction between images and the divinity they depict, reminiscent of the obviousness which Paré reports about the outline of the natural body disrupted by an external tumour.

In the absence of a natural body as a point of comparison, Cranmer looks to Catholic example. Writing to John Calvin in March 1552, Cranmer despairs that '[o]ur adversaries are now holding their councils at Trent for the establishment of their errors […] They are, as I am informed, making decrees respecting the worship of the host'. In contrast, the Reformed Church was in disarray, neither meeting nor writing agreed doctrine:

> It cannot escape your prudence, how exceedingly the church of God has been injured by dissensions and varieties of opinion respecting this sacrament of unity; and though they are now in some measure removed, yet I could wish for an agreement in this doctrine, not only as regards the subject itself [*rebus ipsis*], but also with respect to the words and forms of expression [*verbis et loquendi formulis*].[50]

In an inverted system of signification, the lack of reformist consensus is articulated by a dislocation between the thing itself and the words and spoken formulae that might stand in for it. Catholics were finding a corporate integrity which the international reform movement could not. The row on kneeling later that same year exacerbated the discord which uncoupled words from their referents. If the *Book* was a figure for the rite, at the centre of which was the sacrament of supposed unity, then amendment to the *Book*, as a relic of disunity, jeopardised the whole project of *common* prayer and, with it, the integrity of the reformed Communion.

The bad readers imagined by the Rubric are broadly conceived – 'either for their ignorance and infirmitie, or els of malice and obstinacie' – so that their number might include clerical dissenters, frustrated at the slow pace of liturgical change, as much as lay people, failing to keep up. Abolishing kneeling or revising the *Book* admitted the influence of those readers, whom Cranmer dismissively identifies in his letter to the Privy Council as 'glorious and unquiet spirits'.[51] This resonant phrase is reminiscent of the 'petulant spirits' (*petulantia ingenia*) forbidden by the fourth session of the Council of Trent (1546) from presuming to construe the scriptures in contravention of the Church's interpretation, relying solely on their own knowledge (*suae prudentiae innixus*).[52]

Cranmer's liturgy was indeed part of Protestantism's 'open revolt against the established authority of the [Roman] Church', as David Wills characterises it, and yet Cranmer sought, as others charged with managing the English Reformation had done, not strictly to break that authority but to transplant it, reconstructing it for use by an English monarch. The classic exposition of these substitutions – of which Cranmer's position is reminiscent – was Stephen Gardiner's *De vera obedientia* (1535) which developed obedience, rather than faith alone, as a justification for the royal supremacy.[53] Gardiner, tasked with legitimating the English split from Rome under Henry VIII, insists on the close correlation between

'Realm' and 'Church', the former being the latter plus 'Iewes Barbarianes Saracenes' and 'Turkes'. Henry's legitimate rule over those within the realm who were united by their faith – ie the Church – ought to be acknowledged or he would be a king only of an unfaithful community. '[T]he termynge of wordes', that is the 'diuersitie of names', has turned 'the nature of the thinges themselues vpside downe'.[54] Putting aside the unnaturalness of words reveals the true correspondence between the English Church and the body politic. Gardiner drew his conviction, that princes were 'substituted me[n] […] put in autoritie as [God's] vicegerentes', 'representours of his Image unto men', from the 'most pure and cleare fountaine' of scripture itself.[55] Gardiner explicitly trains his exegesis on the extraction and transfer of divine authority from Rome to the English king.

Cranmer, in his turn, was used to understanding himself as an a 'substituted' man, an agent not only of the crown but, because the king was God's surrogate on earth, also of God himself; this was the way he was depicted, for example, on the title page to the 1539 Great Bible, disseminating to the people below him the *verbum Dei*, which he received from the king above him, who received it, in turn, from God at the very apex of the page.[56] Collapsing these staged transfers, a seventeenth-century annotator of one of the British Library's copies of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* credits Cranmer's defence of the Reformation with being 'in every poynt agreeable to the word of God: as to be in effect the verie same' (flyleaf, C.25.h.5; STC 16288). Cranmer's defence of kneeling, then, was not authorised solely by the imagination of his 'awne brayne', to repeat Knox's terms; in his view, his divine appointment was already exegetically proved and the devices which he now instituted might be prosthetic but they came, by right of his office, from God.

In his letter to the Council, Cranmer works hard to impute that Knox has little sense of the artificiality of his own position; whilst the scriptures were God-given, they were translated by fallible scribes. Cranmer attacks Knox's notion that a strict imitation of Christ and his apostles could bring communicants into God's presence, given that determining the gestures used at the Last Supper relied upon translations of scripture which only approximated its literal sense. Invariably, Cranmer notes, English

translators chose to translate the reclining stance assumed at communal meals in the gospels as sitting down, for example at the Last Supper and the feeding of the five thousand, invoking for contemporary Christians modern dining postures rather than foreign and ancient ones. Cranmer argues that the literal translation of gospel texts straight into the rite would be un-English, admitting the disorderly foreign habits of 'Tartars and Turks'. His objection is strikingly reminiscent of Gardiner's complaint, which I cited above, about the undue influence of non-Christians if the 'Church' were not to be considered a synonym for the 'Realm'.

Thus Cranmer alleges that Knox's objection falls between two logical positions: his own pragmatic remoulding of familiar contemporary practice and a fully authentic but alienating reconstruction of apostolic example. Cranmer's point alleges Knox's recourse to the gospel is itself a relative reverence, charging him with an idolatry which treated the word, and the translated word at that, as icon. As Thomas Moreton, Bishop of Chester, was to write, when he took up the defence of kneeling in the early seventeenth century, the scriptures 'are but lines of Inck, are Creatures [...] and are Signes expressing vnto vs the Truth of God'.[57] However, logocentrism was not Knox's only base for preferring sitting. Indeed, Cranmer misunderstands Knox's position. '[K]nelyng is no gesture meete at the Table', Knox writes to the Privy Council.[58] In this recourse to the discourse of manners he argues not that sitting is *more* natural but that it is *less* so; 'we somtymes by nature were the sonnes of Godde's wrathe', that is '[d]ejected […] in our owne syght'; given this, kneeling, as the posture of beggars, might well have been 'meete'. Cranmer and Knox agree, then, that kneeling is the more normal gesture. Yet, Knox continues with reference to Romans 8, God 'hath appoynted us to be his heares [heirs], when yitt we were not'.[59] Invited to eat and drink at dinner as 'sonnes and inherytours' of God, in fellowship with Christ, it would be rude for communicants to kneel, rather than sit. This argument, that God's grace overturns the principles of natural law, did not require a literal translation of the Greek gospels. Quoting scripture in both Latin and English in his letter to the Council, Knox's unthinking code-switching shows no interest in the Greek of the gospels. The vernacular Bible brought the Last Supper into the everyday lives of contemporary Christians, translating

not the letter but the spirit of a meal between familiars. Knox, too, had a prosthetic imagination but one that rested on a relationship between the elect and God. Posture should articulate not a literal interpretation of the gospels but, rather, the communicants' election which, in the end, was a more correct reading. This position is similar to that described by James Simpson in relation to William Tyndale's soteriology and its attendant theory of reading: for evangelicals '[l]ection presupposes election'.[60]

The Englishing of the whole rite brought it into line with those parts of the Sarum rite, such as the marriage service for example, which were conducted in the vernacular to ensure inner consent. Christian lives had always been structured by liturgy, incorporating births, marriages and deaths into the ritual round, joining two different chronological arcs, of the lifecycle and the liturgical year. The new rite standardised and translated, bringing those conjoined arcs into the present of parishioners, allowing but – as Ramie Targoff reminds us – also compelling a more incorporated response to proceedings.[61] The Rubric acted on and re-inscribed people's bodies. Whilst violence and the threat of violence has always kept writers and readers in check, the process of translating the rite and, indeed, the Bible removed a system which could also rely on its professional Latin literacy to supervise interpretation. Vernacularisation threw readers onto their own devices but in an interpretative culture in which violence put heavy physical pressure on words and how they should be understood.[62] Even Cranmer himself, in the 'Preface' to the *Book* recognises that the new imperative to read might be 'painfull, because that all thynges muste be read vpon the booke, where as before […] they [ie ministers] could saye many thynges by heart' but he urges ministers thus subject to the word beyond their bodies not to 'refuse the payne' (a ii verso). In this plain statement about the prosthetic character of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the practice of liturgy is deliberately dislocated from the heart and reattached to the new *Book*; text replaced habitus and not without hurt.

Knox advises his followers on how to order their hearts whilst outwardly conforming; they should use their time on their knees not 'for a significacio[n] of the humble and gratefull acknowlegyng of the benefites of Christe', as the Rubric suggests they should, but instead to think through their inner alienation from an order that is so 'contrary to your harts' desyre'. With its naked appeal for docile congregations

before state-held religious power, the Black Rubric forcibly divorces non-conformist hearts and knees. Knox is clear that such alienation is produced under threat; '[t]ransitorie life is not so sweate […] Nor yit is corporall deathe […] so fearfull' that he would not withstand the order, he says, but concludes that ceremonies or rites are 'thinges of smaller weyght' that he need not die to resist.[63] The Rubric, then, stands in for other coercive devices – perhaps of torture or execution – which, he implies, might have been deployed had he further withstood.

***

In conclusion, a consideration of the Rubric as prosthesis reframes it as a document which exerted a shaping force not only over the the *Book of Common Prayer* as a physical object, but also over human lives and bodies, the integrity of institutions and new theological arrangements. Its stuck-in nature is part of its significance; unexpected and extra-legal it was an add-on that the *Book* was never supposed to need. If before the Reformation kneeling activated the sacrament as a gestural acknowledgement of Christ's presence, after the Reformation in official English liturgy the same was true, not because of the transubstantiation of the communion elements but because the gesture articulated the Church's corporate unity within which Christ was thought to preside. However, dissent about kneeling exposed the problems of interpretive diversity and, at their logical extension, the threat of state violence and, so, the impossibility of perfect communion. That the Black Rubric was appended was a true victory for no one but, rather, a prosthetic expression of pain and dispute which threatened to deactivate the ideal of communion as it was articulated in the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Yet, on the other hand, a close consideration of the Black Rubric modifies Wills' idea of the prosthetic Reformation. The value of Wills' metaphor for rethinking periodisation is in his recognition that a reaction against the past paradoxically depends upon what has gone before as a 'condition of possibility'.[64] Wills particularly captures this in his discussion of Reformation iconoclasm and the strange resemblance of the new to the old, indeed the medieval. This strange resemblance does not deny the violence of the revolution but understands the difficulty of reconstruction and synthetic substitution. At

other points in his account of the mid-sixteenth century however, Wills writes an overly clarified diachronic narrative and this is particularly marked in his discussion of the move from manuscript to print, which he claims 'installed the whole problematics of reading and interpretation' and, further, the break with Rome which, in his blurring of England and France, risks an impression of history as emancipating.[65] This essay, on the other hand, offers a synchronic study that uses Wills' own argument, that there is and was 'no way back to a single natural origin, yet no way out of the appeals to and of the same', to challenge the diachronic clarity that imagines the years 1552-3 as a point of emergence for a modern age that 'might reasonably be called the age of prosthesis'.[66] The Black Rubric is a microcosm of the dialectical relationship between the Reformation and the pre-Reformation past; of the retention and repurposing of medieval authority, as much as its rejection and redaction; and of the difficulty, even after the invention of print, of producing correct texts for a project that relied for prosthetic support on the uniformity of books, their meanings and their use.

Birkbeck, University of London

†Acknowledgments. The initial research for this article was undertaken during a Leverhulme fellowship in 2011-12; I am grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for their support. I would also like to thank Mark Perrott; Sue Wiseman; Qona Wright at the British Library; Katie Walter, Margaret Healey and Chloe Porter at the University of Sussex and the anonymous readers and editorial staff at *Textual Practice* for their comments on and suggestions for this work.

---

[1] *The Book of Common Prayer* (London: Edward Whitchurche, 1552), STC 16280.5, Sig o i recto-verso. All quotation from the *Book of Common Prayer* will be from this version (chosen as an example from an early run with the Black Rubric assimilated into the body text) and hereafter cited in the text by signature number.
[2] For a discussion of its influence in the Elizabethan and Jacobean Churches, despite its absence from the 1559 prayer book, see Lori Anne Ferrell, 'Kneeling and the Body Politic', in *Religion, Literature and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*, ed. Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 70-92 (p. 76).
[3] Peter Lorrimer, *John Knox and the Church of England* (London: Henry S. King, 1875), p. 132.
[4] David Wills, *Prosthesis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 15.
[5] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 10.
[6] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 218.

[7] Wills, *Prosthesis*, pp. 218-19. Wills suggests the word first appears in 1553 in Thomas Wilson, *Arte of Rhetorique* (p. 223) Since the publication of *Prosthesis* the *Oxford English Dictionary* has added an earlier example, from 1550: Richard Sherry, *Treatise of schemes & tropes gathered out of the best grammarians & oratours*. *Oxford English Dictionary* online edition. Prosthesis n. 1. [Accessed 2 March 2016].
[8] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 219.
[9] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 219. See also the extended discussion of Luther's ninety-five theses as material text and the possible mythography around the action of their being nailed up, Brian Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 30-8.
[10] The quotation comes from James Kearney, *The Incarnate Text: Imagining the Book in Reformation England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), p. 18 but see, also, Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation*, eg. p. 15-16.
[11] Brian Cummings ed., *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. xiii.
[12] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 525; Francis Procter and Walter Howard Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of Its Offices* (London, Macmillan, 1907), p. 80.
[13] Peter Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501-1557*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), II, pp. 743-5; MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 525-6.
[14] Lorrimer, *Knox*, pp. 97-8.
[15] Cranmer's letter to the Privy Council can be read in John Henry Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (London: Rivingtons, 1866), pp. xxxi-xxxii. The two letters by Knox are both published in Lorrimer, *Knox*, pp. 251-74.
[16] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 119.
[17] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company*, II, p. 744.
[18] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 232.
[19] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 15.
[20] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 528. The most recent article on the kneeling dispute particularly in relation to John Knox follows MacCulloch on this point: Iain R. Torrance, 'A Particular Reformed Piety: John Knox and the Posture at Communion', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 67 (2014): pp. 400-13 (p. 402).
[21] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 261.
[22] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 119.
[23] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. xxxi.
[24] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. xxxii.
[25] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company*, II, p. 743.
[26] See the special edition on 'Renaissance Collages' of *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 45 (2015).
[27] On the question of 'hybrid' books see, for example, Juliet Fleming, 'The Renaissance Collage: Signcutting and Signsewing', *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 45 (2015): pp. 443-456 (p. 446).
[28] Cummings ed., *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 794.
[29] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 119.
[30] See, for example STC 16285; 16285a; 16286; 16286.2.
[31] Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck eds., *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 25 and 563. Some commentators suggest that the Black Rubric is so called because other rubrics were printed in red in 1552. See, for example, Torrance, 'A Particular Reformed Piety', p. 402 and MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 527. None of the sixteenth-century books I have consulted print rubrics in red.
[32] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 220.
[33] STC 16279 and 16280.5.
[34] For a discussion of these 'lines', see Mary C. Erler, '*The Maner to Lyue Well* and the Coming of English in François Regnault's Primers of the 1520s and 1530s', *The Library*, s6-VI (1984): pp. 229-43 (p. 230).
[35] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. xxxii.
[36] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. xxxi.

[37] 'Nihil enim humano elaboratum ingenio, tam exactum initio unquam fuit, quin postea, multorum accedente judicio, perfectius reddi posit'. Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 15. The translation is from MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 225.
[38] *OED*, Devise v. 1.
[39] *OED*, Devise v. 7b. See also Device n. 7b.
[40] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 263; my emphasis.
[41] Thomas Becon, *Worckes* (London: John Day, 1560-4), Sig XXXX.x.iiij.
[42] See, for example, MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 181-2.
[43] On its mischaracterisation of Catholic Eucharistic theology, see Cummings ed. *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 794-5 and for a full discussion of debates over the real presence in relation to Reformation semiotics, see Judith H. Anderson, *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), eg. pp. 45-6.
[44] Lorrimer, *Knox*, pp. 261 and 263.
[45] Lorrimer, *Knox*, pp. 270-1.
[46] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 268.
[47] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 268.
[48] Cited here in the English translation of 1634. Ambroise Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*, trans. Th: Johnson (London: Th: Cotes and R. Young, 1634), STC 19189. Book VII, chapter III, pp. 250-1, Sig. Y5 verso-Y6 recto.
[49] Reginald Pecock, *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*, ed. Charles Babington, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1860), I, pp. 148-9.
[50] Thomas Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. John Edmund Cox, Parker Society, 16 (1846), pp. 431-3.
[51] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. xxxi.
[52] Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols (New York: Harper, 1889), II. *The History of the Creeds*, p. 83.
[53] C. D. C. Armstrong, 'Gardiner, Stephen (*c.*1495x8–1555)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [Accessed 2 March 2016].
[54] Cited here in a translation attributed to John Bale, Stephen Gardiner, *De vera obedientia An oration made in Latine, by the right Reuerende father in God Stephan bishop of Winchestre, now Lorde Chauncelour of Englande* (Rome: J. Lambrecht? For Hugh Singleton, 1553), STC 11587, Sig Di, recto and verso – Dii recto.
[55] Gardiner, *De vera obedientia*, sig. C vii recto-verso.
[56] *The Byble in English* (Paris: Francis Regnault; London: Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1539); STC 2068.
[57] Thomas Moreton, *A Defence of the Innocencie of the three ceremonies of the Church of England viz. The Surplice, Crosse after Baptisme, and Kneeling at the receiving of the blessed Sacrament* (London: R. Field for William Barret, 1618); STC 18179, p. 277.
[58] Lorrimer, *Knox*, p. 271. Unreferenced quotations in this paragraph are from the same page.
[59] Lorrimer *Knox*, p. 258.
[60] James Simpson, *Burning to Read: English Fundamentalism and its Reformation Opponents* (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press, 2007), p. 108.
[61] Ramie Targoff, *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2001), esp. pp. 18-22.
[62] Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation*, p. 10.
[63] Lorrimer, *Knox*, pp. 260-1.
[64] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 232.
[65] Wills, *Prosthesis*, p. 221.
[66] Wills, *Prosthesis*, pp. 17 and 225.