

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

Emmeline
Bullough

The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1901

THE ENGLISH CORONATION ORDERS.

THE subject of this paper is narrower and of more limited interest than that which Mr. Brightman treated in his article on Byzantine Coronations in the April number of the JOURNAL: yet the history of English Coronations has a certain special importance in the study of the Western rites; and an attempt to trace the steps by which the English coronation service has reached its present form may have some special interest, at all events for English readers, at the present time. Since Mr. Maskell devoted to the coronation a considerable part of his *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* a good deal has been done for the elucidation of matters connected with the English coronation forms, by the Dean of Carlisle in his edition of the York Pontifical¹, and more recently, in various works issued by the Henry Bradshaw Society, by Canon Wordsworth², by Dr. Wickham Legg³, and by Mr. Dewick⁴. I cannot claim to make any important addition to the information which their labours have made accessible: my purpose is merely to present some of the results of their researches in a consecutive form.

I have said that the history of the English coronations has

¹ Surtees Society (vol. lxi), 1873.

² *The manner of the Coronation of Charles I*, 1892.

³ *Missale Westmonasteriense*, vols. ii and iii, 1893, 1896; *Three Coronation Orders*, 1901; see also an article by him on *The Sacring of the English Kings* in the *Archaeological Journal* for 1894.

⁴ *The Coronation Book of Charles V of France*, 1898.

a special importance. This is due to the fact that perhaps the earliest of all known Western coronation orders is one contained in an English service-book. The book in question is the Pontifical traditionally connected with the name of Egbert, who occupied the see of York from 734 to 766¹. It was written, indeed, long after Egbert's death; but the book from which it was copied may have been his². If its text represents the use of Egbert's time, it shows us how kings were hallowed in England in days as early as the first Frankish coronation of which any trustworthy evidence exists, the coronation of Pepin at Soissons in 752 by the English St. Boniface—and much earlier than the first form of coronation service which we know from any other source in the West, the order of the coronation of Charles the Bald at Metz in 869 by Hincmar of Rheims.

The order of coronation of a queen consort is not of English origin; for though it is true that the earliest form for such a coronation is that employed for the crowning of Judith, the wife of Æthelwulf, on her marriage in 856, this was not in accordance with the English usage of the time. The Pontifical of Egbert contains no order for the benediction of a queen. From the tenth century onwards, indeed, such orders are generally annexed in the English service-books to the form of the coronation of the king: but of these I do not propose to take account³.

The coronation office, between the time of its first appearance in English service-books and that of its first appearance in the English tongue, underwent, as might be expected, a good deal of change. The successive stages of its development are marked by four principal forms, each represented by a group of manuscripts.

(1) The earliest of these forms appears in the Pontifical of

¹ This book, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (MS lat. 10575), was edited for the Surtees Society (vol. xxvii) in 1853.

² The tradition may, however, be due merely to the fact that the first part of the contents of the volume consists of a fragment of the Penitential of Egbert, in the title of which his name appears.

³ The order for a king has always been followed, *mutatis mutandis*, in the crowning of a queen regnant. In 1689 Mary was crowned together with her husband as joint sovereign, and the same forms were applied to both. Where a queen consort has been crowned at the same time with the king, her coronation has always followed, after that of the king was completed.

Egbert, already mentioned, and may therefore have been in use in England as early as the first half of the eighth century. It appears also in an English Pontifical which was for some time in use in the diocese of Alet in Brittany, and afterwards passed to the Abbey of Jumièges (where Martène used it for his text of this office), and finally to the Public Library at Rouen¹. The earliest portion of the Leofric Missal, written, it would seem, near Arras in the tenth century, includes practically the same series of prayers and benedictions, but without the rubrics contained in the two English books².

(2) The second form is found in the Pontifical of S. Dunstan³, in the Pontifical of Abp. Robert⁴, in the Pontifical said to have belonged to S. Thomas of Canterbury⁵, and in two other (fragmentary) English Pontificals⁶. It appears also in the tenth-century Sacramentary known as 'Codex Ratoldi'⁷, whence it was published by Ménard in his edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary. This form is sometimes called the order of Æthelred: but there is no sufficient ground for connecting it with the name of any particular king. It was probably in use from the middle of the tenth century to the time of the Norman Conquest. A revised text of it, with some alterations and additions, which appears in MS 44 of the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, has lately been edited by Dr. Wickham Legg in his *Three Coronation Orders*⁸. The departures from the other MSS shown by this text are on the whole curious rather than important.

(3) The third form is found with very little variation in several

¹ This MS is described in *Archæologia*, vol. xxv, by Mr. Gage, who refers it to the first half of the tenth century. It is now MS 368 in the catalogue of the Rouen Library, where it is assigned to the ninth century.

² F. E. Warren, *The Leofric Missal*, p. 230.

³ MS Lat. 943 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

⁴ Written at Winchester, probably about the end of the tenth century, afterwards in use in the diocese of Rouen. Now MS 369 of the Rouen Library.

⁵ Written in the twelfth century, but probably copied from an earlier text. Now in the Douai Public Library, MS 67.

⁶ MS 146 of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and MS Claudius A. iii in the British Museum.

⁷ Written probably near Arras, afterwards part of the library of the monastery of Corbie, and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, MS lat. 12052. See Delisle, *Mémoire sur d'anciens Sacramentaires*, pp. 188-90.

⁸ Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. xix, p. 53.

English Pontificals of the twelfth century¹, and in the thirteenth or fourteenth-century Pontifical left by Bp. Roger de Martivall of Salisbury to his cathedral church². It is sometimes called the Order of Henry I, being assigned to the time of that king on the same insufficient ground which has served to connect the second form with the name of Æthelred³. Its contents correspond with tolerable exactness to the slightly divergent accounts given by Benedict of Peterborough and Roger de Hoveden of the first coronation of Richard I.

(4) The last of the four forms appears in a considerable number of MSS of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: some of these are Pontificals, one the Pontifical of the Abbot of Westminster: it is also found in the Westminster Missal, and in the various MSS of the *Liber Regalis*. The Westminster books and the *Liber Regalis* contain rather more minute rubrics than are generally to be found in the Pontificals; and the later books are rather more full than the earlier: but the service is practically the same in all⁴.

In the earliest of the four forms, as it appears in the English books, the benediction of the new king takes place in the course of the Mass, between the Gospel and the Offertory. In the Leofric Missal, the prayers of the Mass do not appear in conjunction with the benedictions: but it is of course possible that the latter were intended to be used in the same manner as is prescribed in the English books.

Of the three prayers which in Egbert's Pontifical precede the anointing, the second (*Deus qui populis*) is indicated only by its first words, with a reference to a place 'in capite libri⁵.' It is

¹ Two of these are in the British Museum, two at Cambridge (one in the University Library, the other at Trinity College), one at Trinity College, Dublin, and one at Magdalen College, Oxford.

² Now in the Bodleian Library (MS Rawlinson C. 400).

³ The ground in each case is a modern note added to the text for the sake of distinction in MS Claudius A. iii of the British Museum, which contains fragments of two Pontificals, and thus includes both forms.

⁴ The text and notes of the Westminster Missal edited by Dr. Wickham Legg for the Henry Bradshaw Society supply the means for a minute study of these variations, and of the fully developed form of the coronation order.

⁵ The reference is apparently to a *Benedictio episcopalis* in the order for the consecration of a bishop: but this form does not exactly agree with the prayer

not mentioned in the Leofric Missal, and was probably not from the first in its present position. As it stands, it comes between two benedictions (*Te invocamus* and *In diebus eius*) which were probably at first a single prayer¹. It is to be noted moreover that whereas the whole number of the prayers in Egbert's book is eight, the last of the series is described in the rubric which directs its use as 'oratio septima,' a discrepancy probably due to the insertion of *Deus qui populis*. The general character of this group of prayers is that of petition for blessings on the new king and on his people, and for the prosperity of his reign.

As to the anointing, the directions given in Egbert's book are not minute. One of the bishops is to pour oil upon the king's head, while others anoint him, applying the unction, presumably, to different parts of his person. The Psalm *Domine in uirtute tua* with the antiphon *Unxerunt Salomonem* accompany this action. Then follows the prayer *Deus electorum fortitudo*, beseeching that grace may be bestowed upon the king by means of the anointing². In the Leofric Missal the rubric as to anointing, the anthem, and the psalm are absent: the act of anointing, however, is implied by the presence of the prayer *Deus electorum*.

Next, 'omnes pontifices cum principibus' deliver the sceptre to the king, an act followed by a long benediction, made up of short clauses, on the model of the Episcopal benedictions at Mass, and ending, like these forms, with the clause *Quod ipse prestare, &c.* The 'baculus' is then delivered; but by whom, the rubric does not show. Its delivery is followed, or accompanied, by a benediction in which the words of Gen. xxvii 28, 29, and Gen. xlix 25, 26 are combined with slight alteration. The 'helmet' is then placed on the king's head by all the bishops,

Deus qui populis which appears in the later coronation orders. It would require some modification for use in the benediction of the king.

¹ The abnormally abrupt beginning of the second of these two forms suggests that it is really part of a longer prayer: and in an eleventh-century Milanese *Ordo* published by Magistretti (*Pontificale in usum Eccl. Mediol.*, Milan, 1897, p. 112) the two are joined together as a continuous whole.

² As the rubric stands in Martène's text, it would seem that *Deus electorum* is to be said by one of the bishops during the anointing: but the words 'dicat orationem' are an insertion made apparently without MS authority, and are not needed to complete the sense of the rubric, if its punctuation is slightly changed.

and another benediction, in words selected from Deut. xxxiii, is pronounced¹. The clergy and the people unite in the acclamation 'Vivat rex N. in sempiternum': and the king (placed, according to the Leofric Missal and the Jumièges Pontifical, 'in solio regni') is saluted with a kiss by the 'principes' (or by 'omnis populus,' according to the Jumièges MS)²: the final benediction (*Deus perpetuitatis*) is said over him, and the service of the Mass proceeds. The oblation of the king is mentioned in the *Hanc igitur*, but there is no rubrical direction as to his making an offering.

Attached to the order, in all three books, is an instruction to the effect that it is proper for the king on his enthronement to enjoin upon the Christian people subject to him three precepts. These may be taken to represent (like the 'edictum' of the Roman praetor) the principles on which he intends to govern, and so far cover the same ground as the oath required of the king in the later coronation orders, for which, in its earliest form, they supply the substance. But no oath is required of him: no acknowledgement of him by the people is provided for before his crowning and enthronement: no words are used which indicate that authority is given him by his coronation. The delivery of the insignia of royalty is not accompanied by words that connect them with special functions or special duties of the king. The whole character of the order is that of benediction: its central act is the anointing: and the central point of its intercessions is in the prayer conjoined with that act.

In the tenth-century order the king is led by two bishops from the 'conuentus seniorum' to the church: the anthem *Firmetur manus tua* is sung in the procession. He lies prostrate before the altar during the singing of *Te Deum laudamus*, and then, 'being chosen by the bishops and by the people,' he makes his promise, 'in the name of Christ,' to keep the three rules which his predecessors had proclaimed. Then follow the first three

¹ The delivery of the sceptre and staff and the coronation with the *galea* are not mentioned in the Leofric Missal, which contains, however, the long benediction (*Benedic Domine hunc praesulem principem*) and the two scriptural forms (*Omnipotens det tibi* and *Benedic Domine fortitudinem*).

² The rubric of the Pontifical of Egbert is here apparently corrupt. The other books do not exactly agree.

prayers of the older *ordo*—*Te invocamus, Deus qui populis*, and *In diebus eius*—said ‘by the bishops¹.’ The fourth prayer, entitled *Consecratio Regis*, implores a special blessing for the person ‘quem supplici deuotione in regem Anglorum uel Saxonum pariter eligimus.’ It desires for him, among other things, that he ‘may nourish and teach, defend and instruct the Church of the whole realm of Angles and Saxons . . . cum plebibus sibi annexis’; that he may be set on high in the governance of the realm, and anointed with the oil of the grace of the Holy Spirit. The king is then anointed with oil², while the anthem *Unxerunt Salomonem* is sung; the anointing is followed by a short prayer (*Christe perunge hunc regem*), the complement or conclusion of that which precedes it³, by *Deus electorum fortitudo*, and by another prayer (*Deus Dei Filius*) to the same purpose.

Next comes the delivery of the insignia: the giving of each is performed with a special formula, and followed by a benedictory prayer for the king. The insignia mentioned are the ring, the sword, the crown, the sceptre and the staff. The girding of the sword is accompanied by the anthem *Confortare et esto uir*⁴. The benediction after the crowning is in part identical with the *Deus perpetuitatis* of the older *Ordo*. That after the delivery of the staff is on the model of the Episcopal benedictions: it is followed by another, on the same lines, consisting of the first three clauses of the long benediction, *Benedic Domine hunc praesulem*.

The formula of enthronement (*Sta et retine*) is entitled ‘Designatio status regii,’ and illustrates the character of the newer service. The royal state which belonged to the king by right of succession is committed to him ‘per auctoritatem Dei omnipotentis, et per praesentem traditionem nostram.’ He is bidden to give honour to the clergy ‘in locis congruis,’ that he may be confirmed as

¹ According to the rubrics of some MSS these are to be said by different bishops, the fourth prayer being said by the metropolitan, or the chief bishop present.

² The precise details of the anointing are not specified.

³ In ‘Codex Ratoldi’ the two prayers are one: in the majority of the MSS a break is made before the anointing, with a termination in the usual form, and a fresh beginning made after it.

⁴ The revised form in the Corpus Christi College MS 44 provides an anthem for each of the insignia, and adds the *pallium* or mantle to their number. It substitutes new anthems for *Unxerunt Salomonem* and *Confortare et esto uir*, and adds anthems at other points.

'mediator cleri et plebis'¹. After this allocution are placed the two scriptural benedictions of the older form, and with them the *Consecratio Regis* ends². In practice it was followed by the celebration of the Eucharist, not placed, like the older form, in the Eucharistic service.

In this second *Ordo*, some of the contents of the first have changed their place, some of the prayers are shortened or revised, but every portion of the older form is represented: the differences are in the way of additions to the older form. But these are of such a kind as to impart to the service a character which the older service had not. There is, on the part of the clergy and people, a formal recognition of the king whom the 'conuentus seniorum' has accepted; on the part of the king, there is a promise to rule according to certain principles³. There is a new form of benediction, in which the relation of the king to the Church and people of his realm is expressly set forth. The delivery of the insignia is made with increased formality; the enthronement is accompanied by a significant form of words. The difference between the two *Ordines* is not inaptly expressed by the titles which they severally bear in the Pontificals: the earlier *Ordo* is 'Benedictiones super regem'; the later is 'Consecratio regis.'

Both forms, as we have seen, are found in books written outside England; the 'Codex Ratoldi' is probably earlier than any of the English books which contain the second *Ordo*: but it seems most likely that the text of the 'Codex Ratoldi' has been derived from an English source. It mentions, indeed, the 'Francorum sceptrum'; but the same prayer contains mention of the Church and realm of 'Albion,' and another has a special mention of 'S. Gregory, the apostle of the English.' At the time, moreover, when the 'Codex Ratoldi' was written the form of the Frankish coronations

¹ The language of the passage suggests the doctrine that the king is 'mixta persona':—'quatenus mediator Dei et hominum te mediatorem cleri et plebis in hoc regni solio confirmet.'

² The revised form, which varies the text of several of the prayers, modifies or omits some passages in the first of these benedictions, and omits the second, putting in its place an altered version of *Benedic Domine hunc praesulem*.

³ The 'Codex Ratoldi' contains the form of promise demanded by the bishops of the king for the security of the privileges and rights of the Church and of their sees. This is not in the English MSS; but no doubt some such pledge was asked for and given as part of the process of the 'choosing' of the king by the bishops.

was perhaps still unsettled. The order used by Hincmar and the six bishops who joined with him in crowning Charles the Bald at Metz in 869 is very different from that which was followed by the same metropolitan at the coronation of Lewis 'the Stammerer' in 877: and both these orders differ widely from any of the English forms, though both contain prayers which appear in the second English service¹.

The third form, introduced apparently after the Norman Conquest, differs much from both the earlier orders. There is but little left in it which is found also in Egbert's *Pontifical*: and the prayers which are common to it and the tenth-century form have been rearranged. Several new prayers and formulae are introduced—new, that is to say, to the English order of service. The composition of the form has been much influenced by the *Ordo Romanus* published by Hittorp, or by some kindred *Ordo*.

The form begins, like the second, with the procession from the 'conuentus seniorum'² to the church, and with the anthem *Firmetur manus*. In the church, the king and bishops lie prostrate while a litany is sung. Then the king, 'ab episcopis electus,' makes his promise to the people: a bishop demands of them whether they are willing to be subject and obedient 'tali principi ac rectori'; and on their assent being given, the service proceeds.

The benedictions before the anointing are three. Two of these are new (*Benedic Domine hunc regem* and *Deus ineffabilis auctor mundi*): the third (*Omnipotens aeterne Deus*), which is here placed first of the three, is identical, for the most part, with the *Consecratio* of the second form. But it is separated from the anointing, and the portion of it which followed the anointing disappears altogether. The mention of the Angles and Saxons disappears also³.

¹ Thus the benediction at the anointing of Charles agrees closely with the English benediction after the delivery of the staff. The benediction at the anointing of Lewis is closely related to that in the English form; while in the same *Ordo*, the formulae in delivering the crown and sceptre are identical with those in the English books. See *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capitula Francorum* ii, pp. 456, 461.

² The 'conuentus seniorum' becomes, in the *Pontifical* of de Martivall, 'conuentus fidelium seruorum.' The last word has been altered to 'seniorum' by a later hand.

³ The *Ordo Romanus* of Hittorp has the same prayers at this point, but in a different sequence. They are to be said by different bishops: in the English *Ordo*, apparently, all are said by the archbishop.

The directions for the anointing are more minute than those of the earlier English books. The king's hands are first anointed, with the words 'Ungantur manus istae de oleo sanctificato unde uncti fuerunt reges et prophetae, sicut unxit Samuel David in regem, ut sis benedictus et constitutus rex in regno isto super populum istum Dominus Deus tuus tradidit tibi ad regendum et gubernandum.' Then follows a benediction (*Prospice omnipotens Deus*), after which the breast, shoulders, and arms of the king are anointed with the holy oil, and his head first with the oil and then with the chrism¹. After the anointing has been performed, two more benedictions are said. The first of these (*Deus Dei Filius*) is common to the tenth-century form: the second (*Deus qui es iustorum gloria*) is new².

One striking feature in this section, as compared with the corresponding portion of the earlier offices, is the direction for the use of the chrism, the chief of the holy oils blessed on Maundy Thursday. The 'oil of the catechumens' sufficed for the unction of most anointed kings, and of the Western emperors: the kings of France and England alone were anointed with 'cream'³. In France the usage goes back, it would seem, at least to the time of Louis VIII, in the thirteenth century; in England, to the twelfth-century Pontificals: but it may, in both countries, be earlier than the rubrics which enjoin it. In France, the miraculous chrism contained in the 'sainte ampoule' was mingled for this purpose with chrism hallowed in the usual way: in England also there arose a tradition of a miraculous oil, but this was of later origin, and its influence was probably confined to the coronation of Henry IV⁴.

¹ In Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus* the head is anointed first, the hands last. The formula for the anointing of the hands is the same as that in the English books. The use of chrism is not mentioned.

² Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus* places after the anointing three benedictions:— (1) *Prospice omnipotens*, (2) *Deus qui es iustorum*, (3) a consecratory prayer (introduced, after the manner of the Eucharistic preface, by *Sursum corda* and *Veni dignum*) made up by combining the *Consecratio* of the tenth-century form (which is thus repeated) with *Deus Dei Filius*. It may be noted that *Prospice omnipotens* is the central benediction of the form 'ad ordinandum regem' in the ninth-century Pontifical published by Magistretti, and regarded by him as 'apographum authentici codicis ipsius Romanae Ecclesiae.'

³ In England and in France the chrism was also used for the anointing of priests at their ordination.

⁴ See however below, p. 501 n. 4.

The delivery of the insignia begins with the sword: the next ornaments are the *armillae*, not mentioned in the earlier English books, and the *pallium*, which has hitherto appeared only in the revised form of the second order. Then follow the crown, the ring, the sceptre, and the staff. The sequence is thus different from that in the second order as regards the position of the ring. The formulae used in delivering the ring and the sword are new, agreeing with those in Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*; those for the *armillae* and *pallium* are also new; the formulae for the crown, the sceptre, and the staff remain unchanged¹. The benediction which follows the giving of the insignia is the same, save for a few verbal differences, as the 'Benedictio super regem in tempore synodi' in the Pontifical of Archbishop Robert².

The king salutes the bishops with a kiss, and is then conducted by them to his throne, while the choir sing *Te Deum laudamus*, and enthroned with the formula *Sta et retine*, a formula which remains practically unchanged³.

The changes which have been made in this order as compared with that of the tenth century produce, as we have seen, a considerable amount of agreement with Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*. In the thirteenth-century order of the coronation of the kings of France the conformity is closer still. In the fourth form of the English coronation order there is a partial return to the earlier model, so far as regards the inclusion of prayers omitted in the twelfth century, and the restoration of one at least to its former importance.

The *Liber Regalis* and the Westminster service-books prescribe that the king, on the day before his coronation, is to ride in the sight of the people from the Tower to the Palace of Westminster. On the day of the coronation, which is to be on a Sunday, or a solemn festival, the prelates and nobles are to meet in the palace, and the king to take his seat 'in aula regia maiori.' He is to be conducted to the church, two bishops supporting

¹ In Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus* the order of delivery is (1) sword, (2) *armillae*, *pallium*, ring, (3) sceptre and staff, (4) crown. No formula of delivery is provided for the *armillae* or the *pallium*; the sceptre and staff are covered by one formula.

² It agrees with the benediction provided in Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*.

³ The *Ordo Romanus* of Hittorp postpones the salutation and the singing of *Te Deum* till after the enthronement.

him¹, and to take his place upon a stage 'between the high altar and the choir.' There he is to stand in the sight of the people, while the prelate who is to crown him asks their 'will and consent.' Then follows the anthem *Firmetur manus* (with the psalm *Misericordias domini*, not mentioned in the earlier forms): and the king makes his first offering at the altar, where the collect *Deus humilium uisitor* is said over him. One of the bishops then preaches, 'breuiter,' a sermon to the people: after which the king promises to grant to the people the laws and customs allowed by his predecessors, and especially those laws, customs, and liberties granted to the clergy and people by 'the glorious king Edward,' and the terms of his pledge being expounded to him, and agreed to by him, he confirms his promises by an oath².

The archbishop then begins the service by the singing of *Veni creator*. Before the Litany, the form *Te inuocamus* appears once more: to the Litany are added the seven penitential psalms. Then follow, before the anointing, five prayers:—(1) *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus* (the *Consecratio* of the tenth-century form), (2) *Benedic Domine hunc regem*, (3) *Deus ineffabilis auctor mundi*, (4) *Deus qui populis* (which thus returns), (5) *Deus electorum fortitudo*, which is thus brought once more into immediate proximity to the anointing. The fact that, being so placed, *Deus electorum* is introduced by *Sursum corda* and *Vere dignum* seems to mark it as the special consecratory prayer of this fourth form.

¹ The Bishops of Durham and Bath (who were at the time the two prelates senior by consecration) discharged this function at the coronation of Richard I: and their successors claim by prescription the right of discharging it, a right which they have generally exercised. The Tudor coronations, however, are an exception to this general rule. Henry VII was supported by the Bishops of Exeter and Ely (MS Ashmole 863); this precedent was followed in the case of Henry VIII (MS Tiberius E. viii, cited by Maskell), when the see of Durham was vacant and the Bishop of Bath and Wells was resident at Rome: Edward VI was supported by the Bishop of Durham and the Earl of Shrewsbury (MS Ashmole 817): so also was Mary (Planché, *Regal Records*, p. 19); Elizabeth's supporters were the Earl of Shrewsbury and the Earl of Pembroke (*Calend. of State Papers: Venetian*, 1558-80, p. 18). The coronation of James I brought a return of the old tradition, which, however, was disregarded (like other traditions of more importance) at the coronation of William and Mary.

² Henry VIII made some instructive changes in the actual form of the oath to be taken (Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, 2nd ser. vol. i, p. 176).

The anointing itself follows the same order as is prescribed in the twelfth-century books: the formula for anointing the hands remains the same: the prayer *Prospice omnipotens* is said before the further anointing of breast, shoulders, arms, and head: the anointing of the head is followed by *Deus Dei Filius* and *Deus qui iustorum*. But the anthem *Unxerunt Salomonem* reappears, with the psalm *Domine in uirtute tua*, to be sung at the anointing.

In the next section, that which deals with the delivery of the insignia, the difference between the twelfth-century form and that of the *Liber Regalis* is strongly marked. Increased prominence is given to it by directions for the blessing of certain of the insignia before they are delivered to the king; and also by the appearance of detailed directions as to the vesting of the king after his anointing. This process may very likely have been conducted in the twelfth century much in the same way which we find prescribed in the fourteenth, although the rubrics do not expressly mention it, and the difference between the later and the earlier forms may thus be apparent rather than real. But while the silence of the earlier books prevents us from seeing how this feature of the service was developed, and gives rise to some uncertainty as to its precise significance, the ceremony, as it appears in its full growth, is certainly remarkable.

The first vestment put on after the completion of the anointing is in the English versions of the order called a 'coif,' which is placed upon the king's head 'propter unctionem'—to prevent, that is, the part touched by the holy oils from coming into contact with any other object while the traces of the anointing remained¹. For this purpose it is to be worn for seven days after the coronation. The Latin rubric calls this 'coif' or cap 'amictus': and the name, taken in conjunction with what will appear with regard to some of the other vestments, suggests that it represents, in the order of vesting, the ornament which the name commonly denotes—that is to say, the amice. In judging of the likelihood of this, it must be remembered that the amice was anciently worn on the head, not merely placed there for an instant before arranging it upon the neck and shoulders, but covering the head until the

¹ Linen gloves were also put upon the king's hands before the delivery of the sceptres: but they were apparently not retained after the coronation was ended.

priest had reached the altar, or even until a particular point in the service, when it was thrown back¹. An amice which was to remain on the head would not unnaturally tend to become simply a coif.

The king is also clothed with a vestment called 'colobium sindonis,' which is described as being made 'ad modum dalmaticæ'—that is to say, with sleeves: in other words, with a sacerdotal rochet or alb. Over this is placed a 'tunica longa et raris' answering to the dalmatic, and his sandals and spurs are put on his feet. Then he is girt with the sword, and thereafter receives the 'armillæ.' This ornament we might naturally identify with the bracelets of gold which are mentioned in lists of the regalia, and with the bracelets mentioned in the accounts of the coronations of Edward VI and Mary. But the ornament as described in the *Liber Regalis*, is not precisely of this kind. It is said to be 'about the neck like a stole and hanging down from each shoulder as far as the joints of the arms,' and to be fastened to the joints of the arms with loops or 'laces' of silk. The silk loops may be the successors of the original 'armillæ'; but that part of the whole arrangement which is worn about the neck and hangs down from each shoulder is probably in its origin a stole, put on (in the old fashion) over the dalmatic, and worn in the manner of a bishop's stole.

The last of the royal robes, the *pallium*, is a mantle, square in shape, woven with a pattern of golden eagles. The tradition of the pattern has lasted till the most recent instance of its use: but the shape has been altered in course of time till the vestment has ceased to be 'quadrum' or 'quatuor initiis formatum.' In its latest form, it somewhat resembles a cope: in its earliest form, it would seem to have suggested comparison with a chasuble, such as chasubles then were.

Thus the eye-witness of Henry VI's coronation, who has left us an account (not always easy to follow, or to reconcile with the order

¹ This was the use certainly in some churches of France, and probably of England also. The Dominicans, I believe, observe it still.

² The bracelets are probably what the spectator of Elizabeth's coronation calls 'garters' (MS Ashmole 863). They seem to have degenerated into ties. In some of the Georgian orders they are called 'silk strings.' In the order for the late Queen's coronation the 'armill' is not mentioned. The ornament 'in modum stolæ' was however actually used, not being tied to the arms, but left pendent over each shoulder. (*Treas. Coronation Orders*, p. 148.)

of the service as it appears in other and more official authorities) of what he saw and heard, had on this one point a very clear impression left upon his mind—that at some time in the course of the service the child was arrayed like a bishop about to sing Mass. The resemblance between the royal vestments and the ‘bishop’s gear’ is close enough not only to account for his comparison, but to lead to the conclusion that however the correspondence may have been brought about, whatever the intention of it may have been, it can hardly have been the result of accident.

The crown is blessed before delivery, and set upon the king’s head with the same formula as in the twelfth century. The crowning is followed by the benediction *Deus perpetuitatis*, and this by the anthem *Confortare et esto uir* and the psalm *Dominus regit me*. For the blessing of the ring two prayers are provided, for its delivery the twelfth-century form is used, after its delivery a short benediction which appears for the first time. The delivery of the sceptre and staff, the benedictions after each is delivered, the kiss, the enthronement, the homage, all follow the same course as in the twelfth century. The one point of special note after the crowning is the offering at the altar of the sword with which the king is girt, which is at once redeemed. This the *Liber Regalis* places between the delivery of the ring and that of the staff.

The general tendency in the development of the service down to the formation of the fourth order is towards accretion. The third order discards, it is true, most of those forms of the first order which the second had retained; but the fourth restores some at least of the portions so discarded, and in it almost every feature of importance which has appeared in any of the three earlier orders finds a place¹. The anointing gradually becomes more elaborate, or the directions for it more minute; and the delivery of the royal ornaments becomes gradually more prominent. From the accounts of various coronations, as

¹ The two scriptural benedictions which appear at the end of the first and second orders were in the fourteenth century said over the king in the course of the service of the Mass after the coronation, when he made his oblation at the altar. This may have been the case also in the twelfth-century order.

compared with the schemes drawn up beforehand and the directions of the service-books, it is clear that this part of the order of the service was that which most impressed the onlooker. The anointing he could not well see: the prayers he could not well hear: but the delivery of robes and sword and ring and crown and sceptres is generally noted with some fullness, though probably with occasional errors as to the precise sequence of the various acts. It is perhaps for this reason that these parts of the ceremonial remain so nearly as they were in the fourteenth century, and have resisted the tendency to change more effectually than the 'littera scripta' of prayers and benedictions.

The beginning of change on any large scale was long delayed. At the coronation of Edward VI the council deliberated on certain changes, alleging that some alterations were rendered necessary by law¹, and that it was desirable to abridge the service on the ground of the king's inability to bear the fatigue of so long a ceremony. A scheme was drawn up for this purpose: but from an account of the proceedings at the coronation it would seem that (save probably for the oath, and possibly as to some details of the vesting) little change was actually made either by alteration or omission². One addition was made, which tended rather to increase than to diminish the length of the proceedings. Three crowns were used, being set one after another on the king's head,—the first 'King Edward's crown,' the second 'the imperial crown of this realm,' the third 'a very rich crown made for his Grace'³.

¹ Burnet is probably right in his suggestion that this refers specially to the promises demanded from the king. Those made by Henry VIII had included a pledge to protect the monasteries: and subsequent events had made it inexpedient, from the point of view at least of a good many of the council, to require such a promise from his successor.

² See MS Ashmole 817. The statement in MS Harl. 3504 that the soles of the king's feet were anointed is probably due to some misunderstanding. (See *Three Coronation Orders*, p. 151.)

³ The use of the second crown is perhaps to be accounted for by a desire to assert 'that this realm of England is an empire'; and by the fact that the crown of S. Edward was not of the pattern recognised by later authorities as 'imperial.' The third crown was no doubt intended for the king's own use, and was probably substituted for the others during the service instead of after it because the others were too large for the king to wear, and too heavy to be conveniently held above his head. But Mary also was crowned with three crowns, and Elizabeth with two, if not with three.

Mary's coronation apparently followed closely the precedents of that of Edward VI. Of Elizabeth's we have two accounts, one English, the other in the report of the Venetian agent to his Government, which illustrate the uncertainty of this particular kind of evidence¹. They are both apparently the reports of eye-witnesses; but they differ on some rather material points. If we trust the Venetian reporter, the coronation of Elizabeth took place in the course of a Mass celebrated not by the Bishop of Carlisle, who crowned the queen, but by the Dean of the Chapel Royal, who had consented to say Mass without elevating or consecrating the Host. The English witness says that the Mass which followed the coronation was said by the bishop. The Venetian agent is probably wrong in his statements: the English usage for several hundred years had been that the coronation should precede the Mass: and the divergence of some parts of the coronation service from the Roman model, which the Venetian notes, was probably due to the following of the ancient English order. The English reporter, it is true, speaks of the bishop singing 'the . . . ² of the mass' before the anointing, and so appears to contradict his later statement that the Mass was begun after the coronation was ended. But the earlier statement is easily explained, and is really quite consistent with the later one³. There seems to be no sufficient reason to suppose that any important change was made in the form of service at Elizabeth's coronation. The Epistle and Gospel were read both in Latin and in English: and possibly the English litany, authorised a few weeks before the coronation by the queen's proclamation, may have been used in place of the Latin litany: but on this latter point there is no direct evidence.

At the coronation of James I it might be expected that we should find changes on a large scale. But so far as the coronation service itself is concerned, the one important change consisted

¹ *Calendar of State Papers: Venetian, 1558-80*; MS Ashmole 863 (printed in Nichols' *Progresses of Q. Elizabeth*).

² A blank space in the MS.

³ What the writer recognised as belonging to the Mass was no doubt the *Sursum corda* and the Preface introducing the consecratory prayer *Deus electorum fortitudo*, of which the music and the words might alike suggest the Eucharistic Preface. The blank space in the MS may be due to the uncertainty of the writer as to the proper term to denote this, or to his use of some term which perplexed Ashmole's copyist.

in the adoption of an English translation of the old Latin form of the *Liber Regalis*¹. The English version is, speaking generally, a faithful one, though not always felicitous in expression: it may be said, indeed, that it is more remarkable for its close adherence to the original than for the grace of its style. But it is on the whole a good piece of work. It was employed also, with a few verbal alterations (generally bringing it closer to the original), and with the omission of one portion of the form for the blessing of the ring, at the coronations of Charles I and Charles II.

On all these occasions, according to the practice from the tenth century, the coronation was followed by the celebration of the Eucharist²: and here, while the new English rite was of course followed, some use continued to be made of the old forms. The Collect was translated from the old Collect: the Epistle was nearly the same, the Gospel the same, as those appointed in the *Liber Regalis*. The ancient benedictions *Deus det tibi* and *Benedic Domine fortitudinem* were said, in English, over the king at the time of his oblation, and were followed by a translation of the ancient 'secret'³. At the coronations of Charles I and Charles II the anthem before the celebration, and that sung after the communion of the king, are identical with the ancient introit and 'communion'⁴.

The period of change began with the accession of James II, who, for obvious reasons, desired that the celebration of the

¹ The seven penitential psalms were omitted, some slight alterations affecting the anthems were made and a benediction inserted before *Te Deum laudamus*: but the main body of the service followed the old order. The dislocation exhibited by the text published by William Prynne in 1660 and reprinted by Canon Wordsworth in his *Coronation of Charles I* (Henry Bradshaw Soc., 1892) appears, from a comparison with the order contained in MS Ashmole 863 (copied from a book at Whitehall in 1660), to be due to some error—probably to the misplacing of the pages of Prynne's transcript. Prynne totally omits the form of blessing the ring, which in MS Ashmole 863 is given in full.

² This, as regards the coronation of James I, is obscured by Prynne, whose text places part of the coronation service (including the actual crowning) after the offertory.

³ This was the arrangement at the coronation of James I. At the coronation of Charles I it was altered, the ancient 'secret' being said (as a benediction of the king) after he had made his offering of bread and wine, the other benedictions after his 'second oblation' of a mark of gold.

⁴ The anthem *Protector noster aspice* appears in the order of James I, but only as an anthem at entering into the church. It is repeated in the orders for Charles I and Charles II.

Eucharist should not be connected with his own coronation, and gave instructions to Abp. Sancroft to revise the service, ordering him to 'leave out the Communion service,' and abridge the form of the coronation as far as possible, while preserving what was essential. Sancroft, though primarily responsible for the result, is perhaps not wholly responsible: he seems to have been assisted by other bishops. When he had done his work, about which he seems to have taken some pains, very little of the old service was left ¹.

The things which remain most nearly as they were, and which were, perhaps, essential in the sense that their absence or alteration would have attracted the notice of any spectators who had been present at the coronation of Charles II, are the ceremonial acts. The prayers, and the forms of words accompanying those acts, are partly altered, abridged, or mutilated, partly omitted altogether. The collect *Deus humilium uisitor* is discarded for a new and more diffuse form: the litany remains, but is transferred², carrying with it to the place before the sermon a mutilated version of *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus* (the principal benediction of the tenth-century form) and an altered version of *Deus qui populis*. The shortened recension of *Veni creator* appears, followed by altered and abridged versions of *Te inuocamus* and *Deus electorum*, which retains its *Sursum corda* and *Vere dignum*. The two other benedictions of this section disappear altogether. At the anointing the formula used for the hands is transferred (with more change than was necessary) to the anointing of the head: *Prospice omnipotens Deus* and *Deus qui iustorum* (of which the former had some special claim to be considered important) both disappear. The vestments and insignia are delivered almost as before: but the forms of their benediction are either altered or omitted; the forms of their delivery are changed in every case, the sceptre and staff being delivered with words entirely new³. The act of offering a mark of gold, which should have

¹ Sancroft had, it must be remembered, been chaplain to Bp. Cosin, and had been much concerned in the work of the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. He had probably more knowledge of liturgical matters than any other English bishop in 1685, Sparrow excepted.

² This transference was apparently an afterthought. (See Sancroft's draft order in MS Tanner 31.)

³ Together with the *pallium* the 'orb' is delivered, a change probably due to

taken place at the Offertory, is transferred to the coronation service, being placed (with a new benediction¹) before *Te Deum laudamus*, which precedes the enthronement; and the enthronement is accompanied by a new recension of *Sta et retine*.

The preparation of the order for the coronation of William and Mary was committed to Henry Compton, Bishop of London. He had about four weeks in which to carry out his work of revision; and his qualifications for the task were of the slightest. He may have been present at the coronation of Charles II: but if so, it was probably in the character of an officer of the Horse Guards: and it may fairly be conjectured that his ignorance of the history of the service he was called upon to revise was almost complete. It would not have been surprising if he had confined himself to verbal corrections of Sancroft's form, and joined to it the order of the Communion service provided in the form for Charles II. But he was a man of energy and courage. The short time allowed was enough for him to effect more than one important change, and to remove the greater part of such remains of the ancient forms of prayer and benediction as had escaped the hand of Sancroft.

The most marked change made by Compton was, strangely enough, a return to the usage contemplated in Egbert's Pontifical. He had to decide how the Eucharistic service and the coronation service were to be combined. He might have decided the question by the last precedent, which had itself the sanction of the practice of at least six centuries. But though he had one or other of the earlier Stewart orders before him², he chose rather to adopt a solution suggested, no doubt, by the forms of ordination, and to place the coronation in the Communion service. The point at which he placed it, that at which the consecration of a bishop takes place, was practically the same point at which the benediction of the king is placed in Egbert's Pontifical³.

some uncertainty or misunderstanding as to the relation between the orb and the sceptre. There is a strong tendency visible in the benedictions to avoid blessing the thing, and to bless instead the person to whom it is to be delivered.

¹ The benediction inserted here in the order for James I was changed in that for Charles I. That now introduced is longer than either, and contains some reminiscences of the benedictions formerly pronounced at the offertory.

² He included, as we shall see, something from one of these orders.

³ Of this precedent it is certainly most probable that Compton knew nothing.

The presence of the litany in the Communion service at the consecration of a bishop probably seemed to him rather an anomaly to be avoided than a precedent to be followed: he therefore, like Sancroft, linked the litany with the 'recognition,' and placed it before the beginning of the Communion service, thus separating it more widely from the remainder of the coronation service. He adopted Sancroft's substitute for *Deus humilium uisitor* before the 'recognition,' and his version of *Deus qui populis* at the end of the litany, but discarded the remains of the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus*.

In the Communion service the version of the ancient collect was discarded, the first of the two ordinary collects for the king being made to serve as the collect for the day. The Epistle and Gospel remained as in 1661. The form of the oath, which had been a matter of serious consideration on former occasions, was settled by the Act of the Convention Parliament. After the oath he retained the short version of *Veni creator*¹. The remains of *Te inuocamus* left by Sancroft he removed, and he removed also the *Sursum corda* and *Vere dignum* before *Deus electorum fortitudo*. That prayer he altered, substituting for the latter part of it phrases which make up a formal benediction of the oil, and a prayer for the sovereigns to be anointed². Sancroft had left but little of the old form: what Compton left was hardly more than twenty words.

A more important point, however, than the disappearance of Sancroft's composition is the fact that in Compton's hands this prayer was made to contain for the first time an express blessing of the anointing oil. Anciently, the oil and chrism had been hallowed apart from the service, and needed not to be blessed again. For Mary's coronation, when the yearly blessing of the oils had been for some time interrupted, the oil and chrism were brought from abroad³. At Elizabeth's coronation the same difficulty did not arise. What oil was used at the coronation of James I it is hardly possible to say⁴. For Charles I a compound oil was

¹ There are a few slight variations from the form contained in the Ordinal.

² The latter part of the prayer is for the most part extracted from the orders for Baptism and Confirmation.

³ *Calendar of State Papers: Venetian*, 1534-54, p. 432.

⁴ The directions preparatory to his coronation (MS Ashmole 863) speak of 'the Ampull wherein is the oyle with which anciently the Kings and Queenes

prepared, and blessed by Laud, then Bishop of St. David's, acting for the Dean of Westminster, before the coronation; and as Sancroft has left on record the rule that the oil should be blessed by the Dean, if he be a bishop, or if he be not, then by the Archbishop himself, it may be gathered that this course was followed at the coronations of Charles II and James II. The order for the preparation of the anointing oil for William and Mary shows that in this respect the Stewart precedents were followed: but the appearance of an express prayer for the blessing of the oil in the coronation service itself suggests that the tradition noted by Sancroft was not followed. Compton, very possibly, was not aware of it¹.

The manner and form of the anointing were changed. The places to be anointed were reduced to three—the head, breast and hands: and the head, contrary to long established usage, was to be anointed first. The latter part of the formula provided by Sancroft for the anointing of the head was placed (in a slightly altered form) at the close of the anointing, and was followed by a new benediction, agreeing for its first few words with Sancroft's substitute for *Deus Dei Filius*. Before the anointing, as in Sancroft's order, was sung an anthem beginning 'Zadok the priest.' The words do not, in either case, quite correspond with the old anthem *Unxerunt Salomonem*².

In the delivery of the insignia, certain omissions were probably have been annoynted.' The Venetian agent's account of the proceedings (*Calendar of State Papers: Venetian*, 1603-7, p. 76) shows that it was reported that 'the oil was consecrated long ago, and is kept in the Tower of London,' and states that it had been used also for Edward VI and Elizabeth. It is not impossible that it may have been the alleged miraculous oil of which we find mention made in the time of Edward II, and again at the accession of Henry IV.

¹ In the orders for the coronations since 1689 the words 'Bless this oil and sanctify' have been changed to 'Bless and sanctify,' so that the oil is no longer mentioned in this clause. But at a later mention of the oil the archbishop is directed to 'lay his hand upon the Ampulla,' a fact which suggests that the prayer is still intended to imply a petition for the benediction of the oil, and that the usage by which it was hallowed before the time of the coronation has not been resumed.

² The use of 'Zadok the priest,' in some form, has been continuous. Its survival is perhaps due to Handel's music. For the choice of anthems in the later coronation orders seems to have been determined less by ecclesiastical tradition than by the popularity of certain compositions or the influence of composers. It has depended, probably, not so much on the judgement of the archbishop as on the taste of the sovereign, or of the organist of Westminster.

due to the difficulty arising from the joint coronation of a king and queen¹. But besides the omissions, there were further changes. The sword was to be offered and redeemed as soon as it was girt on. The delivery of the *pallium* and orb was provided with a new formula. The delivery of the crown (or rather crowns) was placed last. For the delivery of all the insignia the formulae were altered into further divergence from the wording of those in the earlier orders.

After the delivery of the ancient insignia Compton provided a new feature in the delivery of the Bible, accompanied by a discourse of some length, and this is followed by a long benediction, on the model of that which Sancroft had attached to the 'second oblation.' *Te Deum laudamus*, as before, precedes the enthronement: *Sta et retine* is modified afresh.

With regard to the latter part of the Communion service, it may be noted that the translation of the ancient 'secret' is used, as in the order for Charles I and Charles II, after the offering of bread and wine. After the offering of gold, the scriptural benedictions are discarded, their place being taken by the same prayer which had been said at the earlier offering, after the first entrance into the church. A proper Preface, newly composed, is provided; and the use of certain 'final Prayers' before the last benediction is directed.

The general result of Compton's revision was that nothing of the ancient order remained in its place without change; and, as I have said, very little of it was left at all. The portions least affected were *Deus qui populis*, *Unxerunt Salomonem*, and the formula for the delivery of the sword. Besides these, the ancient 'secret' has remained down to the time of the last coronation in its place after the offering of the bread and wine.

All the succeeding orders follow in their main outline the order prepared by Compton. Minor changes have been made from time to time. The ornaments omitted by him have been restored to their place, though not always used. The anointing at the last two coronations has been limited still further, extending only to the head and hands: and in the same cases the girding on of

¹ The hose and sandals, the 'colobium sindonis,' the 'tunica talaris' and the 'armillae' are omitted: but they return at later coronations. The sword was delivered to both William and Mary, but girt only upon the former.

the sword has been omitted. What further changes may be made in time to come, it would be difficult to predict. But even the changes which were made by Sancroft and Compton, made as they were with scanty knowledge and scanty regard for ancient forms, have not entirely destroyed the character of the service. In its most recent form, indeed, it is hardly to be reckoned as the direct descendant of the order of the *Liber Regalis*; its true ancestor is the order of the Revolution. Yet in its ceremonial and even in its liturgical forms it is the representative of an ancient line; some of its features can be traced back to remote antiquity. It is like some ancient fabric which has suffered much from the work of ignorant builders, destroying where they sought to improve, but which yet remains a monument of singular interest, demanding not only taste and skill but regard for its whole past history in any architect to whose care it can safely be committed.

H. A. WILSON.