The Book of Common Prayer is one of the most important and influential books in English history, but it has received relatively little attention from literary scholars. This study seeks to remedy this by attending to the Prayerbook's importance in England's political, intellectual, religious, and literary history. The first half of the book presents extensive analyses of the Book of Common Prayer's involvement in early modern discourses of nationalism and individualism, and argues that the liturgy sought to engage and textually reconcile these potentially competing cultural impulses. In its second half, Liturgy and Literature traces these tensions in subsequent works by four major authors – Sidney, Shakespeare, Milton, and Hobbes – and contends that they operate within the dialectical parameters laid out in the Prayerbook decades earlier. Central to all these cultural negotiations, both liturgical and literary, is an emphasis on symbolic representation, in which the conflict between collective and individual authority is worked out through complex acts of interpretation. Rosendale's analyses are supplemented by a brief history of the Book of Common Prayer, and by an appendix which discusses its contents.

Timothy Rosendale is Assistant Professor of English at Southern Methodist University, Dallas. His work has appeared in various journals including Studies in English Literature, Renaissance Quarterly, and Early Modern Literary Studies. This is his first book.
For my family
. . . nam liber loquitur obscure,
et quamvis coneris candide interpretari,
non poteris effugere magnum absurditatem.

(Dryander to Bullinger, 5 June 1549)

. . . [The Book of Common Prayer] speaks very obscurely,
and however you may try to explain it with candour,
you cannot avoid great absurdity.

“O Sir, the prayers of my mother, the Church of England,
no other prayers are equal to them!”

(George Herbert)
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Note on texts

All quotations from the Book of Common Prayer (also referenced as the Prayerbook or BCP) are taken from either F. E. Brightman’s magisterial *The English Rite* or E. C. Ratcliff’s *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*. Brightman’s text is more scholarly; Ratcliff’s is handier and more widely available; both are very useful. In most cases, unless Brightman’s content or apparatus made its use necessary or specifically beneficial, I have used the more convenient Ratcliff, citing only parenthetically by page. I have left these quotations in their original spelling, for the most part, though I have done i/j and u/v modernizations, and I have quietly expanded printing elisions with the elided letters in italics.