

The Royal Law

Source of our Freedom Today

L L Blake



SHEPHEARD-WALWYN

© L L Blake, 2000 & 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this book
may be reproduced in any form without
the written permission of the publisher,
Shepherd-Walwyn (Publishers) Ltd

First published in 2000 by
Shepherd-Walwyn (Publishers) Ltd
107 Parkway House, Sheen Lane.
London SW14 8LS
www.shepherd-walwyn.co.uk

Paperback edition 2018

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record of this book
is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-85683-527-8

Typeset by R E Clayton
Printed and bound in Great Britain
by 4edge Limited

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
1 Government	1
2 Monarchy	16
3 Sovereignty	35
4 Coronation	61
<i>Appendix I: The Form and Order of Queen Elizabeth II's Coronation</i>	86
<i>Appendix II: Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical</i>	102
<i>Index</i>	117

Here is Wisdom; This is the royal Law; These
are the lively Oracles of God.

The presenting of the Holy Bible, Coronation Service

More than 70% of Britons affirm belief in
God, but not as churchgoers

Religion in Britain since 1945, Grace Davie
(Oxford 1994)

Our whole history and culture in Europe is
based on Christianity, whether you believe in
it or not. Our culture is Christian: Shakespeare,
Mozart, – all that makes life worth living is
part of the Christian tradition.

Sir John Mortimer, *playwright and atheist*.
(*Daily Telegraph* 28.4.99)

1

Government

This book is to do with words of government. Disraeli once said: 'With words we govern men'.¹ An Act of Parliament is an act in words. Even brute force requires a commander's voice. Solzhenitsyn put it accurately enough, when he foretold the break-up of the Soviet regime:²

Yes, yes, of course – we all know that you cannot poke a stick through the walls of a concrete tower, but here's something to think about: what if those walls are only a painted backdrop?

Looking back, even a fool would be able to predict it today: the Soviet regime could certainly have been breached only by literature. The regime has been reinforced with concrete to such an extent that neither a military coup nor a political organisation nor a picket line of strikers can knock it over or run it through. Only the solitary writer would be able to do this...

In the appendix to this book is printed a substantial part of the Coronation Service for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Reader, you are asked to read it, before proceeding any further; and to drink deeply of the magnificent words. At one point in the Service, the Archbishop goes to the Queen's chair and says: 'Our gracious Queen: to keep your Majesty ever mindful of the Law and the Gospel of God as the Rule for the whole life and government of Christian princes, we present you with this Book, the most valuable thing that this world affords'. And the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland presents the Bible to the Queen, and says: 'Here is Wisdom; This is the royal Law;

1. *Churchill* edited by Robert Blake and Wm. Roger Louis, [OUP 1993], p. 6

2. *The Oak and the Calf*, [Collins and Harvill Press 1980], p. 10

These are the lively oracles of God’.

Are these meaningless words in the modern world? Do they have a strange beauty about them, as coming from a distant past of coronation-making, but no relevance to our lives today? Are we governed by them any more? Is there a Government of God?

In the view of this writer, there is.

Take an ordinary example: here is part of Regulation 83 of the Motor Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations, 1969¹:

(1) Save as provided in paragraph (2) of this Regulation, no person shall use or cause or permit to be used on a road, any motor vehicle or trailer a wheel of which is fitted with a pneumatic tyre, if...

(f) where the tyre is fitted to a wheel of a motor vehicle, being a motor cycle whereof the cylinder capacity of the engine does not exceed 50 cubic centimetres, the tread of the tyre does not show throughout at least three quarters of the breadth of the tread and round the entire outer circumference of the tyre a pattern the relief of which is clearly visible, or where the tyre is fitted to the wheel of any other motor vehicle or any trailer, the tread pattern (excluding any tie-bar) of the tyre does not have a depth of at least 1mm. throughout at least three-quarters of the breadth of the tread and round the entire outer circumference of the tyre;

A dense enough Regulation to measure out the responsibility of those who do not obey their duty to others. Yet, at any time, we can be free of this density by simply observing the rule of the Common Law:²

The duty of the owner of a motor car in a highway...is to use reasonable care to avoid injuring those using the highway.

And lying beyond that:³

Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,

1. S.I. 1969 No 321, as amended.

2. as expressed e.g. by Atkin LJ in *Hambrook v Stokes Bros.* [1925] 1KB 141

3. *St Matthew* 22, vv 36-40

and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

This is the first and great commandment.

And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

Jean Domat, the seventeenth century French lawyer, wrote something of great value concerning these two laws, love thy God, love thy neighbour:¹

However, although men have violated these fundamental laws, and although society be in a state strangely different from that which ought to be raised upon these foundations, and cemented by this union; it is still true that these divine laws, which are essential to the nature of Man, remain immutable, and have never ceased to oblige men to the observance of them; and it is likewise certain... that all the laws which govern society, even in the condition in which it is at present, are no other than consequences of these first laws.

‘All the laws’: he makes no exception. It is a true lawyer’s perspective, looking down the line from the very finest to the coarsest. Yet the fundamental rules remain, and are still there, in the twenty-first as in the seventeenth century. They can always be appealed to, when we lose our way, and sincerely want to turn back.

In 1917, in *Bowman v Secular Society*², the House of Lords in its wisdom decided that Christianity was no longer part of the law of England. Quite how they made this out it is hard to say; but it was the heyday of Fabianism. Lord Sumner gave the leading judgment: ‘My Lords, with all respect for the great names of the lawyers who had used it, the phrase “Christianity is part of the law of England” is really not law: it is rhetoric... One asks what part of our law may Christianity be, and what part of Christianity may it be that is part of our law? Chief Justice Best once said that “there is no act which Christianity forbids that the law will not reach. If it were otherwise, Christianity would not be, as it has always been

1. *The Civil Law in its Natural Order*, Vol. 1, Chap. 1, sect. viii

2. [1917] AC 406

held to be, part of the law of England". But this was rhetoric too'.

Rhetoric or not, they had their minds changed for them by that excellent Welsh judge, Lord Atkin, in 1932, in the most famous case in English law (although its facts took place in Scotland), *Donoghue v Stevenson*¹. There Mrs Donoghue claimed that she had been poisoned by a decomposed snail which had floated out of an opaque ginger beer bottle, when she poured herself a second drink, in a cafe in Paisley. The matter went as high as the House of Lords for a final decision as to whether there was a cause of action, on these alleged facts (although subsequently there was never a trial on the evidence). Judges simply did not know what to do: there was a great sympathy for the woman's plight, but the state of the existing law did not seem to provide any remedy. She could not sue the cafe: the drink had been purchased by someone else and, in any event, how could the snail have been detected in an opaque bottle? Should the manufacturer be liable? But there appeared to be no nexus between him and the victim; the bottle was not, by nature, a dangerous commodity for which he could be held liable *per se*.

In the biography *Lord Atkin*² it is mentioned that Atkin did not think that a more important problem had ever occupied the House of Lords in its judicial capacity. The appeal raised a question which had revolutionary consequences for the law of civil liability for carelessness. 'It provided a test for the legal system and would demonstrate whether that system was congruent with or remote from the everyday needs of society'.

Atkin himself was searching for some general principle which would open the law. His eldest grandson, now Lord Aldington, remembers as a boy how he attended the family lunch party in Wales:

-
1. [1932] AC 562
 2. by Geoffrey Lewis [Butterworths 1983] p. 57 *et seq.*

During the summer holidays of 1931 I was staying at Craig-y-don with other members of the family. In those days the family went to Matins at the Aberdovey Church every Sunday morning and there was a large family lunch with aunts and cousins presided over by my grandfather, who took much pride in his carving of the joint. He often used the carving time and the carving weapons to conduct a discussion. I remember on several occasions that the post-church discussion about the snail and the ginger beer bottle case— who is my neighbour? — was an easily understandable theme immediately after church. I was then at Winchester aged 17 — an enthusiastic classical student and ignorant of the law, but fascinated by the arguments, and proud of having a grandfather who was so concerned with human relationships and responsibilities...

In Lord Atkin's speech giving judgment in the House of Lords, the great principle emerges: '...The rule that you are to love your neighbour becomes in law, you must not injure your neighbour; and the lawyer's question, Who is my neighbour? receives a restricted reply. You must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour. Who, then, in law is my neighbour? The answer seems to be — persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question.'

Later, Lord Atkin was to say: 'I doubt whether the whole of the law of tort could not be comprised in the golden maxim to do unto your neighbour as you would that he should do unto you'.

Thus, the opinions of the most senior judges in the realm meant that there was a cause of action for Mrs Donoghue to take up. She was the neighbour whom the manufacturer had reasonably to keep in mind when he was making and bottling his product. The Common Law thereafter was opened to all manner of actions in negligence, where the care bestowed on one's neighbour falls short of the standard of reasonableness required by the law. Indeed, the law was revolutionized. But it had as its foundation the

revealed law, the law from the scriptures of God. 'It will be an advantage', said Lord Atkin at the end of his judgment, 'to make it clear that the law in this matter as in most others is in accordance with sound common sense'.

The Will of God is law for us, and our true government, and it finds expression through words. As St John said:¹

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

The same was in the beginning with God.

All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not...

And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.

Jean Domat made the point that the divine laws are essential to the nature of Man, and are immutable. What, then, is the true nature of Man? The eighteenth century explored this subject very thoroughly. They came to the conclusion that Man's true nature was to be happy; and this happiness (or inner peace and harmony) was prescribed by the Creator through natural laws, discoverable by the use of reason.

One of the best descriptions comes from the seminal work of our great Common Law jurist, Sir William Blackstone (1723-80). In his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* Blackstone writes:²

For [the Creator] has so intimately connected, so inseparably woven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter. In consequence of

1. *St John* 1, vv 1-5, 14

2. Vol. 1, Introduction, sect. 2

which mutual connection of justice and human frailty, he has not perplexed the law of nature with a multitude of abstracted rules and precepts...but has graciously reduced the rule of obedience to this one paternal precept, "that man should pursue his own true and substantial happiness". This is the foundation of what we call ethics, or natural law. For the several articles into which it is branched in our systems, amount to no more than demonstrating that this or that action tends to man's real happiness, and therefore very justly concluding that the performance of it is a part of the law of nature; or, on the other hand, that this or that action is destructive of man's real happiness, and therefore that the law of nature forbids it.

Jeremy Bentham, who was one of Blackstone's students, was incensed by what he considered to be the Tory complacency of his tutor. No doubt others, reading this today, would be equally cross. Happiness, Bentham snorted, went without question: everyone desired happiness, few would find it. He desired 'to show how absolutely unserviceable and indeed disserviceable the idea of God is for the purpose of solving any political problem, and to point out the absurdity of jumbling in the manner [Blackstone] has done, things sacred with profane'.¹

In due course Bentham adopted and propounded the principle behind Utilitarianism (which still motivates us today), that 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation'. Blackstone said, quite rightly, that the test was in the *effect* or *result* of one's actions: did it produce happiness, or harmony? On this test, ever since the eighteenth century, Bentham's pronouncement has been gravely deficient in two respects: welfare state legislation has divided people – while the 'greatest number' might be materially better off, and 'happy', the minority will be in misery; and it is certainly true that determining the nature and extent of that 'greatest happiness' has become the role and function of numerous political busybodies. Bentham himself, of course, was always designing ways of imposing his

1. *A Comment on the Commentaries* Sect. 3, 'Divine Law'.

ideas of happiness on the multitude.

Blackstone's test was, and is, an exact one. The question is whether any law, written or unwritten, statute or custom, makes everyone happy. That is to say, they all agree with, and live harmoniously with, the operation of that law. As Plato said, ... 'the object of laws... is to make those who use them happy, for all goods are derived from them'.¹ On the other hand, if a law divides the community, makes some happy and others miserable, this is by definition not a law natural to Man. Being unnatural, it can be law only for a limited time, and will have constantly to be amended and changed, to utter complexity and confusion. Then there is a chance to revert to the underlying natural law, which never uses force to achieve its ends, but just works all the time. It is the law we all take for granted, like gravity. But it is immutable and it runs our lives, basically.

This view - that natural law in fact runs our lives for us - may not be a popular one. Yet, to Socrates, it was self-evident. Condemned unjustly to die, he is visited in his cell by friends who urge him to escape. He replies, but why should I shun the laws which at the beginning gave me life, and protected and maintained me, when now they have decided I must die? He pretends that the laws of Athens speak to him:²

'Consider, Socrates, if we are speaking truly that in your present attempt you are going to do us an injury. For, after having brought you into the world, and nurtured and educated you, and given you and every other citizen a share in every good which we had to give, we further proclaim to every Athenian, that if he does not like us when he has come of age and has seen the ways of the city, and made our acquaintance, he may go where he pleases and take his goods with him; and none of us laws will interfere with him... But he who has experience of the manner in which we order justice and administer the state, and still remains, has

1. *The Laws*, 631 [Jowett Translation].

2. *Crito*, 51-2 [Jowett Translation].

entered into an implied contract that he will do as we command him. And he who disobeys us is, we maintain, thrice wrong; first, because in disobeying us he is disobeying his parents; secondly, because we are the authors of his education; thirdly, because he has made an agreement with us that he will duly obey our commands; and he neither obeys them nor convinces us that our commands are unjust; and we do not rudely impose them, but give him the alternative of obeying or convincing us; - that is what we offer, and he does neither'.

Modern examples of those laws which divide people include abortion and divorce statutes. But underlying all activity in this country, and the English-speaking world generally, is the Common Law of reason, the natural law which we tend to take for granted. How often do we buy travel tickets on buses and trains without considering the law of contract? For that matter our daily purchases and sales are all governed by the law of sale of goods, which we only hear about when something goes wrong; and then there is the possibility of a court hearing in which the wrong may be righted, by a judgment based on reason (or appealed). We pass and re-pass along the public highway without considering the thicket of laws through which we go. We travel by car and public transport, knowing that the law of torts protects us from careless injury. No one can enter our house without permission or the authority of a court. We do not leave our homes in the morning, only to find them occupied by another family on our return. We take the law of property for granted; but there are countries where history has shown the evils of dispossession of rightful owners, to be replaced by favoured ethnic groupings.

There is a third factor in this triad of evidence of the existence of God's government, starting with the divine commandment, going on through natural law – and that is, rightness. We know in ourselves what is right and what is wrong. It is implanted. J E G de Montmorency, sometime Quain Professor of Comparative Law in the University of London, said this in his book:

But if a man or woman, however bad, were placed in a position that eliminated all personal interest and were asked to decide whether such an action were right or wrong the *mens conscia recti* that dwells in every one of us would prevail, at any rate prevail to the extent that the answer would be that this action would be right and that action would be wrong, though they themselves would defy the consequences of a wrong action... It is a strange and mysterious thing, this universal sense of what is right, a sense that cannot be obscured in any ultimate resort in any human being... It is a mysterious thing, but the explanation is really not far to seek in an age that recognizes that law - universality of operation - is the very atmosphere of all our being.

...It would be a more mysterious and stranger thing if there were not the universal sense of orderliness, and for this reason: it would be an exception from an otherwise all-prevailing rule in the universe as we know it. The material universe, the conventional structure of which is slowly becoming known to us, is incapable of deviation from a certain orderliness which can scarcely be an accidental thing, which certainly is an inherent property of physical energy, which certainly is reasonable in our human sense, an orderliness which many or most people attribute to a self-conscious external Mind closely concerned with the affairs of the universe, a Mind which we call God.¹

Around the walls of the fifteenth century Platonic Academy in Florence was inscribed the maxim of the philosopher-priest, Marsilio Ficino: 'All things are directed from goodness to goodness. Rejoice in the present; set no value on property, seek no honours. Avoid excess; avoid activity. Rejoice in the present.'²

It is this rightness which is equity in the law and sovereignty in government. Equity, originating in the Sanskrit 'eka', meaning 'one', is that which gives wholeness, justice, to the law when its balance is found wanting. Similarly, sovereignty in government means doing right to the people, or, better still, letting right be done; for right is always in the intention of God, as we can see in the above quotation from Ficino. What is required from govern-

1. *The Principles of Law* [Benn's Sixpenny Library 1929] pp. 11-13

2. *The Letters of Marsilio Ficino* [Shephard-Walwyn] Vol. 1, p. 40

ment is simply to remove those obstacles which stand in the way of goodness flowing to goodness. The historic Petition of Right was a means by which the subject might bring the Crown under law, culminating in the endorsement by the Home Secretary of the words 'Let right be done'.

'Upon that difference', wrote Professor R W Chambers, '- whether or no we place Divine Law in the last resort above the law of the State - depends the whole future of the world'.¹

Marsilio Ficino (1433-99), upon whose teaching in a very real sense the whole direction and purpose of the present Renaissance culture depended, makes the same point:²

...For I have learned from Plato that those arts which are concerned with personal welfare may sometimes be adequately directed by human wisdom; but that in the art which looks after the good of the state, the director is God Himself and should be acknowledged as such. I have learned that to God belongs the care of all things, but especially of public and state affairs, and that human wisdom is not the governess, but rather the handmaid and servant of divine government.

The Platonic myth in *Protagoras* alludes to this: Prometheus, or human providence, discovered all the arts except care of the state. For this, he says, is given to us by Jupiter through Mercury; that is, it is granted by divine providence through angelic inspiration day by day. Plato also alludes to this by means of comparison: just as without man one beast cannot be successfully and rightly guided by another, so without God man cannot be guided by man. What else could this prophecy mean: 'The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord and He turneth it whithersoever He will'? Likewise this saying from the gospels: 'Thou couldst have no power except it were given thee from above'; and again: 'There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God'. Dionysius the Areopagite made archangels teachers and guides to the leaders of men. David used the Psalms as reins to regulate the government of his kingdom. For he knew that 'except the Lord keep the city, the watch-

1. *Under God and the Law* [Basil Blackwell 1949], cover note.

2. *The Letters of Marsilio Ficino op. cit.*, Vol. V, pp 50-51

man waketh but in vain'. Solomon represents divine wisdom as proclaiming: 'By me kings reign and lawgivers decree what is just. By me princes rule and the mighty decree justice'...

Orators and poets wisely say that those who hold public office are like the helmsmen of ships and, like those who are forever tossed among rocks by wind and wave, they are perpetually in need of protection by divine powers...

As 'David used the Psalms to regulate the government of his kingdom', so we use the Coronation Service as reins to regulate the true government of this kingdom. At the heart of the constitution of this country is, therefore, a song of praise.

It is all a matter of words. Fine words give rise to fine actions; the proliferation of hollowed-out words gives rise to confusion and doubt. Indeed, words can be so manipulated by government that they express the opposite of what they were created to do: the best examples come from George Orwell's frighteningly perceptive book, *1984*. Winston is looking out of his window at the white walls of the Ministry of Truth, on which are emblazoned the words:

WAR IS PEACE
FREEDOM IS SLAVERY
IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH¹

Meanings are not only distorted, but the language is compacted into Newspeak so that concepts of liberty are forgotten. Winston's acquaintance, Syme, works on the eleventh edition of the Newspeak Dictionary. In the foul canteen of the Ministry of Truth, Syme speaks enthusiastically of his work:²

'Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly *one* word, with its

1. [Penguin Books], p. 29

2. *Ibid.*, p. 55

meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten. Already, in the Eleventh Edition, we're not far from that point. But the process will still be continuing long after you and I are dead. Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller...'

That must be the great fear, that the 'range of consciousness' becomes ever smaller, and 'political correctness' rules the mind. The way forward must be through literature, as Solzhenitsyn reminds us. Children should be encouraged to read the best literature, especially Shakespeare, the King James Bible and - the Coronation Service. P D James wrote: 'Give people language and you give them control over their lives'.¹

The language of the Prayer Book and of the Coronation Service is the language of true government, which goes on all the time behind the facade of party politics. It is the language at the heart of the great, historic institutions, many of which are the product of medieval thinking, now so derided; but which have survived Reformation and Renaissance and are the foundation on which the modern state cavorts - these institutions are monarchy, parliament, common law, jury system, church, universities, civil service, armed forces. Monarchy is consecrated to its lifelong duty through the words of the Coronation Service, and, in particular, the oath; the common law at its finest is expressed in words of poetic beauty. Indeed, Blackstone's work, *The Commentaries*, was once described as the poetry of law. The Church has Tyndale. Universities - the old universities - are centres for the teaching of universal knowledge,² not for instruction in how to make money. The civil service traditionally sought its recruits among those with classical learning. The Navy went into battle with flags signalling fine words, 'England expects that every man will do his duty'.

We need from time to time to be reminded of the existence of these

1. *The Salisbury Review*, Summer 1999, p. 5

2. *The Idea of a University*, John Henry Newman [Oxford], preface.

institutions and to know that they form the essence of the nation. A *Times* leader, headed 'National Interest', once said:¹

The sovereign state of Britain is the Crown in Parliament. The system of parliamentary democracy embraces the notion of governments formed from parliamentary majorities for limited periods of office, with regular provision for peaceful change when the parliamentary majority reflects a different balance of political interest. To be loyal to the principles of parliamentary democracy involves a residual disloyalty to the government of the day since it must imply acceptance that a different government with different policies from the present one would also command the same loyalty from its servants and from the other state institutions as this one does...ministers may have their Parliamentary majority behind them and it may give them temporary power to use the permanent institutions of the state - the monarchy, the civil service, the armed forces - to further their policies. But those institutions will outlast them and be at the service of their political opponents.

Even as the words of the Coronation Service may nourish us, so they nourish these institutions which give life to the nation.

Compare the language with which this country entered the Second World War with that bellowed from Berlin. King George VI told the nation: 'We can only do the right as we see the right, and reverently commit our cause to God'. Hitler to his Army of the West and to the German people: 'Sections of the German Army in the East have now, for two days, in response to Polish attacks, been fighting for the establishment of a peace which shall assure life and freedom to the German people. If you do your duty, the battle in the East will have reached its successful conclusion in a few months, and then the power of the whole Nazi State stands behind you'.²

Lord Denning, that great master of the law, was also a master of language. At the end of one of his books he said:

-
1. 25th February 1985
 2. quoted in *Sovereignty – Power beyond Politics*, L L Blake [Shepherd-Walwyn 1988], p. 89

[I]f we seek truth and justice we cannot find it by argument and debate, nor by reading and thinking, but only by the maintenance of true religion and virtue. Religion concerns the spirit in man whereby he is able to recognize what is truth and what is justice; whereas law is only the application, however imperfectly, of truth and justice in our everyday affairs. If religion perishes in the land, truth and justice will also. We have already strayed too far from the faith of our fathers. Let us return to it, for it is the only thing that can save us.¹

Just as American children learn about their Constitution, so we should remind ourselves (and particularly our children) of the fine quality of the Coronation Service; and it is the purpose of this book so to remind us. Edward Ratcliff, in his account of *The English Coronation Service*,² wrote:

In a sense, the English Coronation Service epitomizes the history of the English monarchy and people, and of the relation existing between them. What we collect piecemeal from historical and constitutional documents, scattered over a period of nearly a thousand years, we find gathered up and integrated in the Coronation Service.

The Coronation Service is where the Divine Law is placed above the law of the State, acknowledged and revered. It reminds us of the source of all our law, in truth and in justice. We should not forget the words in which are conveyed the truth which inspires our Common Law.

The question is, whether this fine language can continue into the next coronation, when it comes – given the sorry propensity of the Church to desecrate its own liturgy. Fortunately, the oath by a new monarch committed to a lifetime's obedience is embedded in an Act of Parliament (the Coronation Oath Act 1689).

HRH Prince Charles loves the English language and is unlikely to make any major changes to the Service.

1. *The Changing Law* [Stevens 1953], p. 122

2. SPCK 1937, pp 20-1

Appendix I

The Form and Order of Queen Elizabeth II's Coronation

I. The Preparation

In the morning upon the day of the Coronation early, care is to be taken that the Ampulla be filled with the Oil for the anointing, and, together with the Spoon, be laid ready upon the Altar in the Abbey Church.

The Litany shall be sung as the Dean and Prebendaries and the choir of Westminster proceed from the Altar to the west door of the Church.

The Archbishops being already vested in their Copes and Mitres and the Bishops Assistant in their Copes, the procession shall be formed immediately outside of the west door of the Church, and shall wait till notice be given of the approach of her Majesty, and shall then begin to move into the Church.

And the people shall remain standing from the Entrance until the beginning of the Communion Service.

II. The Entrance to the Church

The Queen, as soon as she enters at the west door of the Church, is to be received with this Anthem:

Psalm cxxii. i-3, 6, 7.

I WAS glad when they said unto me, We will go into the house

of the Lord. Our feet shall stand in thy gates, O Jerusalem. Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself. O pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and plenteousness within thy palaces.

The Queen shall in the mean time pass up through the body of the Church, into and through the choir, and so up the stairs to the Theatre; and having passed by her Throne, she shall make her humble adoration, and then kneeling at the faldstool set for her before her Chair of Estate on the south side of the Altar, use some short private prayers; and after, sit down in her Chair.

The Bible, Paten, and Chalice shall meanwhile be brought by the Bishops who had borne them, and placed upon the Altar.

Then the Lords who carry in procession the Regalia, except those who carry the Swords, shall come from their places and present in order every one what he carries to the Archbishop, who shall deliver them to the Dean of Westminster, to be by him placed upon the Altar.

III. The Recognition

The Archbishop, together with the Lord Chancellor, Lord Great Chamberlain, Lord High Constable, and Earl Marshal (Garter King of Arms preceding them), shall then go to the East side of the Theatre, and after shall go to the other three sides in this order, South, West, and North, and at every of the four sides the Archbishop shall with a loud voice speak to the People: and the Queen in the meanwhile, standing up by King Edward's Chair, shall turn and show herself unto the People at every of the four sides of the Theatre as the Archbishop is at every of them, the Archbishop saying:

SIRS, I here present unto you Queen ELIZABETH, your undoubted Queen:

Wherefore all you who are come this day to do your homage and service, Are you willing to do the same?