

Figures of Prayers in *Measure for Measure*

Machiko Fujimura (藤村 待子)

Introduction

Having been composed in the aftermath of the accession of a new monarch, *Measure for Measure* has long since received critical attention with respect to its equivocal possibility of topical reference.¹ As the earliest performance on record dates back to the court performance at Whitehall, presumably before King James, on St Stephen's Night in 1604, the Duke of Vienna, the protagonist of what Kamps and others call 'disguised prince' plot, tends to be identified with the king himself. The evaluation of the Duke's policy, therefore, is not only a matter of the Duke's problem, but also sometimes the play's stance towards the actual policy of James I hinges on the point.

Although the problem of presenting a negative image of the king before the king himself remains to be solved,² current critical interest at least seems to invest both in positive and negative implications of the assumption. On the one hand, the king's insistence on his prerogative over the common law is a focal point of controversy. Stephen Cohen, for one, has recently recaptured the juridical issue in the play with the Duke's insistence on his prerogative over common law (1998). In the play, Angelo, the Duke's deputy, first adheres to the inflexible letters of the law and then comes to identify himself as the "the voice of the recorded law" (II.iv.61). In his analysis of both the Duke and his deputy, James I, who viewed himself as '*lex loquens*', or 'the speaking Law' and his insistence on royal prerogative over the common law figure prominently and it is in this context that the play's emphasis on the Duke's morality bears significance.³

The King's prerogative is not only pertinent to the juridical issues but also to the religious issues as well. With a slight shift in focus, the play can also be related to the Authorized Version, whose project was initiated in 1604. If the King's political initiative in the project 'to fix the "letter" of the Bible' has a bearing on the play's theme of interpreting the 'spirit' of the commandment in the Old Testament, 'measure for measure' (Barnaby and Wry, 1998: 1234), the relevance can also be witnessed in the play's continual problematization of a language system in its broader context as well. In the play, 'the sustaining connections between religious, moral, legal, and political authority' are undermined precisely because they reside in 'a language system in which form always threatens to become separated from content or in which the "letter" cannot always be trusted to refer to "spirit"' (Barnaby and Wry, 1998: 1236).

Whether concerned to see the play as representative of the king's religious policy or to see it in the context of the king's prerogative over the common law, those claims converge on one point: they share the view to see in the Duke the secular authority arbitrarily interpreting and

manipulating the law at his own will.

On the other hand, the Duke's concurrent hold of both ecclesiastical and political roles in the play is also related to the politico-religious policy of James I. The Duke, who in disguise acts as a friar in order to enforce the secular law, might naturally remind the audience of the Hampton Court Conference, where the king vindicated his *via media* policy with 'an explicitly anti-puritan vindication of the odd mixture of the erastian and the sacerdotal that made up the English royal supremacy' (Lake, 2001: 59). In the play, the Duke, who 'ever loved the life removed' (I. iii. 8), and is later guaranteed by a friar as 'a man divine and holy' (V.i.144) and no 'temporary meddler' (V.i.145), keeps meddling with the temporary affairs. Peter Lake contends that the Duke's whole political scheme depends for its success on the information he gets through ministering: by hearing others' confessions, he came to know the information necessary to settle a dispute and maintain law and order (2001: 177).⁴

Lake compares the play with the contemporary murder pamphlets and observes considerable departure from the convention. In typical murder pamphlets, convicted felons confess their crime and testify their repentance before their execution. Their repentant deaths are attributed to 'the collaboration of three agents': God's providence, the secular magistrate, and the minister. While Providence bends events to dispense both divine justice and mercy, the secular magistrate works exclusively as the agent of justice and the minister as the agent of mercy (2001: 165). As Lake points out, Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* departs considerably from the prevalent convention, in that the Duke acts as both secular magistrate and religious minister. According to Lake, one of the major differences lies in the fact that the friar is not a 'real minister' but 'a secular magistrate in clerical drag' who does not convert any to 'a true repentance or good death' (2001: 167).

Debora Shuger likewise emphasizes the Duke's ecclesiastical role as characteristic in *Measure for Measure* by comparing it with its source. In Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*, arguably the play's principal source, not only the king, the counterpart of Shakespeare's Duke, but also other people act as agents of mercy: the provost, for instance, sets Andrugio, Claudio's counterpart, at liberty on his own judgment against the official order, acting on his religious conviction. In *Measure for Measure*, in contrast, the Duke assumes all those spiritual roles such as hearing confessions and visiting the gaol (2001: 60). According to Shuger, the assumption of 'the sacerdotal nature of royal authority' and the 'notion of the king as a *mixta persona*' justifies the Duke's pastoral ministry in *Measure for Measure*:

In *Basilicon Doron*, James reminds Prince Henry that 'by your calling ye are mixed ... betwixt the ecclesiastical and civil estate: for a king is not *mere laicus*, as both the Papists and Anabaptists would have him, to the which error also the Puritans incline over-far.' By asserting the king's priestly aura in the teeth of papal and presbyterian claims that rulers, whatever their temporal eminence, are mere laypersons and hence subject to the church, the passage underscores the link binding the sacral / sacerdotal king of high Christian royalism to the urgent post-Reformation contest over whether the state should or could be the primary bearer of the sacred. (Shuger, 2001: 59)⁵

Hence, the play displays an anti-puritan stance to some extent:

One might well see this [the success of the Duke's scheme] as an explicitly anti-puritan vindication of that odd mixture of the erastian and the sacerdotal that made up the English royal supremacy; taking it as a confirmation of James's famous anti-presbyterian claim that princes were not 'mere laics' and thus as a refutation of the overly severe and complete puritan separation between the secular and the spiritual, the minister and magistrate, the church and the state, which reached its logical conclusion in the Presbyterian platform. (Lake, 2001: 177)

In the light of these critical attempts to read the play in the anti-puritan context of Hampton Court Conference, this paper intends to discuss the significance of figures of prayers in the play. The Year 1604 was precisely the year when the new version of the Book of Common Prayer was published. In the first chapter of this paper, I would like to discuss the secularization of prayers in the play. In the play, religious prayers are affected and undermined by the secular concerns. Secular petitions, in turn, take on the religious connotations. In the next chapter, I will localize the prayer issue in the context of the juridical issue to see how both premeditated prayer words and the common law share the basic problem: neither prayers nor the law can reflect one's specific need. While the Duke's arbitrary intervention with the law is meant to redress the inflexibility of the law, his problem with the prayers defies his prerogative over the religious issues. In the last chapter, I will look at the Duke's practice of prayer and his failure of prayer. His failure of prayer indicates the limit of the Duke's concurrent hold of both sacred and secular offices. While he succeeds in deriving political information, most of the benefits he derives from his ecclesiastical disguise are somewhat political, as some critics observes.⁶ In what follows, I hope to illustrate those points by looking at prayers in the play.

1. Secularization of Prayers

1.1 Prayer for Peace

After the Duke embarks on a journey, the Viennese people surmise the Duke's motive. Seeking explanation for the Duke's absence, Lucio, one of the Viennese gentlemen, speculates that the Duke has gone abroad to make a truce with the king of Hungary. The other gentlemen's reaction to his story is a symbolically hollow prayer:

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Heaven grant us its peace, but not the King of Hungary's!

SECOND GENTLEMAN. Amen.

LUCIO. Thou conclud'st like the sanctimonious pirate, that went to sea with the ten commandments but scraped one out of the table.

SECOND GENTLEMAN. 'Thou shalt not steal'?

LUCIO. Ay, that he razed.

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Why, 'twas a commandment to command the captain and all the rest from their functions: they put forth to steal. There's not a soldier of us all

that in the thanksgiving before meat do relish the petition well that prays for peace. (I. ii. 4 -16)⁷

While 'its [Heaven's] peace' reminds one of the 'peace of God' as in Philippians 4:7 (Bawcutt, 1991: 91), it also reminds of the common blessing before a meal which was often concluded with prayer for peace in sixteenth century England (Marcus, 1988: 188). In addition to those associations, however, prayer for peace had acquired two specific connotations by 1604, the year of the earliest performance. On the one hand, James I had acceded to the throne and introduced new policy on the relationship with Spain. While the later reign of Queen Elizabeth I was constantly at war with Spain, often with the pirates,⁸ presumably those who 'went to sea with the ten commandments but scraped one out of the table', King James, after a short period of silence, operates a peace policy with Spain.⁹

On the other hand, considering contemporary relief over the peaceful succession of monarch, prayer for peace was, in a sense, synonymous with prayer for the king. According to the extant record of sermons at court, for instance, Henry Hooke delivered a sermon at court before James I in 8 May 1604. In his sermon, he makes three points by citing Psalm 122: 6 ('Pray for the peace of Jerusalem', sig Aijr). By identifying England under the new king with the city of Jerusalem, the site of the politico-religious policy, the preacher first claimed that the peace is realized only in 'religious commonweale' which, as Peter E MacCullough cites, seeks 'the blessednesse of policie vnited with true religion'. Hooke then goes on to suggest that maintaining a peace already secured is 'no lesse vertue than to seeke it'. It is in this context that Hooke refers to 'the miracle of the recent succession', with particular emphasis on 'the superiority of male government'. After cautioning against the threat of the Jesuits, Hooke encouraged prayer as 'the best means for securing the continued peace of "Jerusalem"'.¹⁰

1.2 Secularisation of Prayers

Nevertheless, in the conversation above, their prayer for peace is not depicted as something sincerely wished. Despite all its significance, their prayer for peace can easily be cancelled by materialistic concern, as the Viennese gentlemen admit (I.ii.4-11). Their scope of prayer is restricted and defined by their economic interest. As has been explained in the Oxford edition, the word 'Hungarian' was associated with 'a Hungry person' (The *OED* definition s.v.2). The gentleman might suffer hunger, losing their job as soldiers. Although the gentlemen wish for peace, they would not lose their job as soldiers with the end of the war. It is implied that they need the war to be continued for their job's sake (92).¹¹

Furthermore, prayer for the authority is not only affected by material concern but also treated as a material *per se*. The tendency can be epitomized in Isabella's argument on prayer. When Isabella implores Angelo to spare her brother capital punishment, Isabella proposes to offer a bribe in order to soften Angelo:

ISABELLA. Hark how I'll bribe you; good my lord, turn back.

ANGELO. How? Bribe me?

ISABELLA. Ay, with such gifts that heaven shall share with you.

LUCIO. (*aside to Isabella*) You had marred all else.
 ISABELLA. Not with fond sicles of the tested gold,
 Or stones whose rate are either rich or poor
 As fancy values them, but with true prayers
 That shall be up at heaven and enter there
 Ere sunrise, prayers from preserved souls,
 From fasting maids whose minds are dedicate
 To nothing temporal.

ANGELO. Well, come to me tomorrow.
 LUCIO. (*aside to Isabella*) Go to, 'tis well; away.
 ISABELLA. Heaven keep your honour safe.
 ANGELO. (*aside*) Amen. (II. ii. 147-61)

Furthermore, Angelo cannot concentrate on his prayer because his secular concerns distract his attention. His soliloquy shows that he cannot pray because his mind is full of them: 'When I would pray and think, I think and pray | To several subjects. Heaven hath my empty words' (II. iv. 1-2).

Thus, far from edifying the people on behalf of the secular law, which has long since lost its deterrent effect, the prayers are affected and changed by their secular concerns, and sometimes even treated as a secular bribe. However, the ideal prayer is defined as follows:

ISABELLA. Not with fond sicles of the tested gold,
 Or stones whose rate are either rich or poor
 As fancy values them, but with true prayers
 That shall be up at heaven and enter there
 Ere sunrise, prayers from preserved souls,
 From fasting maids whose minds are dedicate
 To nothing temporal. (II. ii. 151-57)

The secularization of the contents of prayer is one of the controversial issues in Shakespeare's time. In their attempts to eliminate the theatricality of the service, Puritans criticized the Book of Common Prayer. Along with other reasons, one of the reasons was that the book contained too many earthly petitions. The Anglican reaction to their rebuke can be seen in Hooker's vindication of the Book of Common Prayer. Against Cartwright's contention that there were too many 'earthly petitions' in the official prayer book, Hooker vindicated the Anglican prayer book with what might be counted as Calvinistic assumption: Hooker presupposes that one's inward thoughts need to be redressed with the external aid.

Firstly, he justified the prayer book on the ground that the content is suitable for the society where so many people are obsessed with the materialistic concerns. As people are familiar with the need of the secular life, the 'earthly petitions' effectively enable them to concentrate on devotions. Secondly, he argues that the prayer book gives the opportunity for those secular people to pray for the spiritual things that they would not wish for unless the prayer book forced

them to. Thus, Hooker stressed the edifying role of the 'earthly petitions' in the prayer book and in so doing attempted to refute the nonconformist's criticism of church service as superficial idolatry (Targoff, 2001: 55-56).

However, in the play, the role of prayers to edify and to complement the secular juridical problem has been undermined by the materialistic concerns as some puritan apologists had feared. In that sense, prayers in the play embody the puritan fear of ineffective prayers though the play is assumed to be anti-puritan in its cast.

1.3 Prayer, Secular Petition, and the Confusion of the Law

In turn, secular petitions take on smack of religious devotions in the play. The confusion of the sacred with the secular can be illustrated by the confusion of petitions to those in authority with religious prayers. This can be illustrated by Isabella's petitionary prayers. When Lucio asks Isabella to visit Angelo for her brother's sake, his diction is close to that of prayer: 'LUCIO. All hope is gone, | Unless you have the grace by your fair prayer | To soften Angelo' (I. iv. 68-70). Lucio continues:

when maidens sue
Men give like gods; but when they weep and kneel
All their petitions are as freely theirs
As they themselves would owe them. (I. iv. 80-83)

When Isabella asks Angelo to spare her brother civil penalty, the language of her petition resembles religious prayer. The language she uses in her petition itself seems almost interchangeable with the religious devotions.

Peter Lake sees the logical fallacy of both Isabella and Angelo as a logical consequence of the underlined confusion of the secular law with the canon law. According to him, both Isabella and Angelo confuse the divine law with the secular one. Referring to the contemporary puritan's suggestion to implement the Mosaic Law in England, he points out Angelo's tendency to view the law in Vienna not as an imperfect, arbitrary law but as the perfect divine one (2001: 169). Angelo sometimes reacts to Isabella's plea as if he were enforcing the divine law, which, he claims, treats all sin equally.¹² Although Isabella, the Catholic, points out the fallacy, ' 'Tis set down so in heaven, but not in earth' (II. iv. 50), she later makes her argument on the same ground (Lake, 2001: 174-75).

Beneath these juridical confusions, there underlies the confusion of sin with crime, which leads to the confusion of religious prayers with the secular petitionary prayers:

ISABELLA. Because authority, though it err like others,
Hath yet a kind of medicine in itself
That skins the vice o'the top. Go to your bosom,
Knock there, and ask your heart what it doth know
That's like my brother's fault; if it confess
A natural guiltiness, such as his,

Let it not sound a thought upon your tongue
Against my brother's life. (II. ii. 136-43)

The tendency to identify the secular prayer with the religious devotions is by no means restricted to *Measure for Measure*. Other than this play, this identification is, for instance, at work in the petitionary scene in *Richard II*. During the play, religious devotions and secular petitions to kings are constantly linked by people's gesture of kneeling. After she found that her son hatched a plot to assassinate King Henry IV, the Duchess of York implores the king to pardon her son's high treason. On her knees, she asks for his pardon. She stays kneeling (V. ii. 116-7)¹³ till the king pardons him. To her prayer, the Duke of York was opposed, claiming similar argument to that of Angelo:

YORK. [*to King Henry*] If thou do pardon whosoever pray,
More sins for this forgiveness prosper may.
This festered joint cut off, the rest rest sound;
This let alone will all the rest confound. (V. iii. 82-85)

Her argument on the secular petitionary prayers to the king, in reply, is curiously coterminous with one of the contemporary prayer-debate issues:

KING HENRY. Rise up, good aunt!
DUCHESS OF YORK. Not yet, I thee beseech.
Forever will I walk upon my knees
And never see day that the happy sees
Till thou give joy, until thou bid me joy,
By pardoning Rutland, my transgressing boy.
AUMERLE. Unto my mother's prayers I bend my knee. [*Kneels.*]
YORK. Against them both my true joints bended be. [*Kneels.*]
Ill mayst thou thrive if thou grant any grace.
DUCHESS OF YORK. Pleads he in earnest? Look upon his face.
His eyes do drop no tears; his prayers are in jest;
His words come from his mouth, ours from our breast.
He prays but faintly and would be denied;
We pray with heart and soul and all beside.
His weary joints would gladly rise, I know;
Our knees still kneel till to the ground they grow.
His prayers are full of false hypocrisy;
Ours of true zeal and deep integrity.
Our prayers do outpray his; then let them have
That mercy which true prayer ought to have.
(V. iii. 91-109)

In her exposition to Claudius's failure of prayer, Ramie Targoff explains how the contemporary Anglican apologists employed anti-theatrical rhetoric to justify bodily expression, such as kneeling and facial expressions, as significant in prayer. Initially, those expressions were regarded as the indicators of the sincerity of prayers. They gradually came to acquire its significance as the means to edify prayers' internal state (Targoff, 1997: 51). When we consider Henry Bolingbroke has acquired his reputation by kneeling (III. iii. 72-77, II. iii. 83-4, and III. iii. 190-93), this identification of secular kneeling with religious devotions cannot be merely coincidental. He often conveys his loyalty to King Richard with his bended knee:

KING RICHARD. A brace of draymen did God speed him well,
And had the tribute of his supple knee
With 'Thanks, my countrymen, my loving friends',
As were our England in reversion his,
And he our subjects' next degree in hope. (I. iv. 32-36)

When he kneels, his posture thus simultaneously conveys his religious faith and secular loyalty:

BOLINGBROKE. On both his knees doth kiss King Richard's hand
And sends allegiance and true faith of heart
To his most royal person, hither come
Even at his feet to lay my arms and power
Provided that my banishment repealed
And lands restored again be freely granted. (III. iii. 36-41)

His posture is highly impressive in contrast to King Richard, who says, 'I hardly yet have learned | To insinuate, flatter, bow and bend my knee' (IV. i. 165-66).¹⁴ In the petitionary scene above, the Duke of York criticizes his son's repentance in his prayer on the same ground as the Duke in *Measure for Measure* uses in probing the nature of Julietta's repentance: 'Fear, and not love, begets his penitence. | Forget to pity him, lest pity prove | A serpent that will sting thee to the heart (V. iii. 55-57).

However, the king Henry was not completely fallen into the same fallacy as in *Measure for Measure*. For one thing, King Henry makes distinction between the crime already committed and uncommitted crime: 'Intended or committed was this fault? | If on the first, how heinous e'er it be, | To win thy after-love I pardon thee' (V. iii. 32-34). It is this confusion that, according to Lake, Isabella makes when she asks Angelo to pardon her brother's crime, were there any sin in Angelo's bosom (II. ii. 136-43). As long as crime in question is only thought upon, it is not crime. It is true, for sure, that the distinction between religious sin and secular crime is sometimes obscured even in *Richard II*, when they talk about prayer. In fact, the cult of Richard II is sarcastically seen in the play (I. ii. 37-41). Even in the speech of King Henry, the distinction between sin and crime is highly obscured:

KING HENRY. My dangerous cousin, let your mother in.

I know she's come to pray for your foul sin. (V. iii. 80-81)
KING HENRY. Your mother well hath prayed, and prove you true.
DUCHESS OF YORK. Come, my old son. I pray God make thee new. (V. iii. 144-45)

Here, secular prayers and religious prayers are hardly distinguishable from each other.

At the same time, however, the king Henry IV bears in mind that he is but a mere human being needed to be forgiven, as has been noted in the passage in the Lord's prayer:

KING HENRY. I pardon him, as God shall pardon me.
DUCHESS OF YORK. O, happy vantage of a kneeling knee!
Yet am I sick for fear. Speak it again,
Twice saying 'Pardon' doth not pardon twain,
But makes one pardon strong.
KING HENRY. With all my heart
I pardon him.
DUCHESS OF YORK. A god on earth thou art! (V. iii.)

In contrast, this recognition seems to be obscured in the Friar / Duke in *Measure for Measure*. In the play, both the Duke and his deputy think they are, as it were, the absolute judges:¹⁵

DUKE. No, holy father, throw away that thought.
Believe not that the dribbling dart of love
Can pierce a complete bosom. Why I desire thee
To give me secret harbour hath a purpose
More grave and wrinkled than the aims and ends
Of burning youth.
FRIAR. May your grace speak of it? (I. iii. 1-6)

If the Duke assumes his infallibility, his deputy likewise builds on the assumption:

ANGELO. You may not extenuate his offence
For I have had such faults; but rather tell me,
When I that censure do so offend,
Let mine own judgment pattern out my death,
And nothing come in partial. Sir, he must die (II. i. 27-31)

Based on this claim, Angelo strictly applies the fornication law to Claudio. Peter Lake claims that only 'his own conviction of his own sinlessness' makes such decision possible: 'On this basis he is a "puritan" indeed' (2001: 176). Moreover, later in the play, when the Duke in disguise reproaches the juridical failure of Angelo and Escalus, his criticism of 'poor souls' takes on religious tones and again assumes the Duke's infallibility:

DUKE. Boldly, at least. But O, poor souls,
Come you to seek the lamb here of the fox?
Good night to your redress! Is the Duke gone?
Then is your cause gone too. The Duke's unjust
Thus to report your manifest appeal,
And put your trial in the villain's mouth
Which here you come to accuse. (V. i. 299-305)

Certainly, the idea that a king is God's deputy was then prevalent enough, and the confusion of secular petitions with sacred prayer might be naturally explained by the parallel structures. However, when we consider the underlying confusion in the play, we might safely assume that these confusions are constructed on purpose.

Some of the contemporary audience might have remembered the recent Hampton Court Conference, where religious prayers and petitions to the king were considered to be coterminous. At the Hampton Court Conference, John Reynolds, the leading puritan delegate, implored King James I for some means which would enable ministers to improve their preaching skills. On hearing his petition, Richard Bancroft, the bishop of London, suddenly knelt down. On his knees, he entreated the king to foster a 'praying ministry' rather than a minister 'who think it the only duty of ministers to spend the time in the pulpit'. In the succeeding speech, as Lori Ferrell contends, 'he [Bancroft] made a distinction between praying and preaching ministries' in order to convince the king that there were 'the two opposing parties in the Church of England' (1996: 72). According to him, as she analyses, kneeling, often associated with the act of praying, simultaneously expresses obeisance to God as well as obeisance to the monarch:

In an erastian church, it conveyed these ideas simultaneously. Herein lay the heart of the problem—were the two issues coterminous? Just where in matters of religion did secular loyalty end and religious conviction begin? What was the spiritual duty of a subject confronted with the arbitrary rule of a royal supremacy? And just how arbitrary was that rule?—in rhetorical terms, Bancroft's juxtaposition of praying with preaching ministries was studied and succinct. He by-passed the theological consensus that may well have existed between two parties—after all, Calvin's theology has no excursive relation either to prayer or to preaching—[. . .] The bishop of London ingeniously transformed the idea of an educated preaching clergy, one of the cornerstones of Protestantism, into a threat to the royal supremacy.—Speaking on his knees, Bancroft turned a 'praying ministry' into an obedient ministry, and identified it with a posture of humility and obeisance. (Ferrell, 1996: 73)¹⁶

Thus, we have seen how the confusion of the secular with the religious law, especially such as the underlying confusion of sin with crime leads to the confusion of sacred prayer with secular one: secular petitionary prayers are almost treated as religious devotions. Far from complementing the secular law, the prayers in the play are likewise secularized.

2. The Prayer Book and the Juridical Issues

2.1 Form and Content of Prayer

As has been mentioned in the preceding chapter, Isabella's prayer is exchanged as a commodity. As if to stress its materiality, her prayer for the Duke's deputy always consists of the same phrase, kind of *oratio jaculatoria*: 'Save your honour.' Earlier in the same scene, the provost also greets him with the same phrase (II. ii. 25). She also uses the term as a farewell remark: 'O just but severe law! | I had a brother, then. Heaven keep your honour' (II. ii. 41-42).¹⁷

Although 'your honour' simply serves as an honorific title, considering that it is honour that Angelo loses later in the play, it is quite ironical that she vehemently prays for his 'honour'. The gentlemen above later discuss the effectiveness of prayer, saying it does not matter which words you use in your prayer, because 'Grace is grace despite of all controversy, as for example thou thyself art a wicked villain despite of all grace' (I. ii. 24-26). Thus, although the diction of Isabella's prayer literally prays for his honour, Angelo loses his honour though his life is saved.

Taken literally, her prayer in this sense is incompatible with her underlined wish. Earlier in the scene, she asks him to reflect on himself. She asks him to reprieve her brother if his heart 'confess[es] | a natural guiltiness, such as his [Isabella's brother's]' (II. ii. 140-41). In other words, the possibility of Claudio's reprieve thus depends on Angelo's sense of hidden sin: the possibility that he finds himself not so honorable a man. In fact, as she repeats the same prayer, he gradually finds himself attached to Isabella:

ISABELLA. Heaven keep your honour safe.

ANGELO (*aside*). Amen.

For I am that way going to temptation

Where prayers cross. (II. ii. 160-63)

ISABELLA. Save your honour.

Exeunt all but Angelo

ANGELO. From thee, even from thy virtue! (II. ii. 167-68)

Even when Angelo tells her he is executing his brother, her prayer remains the same: 'ANGELO. (*To her*) Your brother cannot live. | ISABELLA. Even so. Heaven keep your honour' (II. iv. 33-34). She later delivers a similar prayer to the Duke when she feels he has humiliated her: 'Heaven shield your grace from woe, | As I, thus wronged, hence unbelieved go' (V. i. 119-20). When Claudio asks her to save him with a corrupt means, she even says, 'I'll pray a thousand prayers for thy death, | No word to save thee' (III. i. 149-50).

Not only Isabella, but also other members of the play engage in prayer whose content is far detached from their meaning. When Pompey, a tapster, is arrested, he asks Lucio to pay bail bond for him in vain:

POMPEY. I hope, sir, your good worship will be my bail.

LUCIO. No indeed will I not, Pompey, it is not the wear. I will pray, Pompey, to increase your bondage; if you take it not patiently, why, your mettle is the more.

Adieu, trusty Pompey. Bless you, friar. (III. i. 337-41)

Elsewhere, Lucio asks the Friar / Duke to pray for him while slandering against the Duke. His request of prayer is interwoven with slanders: 'Farewell, good friar, I prithee pray for me. The Duke—I say to thee again—would eat mutton on Fridays' (III. i. 437-39). These instances of insincere prayer words seem to suggest, there is considerable distance between what those prayers literally mean and what the praying people actually have in mind.

2.2 Failure of 'Precise' Prayer

After the initial conversation with Isabella, Angelo tries to pray by himself:

ANGELO.¹⁸ When I would pray and think, I think and pray
To several subjects. Heaven hath my empty words,
Whilst my invention, hearing not my tongue,
Anchors on Isabel: Heaven in my mouth,
As if I did but only chew his name,
And in my heart the strong and swelling evil
Of my conception. The state whereon I studied
Is like a good thing, being often read,
Grown seared and tedious; [. . .]
[. . .]

[. . .] O place, O form
How often dost thou with thy case, thy habit,
Wrench awe from fools and tie the wiser souls
To thy false seeming! Blood, thou art blood.
Let's write 'good angel' on the devil's horn,
'Tis not the devil's crest. (II. iv. 1-17)

Like Claudius in *Hamlet* (III. iii. 36-79, 97-98), this might be classified as the usurpers' failure of prayer. It might also testify to the difficulty of praying in solitude (Targoff, 2001: 53). Certainly, Angelo's failure might justify Hooker's claim that common prayer is a precaution against 'the distraction and devotional lethargy', the difficulties attendant on praying privately by oneself (Targoff, 2001: 53). Especially, in the case of 'precise' Angelo, his distress might have conformed to the audience's stereotypical 'proud puritan' who cannot pray on his knees (Ferrell, 1996: 74).

While apparently demonstrating the distraction warned by Anglican argument, Angelo's failure of prayer is itself a clear illustration of the Puritan's anxiety as well, for the fact still remains that Angelo says prayer words:

ANGELO. When I would pray and think, I think and pray
To several subjects. Heaven hath my empty words,
Whilst my invention, hearing not my tongue,

Anchors on Isabel: Heaven in my mouth,
As if I did but only chew his name, (II. iv. 1-5)
CLAUDIUS. My words fly up, my thoughts remain below.
Words without thoughts never to heaven go. (*Hamlet*, III. iii. 97-98)

The Church of England had defined the ideal praying as reading the Book of Common Prayer. Since the Admonition Controversy, the puritans opposed to the use of the premeditated words by distinguishing praying from reading the prayer book.¹⁹ In reply, the Anglican apologists offer their definition of prayer, according to which, Angelo manages to pray: 'Heaven hath my empty words' (II.iv.4). The premeditated prayers, especially in the Book of Common Prayer,²⁰ are, by the Anglican definition, considered as the most effective set words of prayer. This can be seen more clearly in contrast to Macbeth, who was literally unable to say 'Amen' to the princes' prayer for blessing:

MACBETH. One cried 'God bless us!' and 'Amen' the other,
As they had seen me with these hangman's hands.
List'ning their fear, I could not say 'Amen'
When they did say 'God bless us.'

LADY MACBETH. Consider it not so deeply.

MACBETH. But wherefore could not I pronounce 'Amen'?
Had most need of blessing and 'Amen'
Stuck in my throat. (*Macbeth*, II. ii. 29-36)

If Angelo seems at least able to recite the prayer book, in the automatic act of reading his repeated prayer words remain distant from his internal condition: his internal state is not transformed into something cleaner. While Claudius in *Hamlet* cannot pray for pardon, Angelo cannot pray to be delivered from evil thoughts. Hence, although Angelo is often associated with them, his practice is the kind of prayer which would be criticized by puritans.

This tendency of prayers without sincerity in the play is, however, highly problematical, especially from the puritanical point of view. The puritans famously attacked theatres on the anti-theatrical ground. As has been widely known, not only the stages but also theatrical elements in the church became the object of their criticism: they criticized the theatricality of the service in the Church of England, seeing the remnants of Catholicism in it. Their anti-theatrical attitudes naturally endorse and led to their preference of extemporaneous prayer to premeditated set phrases. Jonathan Barish recapitulates their argument as follows:

Not only the Puritan attack on the stage, but the Puritan attack on the liturgy, it may be suspected, drew strength from the belief in a total sincerity. Worship, to be genuine, could only be a direct translation of one's inner self. It could only be unique, spontaneous, an unpremeditated outpouring from the grateful soul. To reduce it to set forms, to freeze it in ritual repetitions of word or gesture, to commit it to memory, to make it serve a variety of occasions or a diversity of worshippers, was to make the

individual a mimic of sentiments not exactly, or not entirely, his own, to introduce a fatal discrepancy between the established gesture and the nuances of feeling. (Barish, 1981: 95)

Both Barish and Targoff agree that Milton's *Paradise Lost* provides an exemplar of ideal devotions in this sense (Barish, 1981: 95-96; Targoff, 2001: 37). Apparently rehearsing the Puritan argument on prayers since 1570s, Adam and Eve pray:

But first, from under shady arborous roof
Soon as they forth were come to open sight
Of day-spring, and the sun, who, scarce up-risen,
With wheels yet hovering o'er the ocean-brim,
Shot parallel to the earth his dewy ray,
Discovering in wide landskip all the east
Of Paradise and Eden's happy plains,
Lowly they bowed adoring, and began
Their orisons, each morning duly paid
In various style; for neither various style
Nor holy rapture wanted they to praise
Their Maker, in fit strains pronounced, or sung
Unmeditated; such prompt eloquence
Flowed from their lips, in prose or numerous verse,
More tuneable than needed lute or harp
To add more sweetness; and they thus began.

(*Paradise Lost*, V. 137-52)

Enriched with 'various style', their prayers are not confined to prescriptive patterns. Rather than memorizing the prayer words, they engage in 'unmeditated' extemporaneous prayers. As Barish argues, meditation entails another 'element of acting, and hence of falsehood': 'To adopt the very words today that one used yesterday, to imitate even one's own previous prayers, let alone those of others, would be to put on a *performance* of piety, instead of simply being pious' (Barish, 1981: 95-96).

As has been seen, the prayers in *Measure for Measure* neither reflect one's wish nor contribute to the prayers' edification, thereby in a way embodying Puritanical fear of insincere devotions. In the play, with the character's secular concerns, prayers' words are almost reified to lose their function as religious devotions.

2.3 The Law as an Insight into Prayer Issues

Furthermore, religious devotions cannot serve as the corrective to the secular world. In the gentlemen's conversation below, the Mosaic Law, the ecclesiastical law, gives them an insight into their practice of prayer:

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Heaven grant us its peace, but not the King of Hungary's!

SECOND GENTLEMAN. Amen.

LUCIO. Thou conclud'st like the sanctimonious pirate, that went to sea with the ten commandments but scraped one out of the table.

SECOND GENTLEMAN. 'Thou shalt not steal'?

LUCIO. Ay, that he razed.

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Why, 'twas a commandment to command the captain and all the rest from their functions: they put forth to steal. There's not a soldier of us all that in the thanksgiving before meat do relish the petition well that prays for peace. (I. ii. 4-16)

The idea that law gives an insight into prayer itself is not unique but shared by contemporaries. Their shared properties are also emphasised in one of the sermons before Prince Henry at Oatlands in 1603 which, like the other sermon I cited earlier, was later to be published and circulated. Hugh Broughton, a famous puritan preacher, preached at court, citing Matthew 6:9-13. In his sermon, he criticized images and vestments and called for new translations of both the Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer. In the course of his argument, he cited the Ten Commandments as 'an interpretive tool' for the Lord's Prayer 'by matching the laws of the former with corresponding petitions from the latter'. The first half of the Ten Commandments consists of the commandments concerning the relationship between God and human beings, while the latter half is concerned with the human relationship with each other.²¹ Along with the puritan idea of both Mosaic Law and the secular law, the implication seems significant.

The similarity of the secular law with the religious devotions in the play does not end there. Both the law and the prayer book share the paradigmatic structures. The problem with the secular law lies in the fact that it must delete the specificity of individual cases, for the law must derive a similar structure out of each case, and thus ignores the differences, in order to apply the terms universally to the specific situations (Eagleton 1986: 48-57). The law, for instance, does not consider the specificity of Claudio's case. Not only the law but the prayers share the basic problem. As the soldiers remark, prayer might be 'In any proportion or in any language', and 'in any religion' (I. ii. 22-23), because 'Grace [i.e. blessing before a meal] is grace, despite of all controversy; as, for example, thou thyself art a wicked villain, despite of all grace' (I. ii. 24 -26). Prayers in the play do not complement those ineffective secular laws. What appeals to Claudio in *Hamlet* is prayer for deliverance from temptation and prayer for pardon: 'And what's in prayer but this two-fold force, | To be forestalled ere we come to fall, | Or pardoned being down?' (*Hamlet*, III. iii. 48-50). However, neither of the functions is fulfilled in the play. Hence, the juridical problem is pertinent to the weakness of premeditated prayers in the play.

2.4 The Book of Common Prayer

It might remind one of the Book of Common Prayer, which is itself a compilation of rules and guidance for the ecclesiastical ceremonies.²² As has been mentioned, the new, revised version of the Book of Common Prayer was published in 1604, the year of the earliest recorded performance of *Measure for Measure*.²³ Alongside the prayer book, James I's 'A Proclamation

for the Authorizing and Uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer So to Be Used throughout the Realm' was issued in the year in order to secure its dutiful observance.

This tendency might be partly ascribed to the paradigmatic characteristic of post-Reformation prayer book. In pre-Reformation England, priests and congregation prayed different prayers during the service. In post-Reformation England, in contrast, the emphasis was put on unanimous, public prayers which would enable the congregation to understand and pray with the priests' prayer during the service. The new emphasis can be demonstrated, as Targoff shows us, by the paradigmatic use of 'we' in the General Confession in the Book of Common Prayer. Private, auricular confessions before the Sacrament of Holy Communion in post-Reformation England were replaced with the General Confession, public prayer. As Targoff puts it, 'Individual identities are temporarily suspended in the face of this collective voice that does not differentiate among its speakers' (2001: 33):

What is designated as a personal utterance—'from the bottom of thine heart add the confession of thy sins'—turns out to involve a prescribed set of words that do not necessarily reflect or accommodate the specific conditions of the speaker. The devotional *I* that the Primer puts forth is no more nor less than singular version of the liturgical *we*. (Targoff, 2001: 35)

Taking these similarities into consideration, the ineffectiveness of the law in *Measure for Measure* is all the more significant in understanding the prayers in the play. The law turns out to be an ineffective deterrent to the offences and hence needs to be supplemented by the royal intervention: the law remains ineffective as a deterrent till the very end, and it is the Duke who frustrates the deputy's effort to enforce the law. In the end, the Duke pardons all the characters, thereby completely negating the power of law. As Lake concludes, 'no one dies, no one (with the partial exception of Isabella) repents and everybody gets married' (2001: 167). The law is thus deprived of its two functions to make one repent and prohibit one from the crime. The weakness of the law resides precisely in the point that it cannot consider specific situations. However, in the case of prayer, the Duke's intervention with religious issues might not be that successful. In the last chapter, I hope to consider the Duke's ecclesiastical role by examining his practice of prayers.

3. The Prayers of the Duke

3.1 The *Via Media* Policy of James I

At the end of the play, the Duke intervenes with the law to offer mercy. While the Duke's arbitrary intervention with the law might merit the audience's applause and celebration, his engagement in prayer betrays his problem of ecclesiastical policy. To illustrate this point, I would like to return to the soldiers' prayer, which I have quoted in the preceding chapters:

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Heaven grant us its peace, but not the King of Hungary's!
SECOND GENTLEMAN. Amen.

LUCIO. Thou conclud'st like the sanctimonious pirate, that went to sea with the ten commandments but scraped one out of the table.

SECOND GENTLEMAN. 'Thou shalt not steal'?

LUCIO. Ay, that he razed.

FIRST GENTLEMAN. Why, 'twas a commandment to command the captain and all the rest from their functions: they put forth to steal. There's not a soldier of us all that in the thanksgiving before meat do relish the petition well that prays for peace.

SECOND GENTLEMAN. I never heard any soldier dislike it.

LUCIO. I believe thee, for I think thou never wast where grace was said.

SECOND GENTLEMAN. No? A dozen times at least.

FIRST GENTLEMAN. What, in metre?

LUCIO. In any proportion or in any language.

FIRST GENTLEMAN. I think, or in any religion.

LUCIO. Ay, why not? Grace is grace, despite of all controversy; as, for example, thou thyself art a wicked villain, despite of all grace.²⁴ (I. ii. 4-26)

At first sight, their reference to the act of tampering (I. ii. 4-11) may be seen as an ironical treatment of Millenary Petition by the puritans, and the puritan understanding of both Mosaic Law and the Book of Common Prayer. On James's accession, the puritans petitioned to the new king for further reformation. The revision of the Book of Common Prayer is one of their requests at Hampton Court Conference. They expressed their hope that some words be omitted in the new prayer book. While their ardent petition resulted in both new versions of the prayer book and the Scripture, little was reflected in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer which was published in 1604 (Brightman, 1921: clxxxix-clxxxii).

On the contrary, however, it may be possible to consider this as a reaction to the *via media* policy. The soldiers' indifference to the details of their prayer may have reminded the contemporary audience of the king's *via media* policy simultaneously. For the peace of the ecclesiastical polity, King James I continued to keep balance between the Catholic and Puritan approaches, sometimes employing the similar arguments to refute those two opposing views. For that purpose, he discouraged his subjects from discussing details of ceremony. While the prayers of Isabella, a Catholic novice, and that of Angelo, a puritanical figure, are supposed to be quite different, both characters share one problem: as Puritans feared, prayers with set words in the play cannot express the worshippers' specific situations.

At the Hampton Court Conference, King James dismissed arguments concerning some aspects of ceremonies of the service as 'insignificant' in order to secure the peace of the ecclesiastical polity. In contrast to the reigns of both his predecessor and successor, where not only obedience through subscription but also ceremonial conformity was coerced, his policy was unusual in that it did not urge the ceremonial conformity. He demanded acceptance of the government, liturgy and basic doctrine of the Church through subscription, but did not insist that controversial ceremonies should be constantly observed (Fincham and Lake, 1993: 26). Not only ceremonies but also debate on Predestination was also among those issues to be avoided:

voluntarily pray in their soliloquies. The Provost, for instance, secretly prays for Isabella so that she dissuades Angelo from executing Claudio: 'Heaven give thee moving graces!' (II. ii. 36); 'Pray heaven she win him' (II. ii. 127). He also prays for Claudio: 'Heaven give your spirits comfort!' (IV. ii. 67). With such improvisation, or spontaneity, which might remind one of the puritan vindication of the extemporaneous prayers, his prayers directly express his hope.

Likewise, after Angelo turns down Escalus's suggestion to reprieve Claudio, Escalus secretly prays for his forgiveness:

ESCALUS. (*aside*)

Well, heaven forgive him, and forgive us all.
Some rise by sin, and some by virtue fall.
Some run from brakes of vice, and answer none,
And some condemned for a fault alone. (II. i. 37-40)

Even Isabella offers to pray for Angelo:

ISABELLA. That I do beg his life, if it be sin
Heaven let me bear it; you granting of my suit,
If that be sin, I'll make it my morn prayer
To have it added to the faults of mine,
And nothing of your answer. (II. iv. 69-73)

Those prayers might present striking contrast to the prayers of the Duke. In contrast, from the very beginning, when the Duke asks for vestments, he asks a friar to teach him how to play his ecclesiastical part convincingly:

DUKE. Therefore, I prithee,
Supply me with the habit and instruct me
How I may formally in person bear
Like a true friar. (I. iii. 45-48)

This theatricality of the Duke's ecclesiastical role, however, is incompatible with the ideal of James's understanding of the king's ecclesiastical role:

Sacral kingship entails that the prince 'represent unto us the person even of God himself' not as an actor represents a character but as a priest at the altar represents Christ—or as the Duke makes Angelo 'In our remove...at full ourself' (I. I .43). A good actor need not be a good human being, but a priest who is not himself good cannot be a good priest.—his [James's] understanding of the way in which kings imitate the persons of the Trinity and of the saints is wholly anti-theatrical. The sacral character of the mimesis forbids any disjunction between the royal persona and the royal person; it is essential that the imitation of God be a true likeness, not role-

playing, for the obvious reason that the street name for make-believe godliness is hypocrisy, the white devil. (Shuger, 2001: 62-63)

As has been seen, his practice of prayer reveals the problem of his spiritual role.

Another instance of his hollow prayer can be seen in his conversation with Julietta. According to Lake, his conversation with Julietta is the only example where his ministering as a friar possibly succeeds (2001: 167). However, his ineffective prayer again proves the opposite. After simply confirming the nature of Julietta's repentance, he informs her of the coming execution of Claudio and left her with a farewell remark:

JULIETTA. I do confess it, and repent it, father.

DUKE. 'Tis meet so, daughter, but lest you do repent

As that the sin hath brought you to this shame,
Which sorrow is always toward ourselves, not heaven,
Showing we would not spare heaven as we love it,
But as we stand in fear—

JULIETTA. I do repent me as it is an evil,

And take the shame with joy.

DUKE.

There rest.

Your partner, as I hear, must die tomorrow,
And I am going with instruction to him.

Grace go with you; Benedicite. *Exit.*

JULIETTA. Must die tomorrow! O injurious law,

That respites me a life, whose very comfort
Is still a dying horror! (II. iii. 29-42)

It is evident that he left her at the very moment she needs ministering. After he left, Julietta throws off her former mental tranquility and just despairs. Far from receiving spiritual comfort, she gets worse.

Furthermore, the problem can especially be observed in the Duke's inability to make a felon pray. In his attempt to save Claudio from his death penalty, the Duke schemes to put another convicted felon to death and afterwards send his corpse to Angelo as a token of his execution. However, the prisoner, the substitute for Claudio, is so drunk that he cannot follow the Friar / Duke's instruction to prepare for the death:

ABHORSON. Truly, sir, I would desire you to clap into your prayers, for look you, the warrant's come. [. . .]

DUKE. Sir, induced by my charity, and hearing how hastily you are to depart, I am come to advise you, comfort you, and pray with you.

BARNARDINE. Friar, not I. I have been drinking hard all night, and I will have more time to prepare me, or they shall beat out my brains with billets. I will not consent to die this day, that's certain. [. . .]

DUKE. Unfit to live or die; O gravel heart! (IV. iii. 38-61)

The absence of such prayer presents striking contrast to its source: in *Primos and Cassandra*, by contrast, a group of convicted prisoners are brought onto the stage by catchpoles and unanimously sing a psalm-like prayer:

With heart and voice to thee O Lord,
At latter gasp for grace we cry:
Unto our suits good God accord,
Which thus appeal to thy mercy.
Forsake us not in this distress,
Which unto thee our sins confess (1. II. iii. qtd. in Shuger, 2001: 51)
Our secret thoughts thou, Christ, dost know,
Whom the world doth hate in thrall.
Yet hope we that thou wilt not so,
On whom alone we thus do call.
Forsake us not in this distress,
Which unto thee our sins confess,
Forsake us not, &c. (1. II. vii. qtd. in Shuger, 2001: 52)

When a catchpole teases one of the prisoners, the attendant preacher scolds him. The priest ministers those anonymous prisoners till their last moment, and their psalm-like prayer which is absent from Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* attests to their faith in the face of death. In addition to their *Ars Moriendi*, as Shuger claims, their prayer leaves another impression on the audience: it also reminds the audience of the 'space | Betwixt this world and that of grace', the space, in other words, between 'the state, which punishes criminals, and Christ, who has mercy on sinners' (2001: 52). The intermediate space between those two spheres is almost lost in the play which celebrates the coalescence of the sacred and the secular roles of the Duke.

It is possible to claim that the Friar/ Duke, though a Catholic in his role, shows a Protestant cast in this scene. The significance of prayer in the hour of one's death had come to acquire its significance as a performance. In pre-Reformation England, people were strongly encouraged to cleanse their sin by means of the last Sacrament and confession. In post-Reformation England, where the doctrine of purgatory was officially negated, prayers play a major role in the ideal *Ars Moriendi*.²⁶ Considering the importance of prayer in the post-Reformation England, the Duke's failure with prayer is all the more significant. In addition, he does not pray with Claudio, who is, as he himself believes, dying on the next day. Teaching how to accept his death with resignation, through secular preaching, is all the Duke does for him.

Considering the shift in the meaning of prayer in post-Reformation England, this secular exploitation of confession is all the more meaningful. His practice of prayer is far from the ideal prayer (II. ii. 151-57). Hence, the Duke's failure of prayers in the play indicates the problem caused by the Duke's ecclesiastical policy, which is closely bound up with his political role.

Conclusion

As has been seen, figures of prayers in *Measure for Measure* serve as the medium to convey the problem attendant on the political exploitation of religion. In light of the critical attempts to recapture the play in the context of Hampton Court Conference, this paper has attempted to discuss the significance of figures of prayers in the play. The first chapter of this paper argued the secularization of prayers in the play. In the play, religious prayers are affected and undermined by the secular concerns. Secular petitions, in turn, take on religious connotations. In the second chapter, I compared the contemporary prayer controversy with the juridical issues to see how both premeditated prayer words and the law in the play share the same problem: neither prayer words nor the law deal with one's specific situation.

While the inflexibility of the law justifies the Duke's arbitrary intervention with the juridical issues, his failure of prayer defies his prerogative over the religious issues. Thus, in the last chapter, the problem of the Duke's policy was discussed by examining his own practice of prayer. His failure with prayer indicates the limit of his concurrent hold of both sacred and secular offices. While he succeeds in deriving political information from ministering, his prayers betray the shaky ground on which his claim to the ecclesiastical issues is built. It is also worth noting that the corollary of these confusions, the ineffectiveness of prayers in this anti-puritan play, is criticized, following the puritans' account. The Duke's ecclesiastical role, rather than vindicating the unity of religion and politics, the emphasis of much recent criticism, demonstrates the ineffectiveness of prayers, criticized according to the strictures of the very Puritans that the play elsewhere seems to be denouncing.

Notes

¹ See, for example, Bennet (1966), Greenblatt (1988: 129-64), Tennenhouse (1982), Dollimore (1994: 72-87), and Bernthal (1992: 247-69).

² See, for example, Gibbons (1991), and Astington (1999: 133).

³ See also Hamilton (1992: 111-27), and Marcus (1988).

⁴ However, this mixture of the sacred with the secular is not confined to the king alone. The mixture is significant in its broader historical context as well:

If clergymen really became guilty of 'meddling in secular affairs', 1603 surely marks the start of that process. Elizabeth treated her clergy notoriously badly and perhaps only Whitgift ever enjoyed her trust and affection. She left sees vacant with impunity and acted with little thought for the prestige and economic standing of her Church. All this changed dramatically under James I [. . .] Nevertheless, it is under James that we detect a big change from the reign of Elizabeth, as bishops were pulled into—and sought—more secular roles and authority than hitherto. Whitgift had been the sole cleric admitted to Elizabeth's Privy Council; he was retained on the accession of James I, but did not live to see six other Jacobean bishops serve on the Council—Bancroft, Abbot, Bilson, Andrewes, Montagu and Williams. (Foster, 1993: 140-41)

⁵ The nature of kingship is also pertinent to the juridical issue as well: 'Bacon likewise invokes the king's *mixta persona* but in the context of the tension between the royal prerogative and the common law

rather than, as in *Basilicon Doron*, between crown and church' (Shuger, 2001: 59). For the common lawyers and their defence of nonconformists before the 30 November 1604 deadline of subscription, see Hamilton (1992: 118-25).

⁶ See, for example, Slights and Holmes (1998: 263-69).

⁷ In this paper, all the quotations of *Measure for Measure* are from the Oxford edition by Bawcutt (1991).

⁸ See, for example, Jacques (1989).

⁹ See, for example, Ungerer (2000: 309-25).

¹⁰ The diskette attached to McCullough (1998).

¹¹ For the contemporary connotation of Hungary as a site of religious conflict, see Marcus (1988: 187-89), Lever (1965: xxxi), and Ellison (2003: 65). Although Hungary may have reasonably reminded the audience of the recent truce, the 'hungry' reading is also possible in the context of their ensuing conversation on meals.

¹² Certainly, Angelo's recourse to the divine law on the secular case, his tendency to apply the divine law across the board, is congruent with the contemporary understanding of the puritan theocratic vision, where the divine law directly governs the earthly society through godly magistrates (Lake, 2002: 621-700; Hammlton, 1992: 111-27). In discussing the play, however, the puritan idea of theocratic society should be distinguished from high Christian royalism such as James I's insistence on the king as more than 'mere laics'. This paper is mainly concerned with the latter issue, the secular prince holding sway over the issues ecclesiastical rather than the godly magistrate governing the secular society. In the petitionary scene, as we have seen, the juridical confusion between the divine law and the secular one inevitably causes the confusion of secular petitions with religious prayers which, again, leads us back to the question of high Christian royalism.

¹³ Quotations of *Richard II* are from the Arden edition by Forker (2002).

¹⁴ It is all too famous that Queen Elizabeth I saw her criticism in the figure of Richard II. However, concerning prayers, Elizabeth I differs considerably from Richard II in her emphasis on her 'bended knee' in her prayers (McCullough, 1998: 76-77, 156-57).

¹⁵ Foster states as follows: 'After some initial alarms over the Hampton Court Conference, clergymen could be forgiven for thinking that God himself had descended to earth to aid them, and their eulogies about James frequently verged on the blasphemous' (1993: 140-41).

¹⁶ For the Puritans' endorsement of preaching over the performance of liturgy such as common prayer, see Fincham and Lake (1993: 23-50), and Targoff (2001: 43-44).

¹⁷ According to Bawcutt, there is no single instance of God's name in *Measure for Measure* while there are forty-four instances of 'heaven', 'heavens', or 'heaven's'. As a parliamentary act of May 1606 prohibited the players from calling God's name on the stage, some of these words, especially at II.iv.4-5 ('Heauen in my mouth, | As if I did but onely chew his name'), might have been substituted for 'God'. Moreover, it has also been claimed that 'Save' at II.ii.25 and 165 may originally have read 'God save' and the word was removed later (1991: 68-9).

¹⁸ For the relationship between Angelo and Puritanism, see, for example, Ellison (2003: 51-55), Gibbon (1991: 2), and Poole (2000: 192). According to Peter Lake, words such as 'precise' and 'saint' in the play suggest that he embodies the people's prejudice against puritans (2001: 168-69).

¹⁹ Kaufman, in his work mainly on *Hamlet*, discusses puritan's self-fashioning through praying. According to him, depression leads to the modesty and convinced faith in grace, which is the hopeful sign. Kaufman explains that praying plays an important role during this process (1996).

²⁰ I am by no means criticizing the prayer book. In fact, Judith Maltby's laborious research tells us how enthusiastic the congregations in many parishes were in keeping the order of the Book of Common Prayer (1998). What I would like to suggest is that prayer in the play is criticized according to a puritanical account despite the play's general anti-puritanical ethos.

²¹ The diskette format attached to McCullough (1998) reads as follows:

The sermon is prefaced by an anonymous letter 'To the Christian Reader' in defense of Broughton, and a short letter from Broughton to the King asking the King's opinion about publishing the sermon. STC 3867: AN | EXPOSITION | VPON THE LORDS | Prayer, compared with the Decalogue, as it | was preached in a Sermon, at Oatlands: before the | most Noble, HENRY Prince of Wales. | Aug. 13. Anno 1603. | VVith a Postscript, to advertise of an error in all | those that leaue out the Conclusion of the Lords Prayer. | Also, the Creed is annexed, vvith a short and plaine expli-|cation of the Article, commonly called: | He descended to Hell. | BY HVGH BROVGHTON. | [orn] | [orn]

²² Rosendale refers to the characteristic as follows:

The Prayer Book is unmistakably prescriptive of sociopolitical order and hierarchy. Liturgical form itself is an order-based discursive mode, restricting improvisation and randomness by imposing set formulae of religious expression on those under its aegis. The legislative coercion of uniform Prayer Book use in the various Acts of Uniformity further amplified this function, as it sought to control the dangers of religious diversity by imposing a single, state-appointed form of worship on the entire nation. (2004: 149)

²³ The phrase, 'what in metre' might allude to the Edwardian prayer book in 1553: 'the only prayers presented in rhyme apart from the Psalms and scriptural songs are the "graces" to be recited before and after dinner, supper, and meat' (Targoff, 2001: 65).

²⁴ As for the current debate on Predestination and Arminianism, see, for example, Tyacke (1988: 201-16), White (1983: 34-54), and Lake (1987: 32-76). In this paper, I do not mention the debate, for I hope to approach predestination here only with respect to its relationship with the prayer issue in the play.

²⁵ For the religious denomination of Falstaff, see Poole (2000), and McAlindon (2001: 100-07).

²⁶ Knapp points out the importance of confession in Shakespeare's plays as follows:

The most telling evidence of Shakespeare's own accommodationism is his surprisingly sympathetic treatment of friars, who 'speak with authority, within the sphere of their religious vocation, and command the respect of the other characters' in the play they inhabit.—What appears to have recommended friars to Shakespeare besides their itinerance, in other words, is their association with confession, which Shakespeare presents as performed in his theatre the way Protestants argued it should be: not in 'private' or in 'secret', but before 'the open audience of the whole people. (2001: 68-69)

Bibliography

- Astington, John H., 'The Globe, the Court and *Measure for Measure*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 52 (1999), 133-42
- Barish, Jonas, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981)
- Barnaby, Andrew, and Joan Wry, 'Authorized Versions: *Measure for Measure* and the Politics of Biblical Translation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51.4 (1998), 1225-54
- Bennet, Josephine Waters, *Measure for Measure as Royal Entertainment* (New York; London: Columbia UP, 1966)
- Bernthal, Craig A., 'Staging Justice: James I and the Trial Scenes of *Measure for Measure*', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 32.2 (1992), 247-69
- Brightman, F.E., ed., *The English Rite: Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, 2 vols (London: Rivingtons, 1921), I
- Cohen, Stephen, 'From Mistress to Master: Political Transition and Formal Conflict in *Measure for Measure*', *Criticism*, 41. 4 (1999), 431-65
- Dollimore, Jonathan, 'Transgression and Surveillance in *Measure for Measure*', in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, eds. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994), 72-87

- Duffy, Eamon, *The Voices of Morebath* (New Haven; London: Yale UP, 2001)
- Eagleton, Terry, *William Shakespeare, Rereading Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986)
- Ellison, James, 'Measure for Measure and the Executions of Catholics in 1604', *English Literary Renaissance*, 33.1 (2003), 44-87
- Ferrell, Lori Anne, 'Kneeling and the Body Politic', in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*, eds. by Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), 70-92
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. by Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1993), 23-50
- Foster, Andrew, 'The Clerical Estate Revisited', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. by Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1993), 139-60
- Greenblatt, Stephen, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)
- Hamilton, Donna B., *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (London: Harvester, 1992)
- Jacques, Lezra, 'Pirating Reading: The Appearance of History in *Measure for Measure*', *English Literary History*, 56.2 (1989), 255-92
- Kamps, Ivo, 'Ruling Fantasies and the Fantasies of Rule: *The Phoenix* and *Measure for Measure*', *Studies in Philology*, 92.2 (1995), 248-73
- Kaufman, Peter Iver, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection* (Urbana; Chicago: U of Illinois, 1996)
- Knapp, Jeffrey, 'Jonson, Shakespeare, and the Religion of Players', *Shakespeare Survey*, 54 (2001), 57-70
- James I, 'A Proclamation of the Authorizing and Uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer So to Be Used throught the Realm', in *The Book of Common Prayer 1559* in <http://Justus.Anglican.org/resources/bcp/1559/James_I_Procl_Uniformity.htm> [accessed 20 April 2004]
- Lake, Peter, 'Calvinism and The English Church 1570-1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (1987), 32-76
- , 'Ministers, Magistrates and the Production of "Order" in *Measure for Measure*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 54 (2001), 165-81
- , and Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2002)
- Magedanz, Stacy, 'Public Justice and Private Mercy in *Measure for Measure*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 44.2 (2004), 317-32
- Maltby, Judith, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998)
- Marcus, Leah S., *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988)
- McAlindon, Tom, 'Perfect Answers: Religious Inquisition, Falstaffian Wit', *Shakespeare Survey*, 54 (2001), 100-07
- McCullough, Peter E., *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998)
- 'The Millenary Petitions', in *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (New York: Macmillan, 1896), 508-11, in *Hanover Historical Texts Project* <<http://history.hanover.edu/texts/ENGref/er88.html>> [accessed 20 April 2004]
- Milton, John, *Paradise Lost*, eds. by Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg, Oxford World's Classic (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004)
- Poole, Kristen, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000)
- Rosendale, Timothy, 'Milton, Hobbes, and the Liturgical Subject', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 44.1 (2004), 149-72

- Shakespeare, William, *The First Part of King Henry IV*, eds. by Herbert Weil and Judith Weil, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997)
- , *Hamlet*, ed. by Philip Edwards, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985)
- , *King Richard II*, ed. by Charles R. Forker, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002)
- , *Measure for Measure*, ed. by N. W. Bawcutt, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998)
- , *Measure for Measure*, ed. by Brian Gibbons, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991)
- , *Measure for Measure*, ed. by J. W. Lever, The Arden Shakespeare (London : Methuen, 1965)
- Shuger, Debora K., *Political Theologies in Shakespeare's England: The Sacred and the State in 'Measure for Measure'* (New York: Palgrave, 2001)
- Slights, Jessica, and Michael M. Holmes, 'Isabella's Order: Religious Acts and Personal Desires in *Measure or Measure*', *Studies in Philology*, 95.3 (1998), 263-93
- Targoff, Ramie, *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England* (London: The U of Chicago P, 2001)
- , 'The Performance of Prayer: Sincerity and Theatricality in Early Modern England', *Representations*, 60 (1997), 49-69
- Tennenhouse, Leonard, 'Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time', *Genre*, 15 (1982), 139-56
- Tyacke, Nicholas, 'Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 115 (1988), 201-16
- Ungerer, Gustav, 'The Spanish and English Chronicles in King James's and Sir George Buc's Dossiers on the Anglo-Spanish Peace Negotiations', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61. 3 (2000), 309-24
- Whetstone, George, *Promos and Cassandra*, ed. by John S. Farmer, The Tudor Facsimile Texts, 52 (Edinburgh, 1910; New York: AMS Press, 1970)
- White, Peter, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (1983), 34-54
- , 'The *via media* in the Early Stuart Church', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. by Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1993), 211-30