

lise of reason. Reason first of all demonstrates God, and God's perfection is the basis and criterion of right and wrong. The discussion is clear and close and cogent, but perhaps it would have been better to assist the intelligence of the reader by a greater number of chapter-headings, marking the framework and sequence of the argument.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- Benziger Bros., New York.**
The Early Friends of Christ. By Jos. P. Conroy, S.J. Pp. 222. Price, {1,75. *My God and My All.* By Fr. Lasance. Pp. 287. Price, 35 c. and upwards.
- Blackwell, Oxford.**
More's Eutopia. Translated by G. C. Richards. Pp. xxi. 138. Price, 5s. net. *William Hemminge's Elegy on Randolph's Finger.* With Introduction by G. C. Moore-Smith. Pp. 35. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- Blaise Benziger, New York.**
General Legislation in the New Code. By V. Rev. H. A. Ayrinhac. Pp. 384. Price, 12s. 6d.
- Borns, Oates & Washbourne, London.**
The Catholic Students "Aids" to the Study of the Bible. By Hugh Pope, O.P. Vol. HI. With Maps. Pp. xiv. 461. Price, 7s. 6d. *Sir Edward Widdington.* By a Catholic Gentleman. Pp. 32. Price, 5s.. *Stories in School.*, With Introduction by Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. Pp. 195. Price, 5s. *The Pope's Encyclical on St. Francis of Sales.* Price, 3d. *Monica's Mistakes.* By C. J. Oddie. Pp. 158. Price, 3s. 6d. *A Priest's Prayer and other Poems.* By Allan Ross, Cong.Orat. Pp. 88. Price, 3s. 6d. *The Roman Martyrology.* Translated. Pp. xvi. 156. Price, 10s. *Up and down Lourdes.* By Edith Cowell. Pp. 108. Price, 3s. 6d. *Time's Gift.* By Celest Zanetti. Pp. 47. Price, 2s. 6d.
- Catholic Truth Society, London.**
 Several Twopenny Pamphlets.
- Cecil Palmer, London.**
Proof of the Existence of God. By C. E. PeL Pp. 180. Price, 7s. 6d. net.
- Dessain, Mechlin.**
Epitome juris Canonici. Tom. III. By A. Vermeersch, S.J., and J. Crensen, S.J. Pp. xii. 397. Price, 15.00 fr. *De Objectis et Actibus ad Justitiam pertinentibus.* By E. Van Rosy. 4th edit. Pp. 62.
- Encyclopedia Press, London.**
Supplement to the Catholic Encyclopedia. Pp. 786. Price, 30s.
- Examinee Press, Bombay.**
History of England Series: Later Medieval Period. By E. R. Hull, S.J. Pp. 152. Price, 12 annas.
- Fisher Unwin, London.**
Climbs on Alpine Peaks. By His Holiness Pius XI. Illustrated. Pp. 136. Price, 8s. 6d. net.
- Hurst & Blackett, London.**
The Soul-Sifters. By A. J. Anderson. Pp. viii. 279. Price, 7s. 6d. net.
- Kegan Paul & Co., London.**
Scientific Thought. By C. D. Broad, M.A. Pp. 555. Price, 16s. net.
- Longmans, London.**
The Arts in Greece. By F. A. Wright. Pp. viii. in. *The Creed for the Twentieth Century.* By C. G. Harrison. Pp. xv. 128. Price, 4s. 6d. net. *An Order for the Administration of Holy Communion in the Diocese of Bombay.* Pp. x. 53. Price, as.Gd. net.
- Macmillan & Co., London,**
The Nature of 'Intelligence' and the Principles of Cognition. By C. Spearman. Pp. viii. 358. Price, 15s. net.
- Sands & Co., London.**
The Little Ones. By Mother Mary Eaton. Pp. 137. Price, 2s. 6d. n,
- S.P.C.K., London.**
The Prelude to the Reformation. By R. S. Arrowsmith, M.A. Pp. xii. 226. Price, 8s. net.
- Society of SS. Peter and Paul, London.**
Congress Booklets. By various authors. Price, 3d. each.
- Talbot Press, Dublin.**
Gemma Galgani. By Ph. Coghlan, C.P. Pp. 122. Price, 2s. net.
- TÉQUI, Paris.**
Au Seuil de la Vie. By Abbé F. Delerue. 2 Vols. Pp. eü. 282. Price, to.00 fr.
- Vatican Press, Rome.**
Il Primato di S. Pietro. B̄y. N. Cardinal Marini. 2nd edition.) Pp. xx. 373. Price,

power, has never been able to secure the necessary prerequisite—uniformity of belief.

The attempt, as we know, was made under Edward, under Elizabeth, and under Charles II. The Prayer-Books of 1549 (1st Edward), of 1552 (2nd Edward), of 1559 (Elizabeth), and of 1662 (Charles) were the results. Why any objection should be taken to the revision of a Book so frequently revised before, why Cranmer and the Caroline divines should be supposed to have said the last word on Anglican liturgy, whereas their successors in the Episcopate have the same power, or—since the setting up of the National Assembly—even more, to alter and amend the forms of worship in the State Church, is apt to puzzle the outsider until he realizes that the contest is in essence about points of doctrine. The old-fashioned Protestants are in deadly fear lest, under pretence of bringing the liturgy “up-to-date,” something more than revising the English and excising strong passages from the Psalms may be accomplished, viz., the recognition of the Communion Service as a sacrifice, with all that such recognition implies; that is, the restoration of the Mass as the main feature of Anglican worship.

That being so, it may be of interest to recall, using the classic researches of Gasquet and Bishop¹ as a basis, what exactly Cranmer did when he turned the Sarum Missal into the Book of Common Prayer. We know what he did with the Ordination-service, for the Holy See, by an irreformable judgment, has decided, that that rite, mutilated to express the heretical mind of Cranmer, is incapable of conferring the Sacrament.² The same heretical mind was at work, as we shall see, even in the first “revision” of the Sarum Missal, in order to abolish the Sacrifice of the Mass,

Before examining what Cranmer did to the Sarum Missal, a word must be said in explanation of the Sarum Missal itself. In the Middle Ages nearly every cathedral in England celebrated the Mass according to its own “use” or local adaptation of the Roman rite. The neighbouring parish churches followed the model set by their cathedral. But, as many of the English sees had a monastic cathedral, and as Religious Orders followed a use peculiar to themselves, it would often happen that the secular clergy of a

¹ *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* (Hodges).

* For a convenient summary of the argument against Anglican Orders see *What Cranmer meant to do and did* by Father Joseph Rickaby (C.T.S.: id);

parish church would have to adopt the use of some secular cathedral outside their own diocese. For reasons which it is unnecessary to discuss here, most of the secular clergy; adopted the use of Salisbury Cathedral. This Sarum Missal was originally compiled, shortly after the Norman Conquest; by St. Osmund, a Norman, Bishop of Salisbury, or Sarum. It represents, in the main the Roman rite of the eleventh-century, with the addition of a few Norman customs. The Sarum priest recited in the sacristy, while vesting, the Psalm! "Judica," the "Pater" and "Ave." At the foot of the altar, he used a shortened form of the Confiteor, like that of the Dominicans, followed by the "Misereatur vestri.": Wine and water were put into the chalice before the Gospel; and at the offertory, chalice and Host were offered together, with the prayers "Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas" and "In spiritu, humilitatis." After the Lavabo the priest said "Orate fratres et sorores." From the preface onward; through the Canon, the Sarum Mass was word for word and gesture by-gesture that of our Missals to-day, except: that a profound inclination took the place of the genuflection, and after the Elevation the priest stood with arms outstretched in the form of a cross. At High Mass, a ritual fan, made of rich materials, was waved over the celebrant by a deacon. Before his Communion the priest said this prayer, peculiar to the Sarum use:

Ave in ætæm, sanctissima caro Christi, mihi ante omnia, et super omnia summa dulcedo. Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi sit mihi peccatori via et vita. In nomine *Patris et Filii* et Spiritus Sancti.

- - - - -

Such, in brief, was the Sarum "use," which, at the death of Henry VIII. (January 28, 1347), was as yet intact. Bishop Gardiner' celebrated a solemn requiem according to Sarum for that monarch on the day of *his* funeral. But the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist had long been denied by the Continental Reformers, and the new teaching, had filtered into England and given-occasion to violent discussions as to the manner of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Among the lowest classes the profane had been quick to seize the opportunity for revolting blasphemies.

» Hail for evermore; thou mæst holy flwb of ^{æ4}
beyond Icings beside To me - *gr*% Body of Our Lord /esu,
Christ be the Way and the Life- 1» the Nsrne, etc.

Ribald men were applying such blasphemous epithets to the Blessed Sacrament as "Jack-in-the-Box," "the Sacrament of the Halter" "i; and the sacred words of Consecration, "Hoc est Corpus," had been corrupted into "Hocus Pocus," as the refrain of popular ballads.³

Naturally such profanities gravely shocked the conscience of the people, who, in spite of their confused notions about the authority of the Pope, still retained their devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, and there was an outcry of resentment. Somerset and Cranmer saw in this popular disturbance a means for advancing their own ends. Promptly (November, 1547) they, introduced into Parliament a "Bill for the Sacrament of the Altar," to suppress the growing irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament. Towards the end of the month, after the second reading of this Bill, which met with great favour from the Catholic-minded party, they tacked on to it a clause providing for the administration of Communion under both kinds, as being conformable to the primitive practice of the Church. After some difficulty the Bill was passed, and in the following March (1548) Cranmer drew up the Order of Communion, a ritual in English for the communion of the laity under both kinds, to be inserted in the Latin Mass. It contained a part called the "Warning of Communion," which shows Cranmer's ultimate aim. Some days before the Communion a notice must be read out, stating on what day "the parson intends to administer it." Communion was to be restricted to Sundays and Holydays. By this subtle and specious innovation Cranmer paved the way for the abolition of Masses at which there were no communicants. That it was only a preparation for more radical changes is seen from contemporary documents. There is extant a document in Cranmer's own handwriting,* containing a series of questions submitted to the bishops of England at the very time that the Order of Communion was being written. The questions are tentative and are evidently, meant to sound the bishops as to how far it was expedient to go in the matter of the abolition of the Mass. One question begins thus in Cranmer's hand: "Whether it be convenient the accustomed . . . This is struck out, and over it is written "What is the Mass?" This is again struck

* Nichols, *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation.*

* Froude, *The Reign of Edward VI.*

J. C. C. C. : MS. 105. Quoted by Gasquet and Bishop.

Λ:»,

PS :f

I'M t
y

I
■ ■ ■
y. ■

out, and changed into "Wherein consisteth the Mass by Christ's institution?"

The other questions may be summed up thus: "What is the Mass for? for sacrifice or communion?" "Shall we do away with the Mass offered for the living and the dead, as distinct from Communion?" "Should the Gospel be explained at the Mass to the people?" "Should the Mass be in English?" The answers given by the bishops to these questions are of great importance. The Henricians replied in the Catholic sense, Bonner and five others submitting a joint answer; but Cranmer, whose mind was most probably made up when he framed the questions, gives clear, laconic answer in the plain Lutheran sense. He writes that the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a memory and representation of the sacrifice of the Cross. The Mass had no virtue of itself, its virtue being limited to the reception of the Sacrament. Mass offered for the living and the dead, 'apart from Communion, should not be allowed to continue.

While this questionnaire was being answered, Somerset and Cranmer made use of the pulpit to bring about a change in public opinion favourable to the reforms at which they were aiming. Latimer, for instance, preached his famous Plough Sermon at St. Paul's (January 18, 1548)1;

Where the devil is resident, and hath his plough going, down with Christ's cross, up with superstition and idolatry. This is the mark at which the devil shooteth, to evacuate the Cross of Christ. These 1,500 years he hath been a doer, only purposing to evacuate Christ's death and to make it of small efficacy and virtue. For whereas Christ would be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in him should have salvation, the devil would none of that: they would have us saved by a daily oblation propitiatory, by a sacrifice expiatory, or remissory.

Meanwhile the land was flooded with pamphlets, dedicated to the King and the Lord Protector, stigmatizing the Mass as wicked and devilish. The time seemed now ripe for Cranmer to take the step he had long been meditating. The Order of Communion of 1548 had been adopted by some in its entirety, by others in part, by others not at *all*, and everything was in confusion. The Government decided to remedy the confusion by a "*uniform, quiet* and godly

> Latimer "Sermon.-" Parker Sec., PP-7^.

PB
It
S;
&
if

O

y.

O

ii

- 'F?!

'1®

order, rite and fashion, of common and open prayer and administration of the Sacraments." This was the first Book of Common Prayer, in the inspiration and composition of which Cranmer had the chief part. On its completion, the Book was presented to Parliament and debated in the Lords. Of this debate, which began on December 15, 1548, and lasted four days, full notes are preserved in the Royal MS. in the British Museum, unique of their kind and first brought to light by Gasquet and Bishop.¹ After some irregular discussion about the Bill in general, Somerset "commanded the Bishops to fall to some point, and willed them to dispute whether bread be in the Sacrament after the Consecration, or not." The account of the debate reads, in some respects, like one of the weekly scholastic disputations in a theological seminary. Quotations from the early Fathers, familiar to anyone who has done the scholastic treatise, "De Eucharistia," were hurled from one bishop to another, to be rebutted by other quotations from a different part of the same work. Both sides appealed to St. Augustine in support of their own doctrine. The Bishop of Bath cited a passage from "Sermo 272," which seems against the real presence: "Fecit -corpus sum, id est figuram corporis sui." Thirlby of Westminster quoted from the "Enarratio in Psalmum '98," the passage "Adorate scabellum pedum. Terra est scabellum. Caro significat terram," which proves that the Blessed Sacrament is to be adored. St. John Damascene, St. Chrysostom, Theophilact, Eusebius, St. Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, are all quoted. Cranmer made a long speech in defence of a virtual presence:

They be two things, to eat the Sacrament, and to eat the Body of Christ. The eating of the Body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be, although a man never taste the Sacrament. The wicked eat the Sacrament. But the wicked eat not the Body of Christ, but their own condemnation.

Therefore the Sacrament is not the body of Christ. Tunstall, in reply, instead of distinguishing the above premisses, gave the argument from Scripture: "His body is in bread and wine, because God hath spoken it, which is able to do it, saying 'This is my body.'" Cranmer at once retorted: "If the evil man eat his body, he hath life everlasting." They did not argue in strict scholastic form, and consequently

¹ Royal MS. 17B. xxxix., *ci.* Gasquet and Bishop. Appendix V.

HOW CRANMER "REVISED" THE SARUM MISSAL 487

H'V

never kept to one point at a time. Occasionally Somerset interrupted in anger, urging the bishops to agree to the Book. But no agreement was reached. One interesting remark, made by Thirlby of Westminster shows that the Book had been tampered with after it had been first presented to receive the bishops' signatures. The word "Oblation," which was in it then, had been removed.

After the debate had lasted four days the Book of Common Prayer was passed. Of the bishops thirteen were favourable, ten unfavourable, and four absent. It was embodied in the Act of Uniformity and became law on Whit-Sunday, 1549.

It is one of the most momentous documents in the ecclesiastical history of England, as it displaced, for the first time, the liturgy which had been followed ever since the conversion of England to Christianity. It is a compromise, and still marks only an intermediary stage. Entirely Lutheran in spirit, it keeps as much as possible of the Sarum form to avoid giving too great a shock to the people. The manifest aim was to remove the sacrificial character of the Mass. First, the name is changed. The new title is: "The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion commonly called the Mass." Notice is to be given beforehand of intending communicants, and no service is to be held unless there are communicants. "The priest shall wear a white alb, plain, with a vestment, or a cope," *i.e.* the use of the ordinary vestments is made optional. The service was opened by the clerks' singing in English, for the Introit, a Psalm appointed for the day. In this particular point Cranmer could claim a return to a more ancient usage, for originally the Introit of the Mass was a whole Psalm, cut down in the eighth or ninth century to two or three verses. The Confiteor, regarded by Lutherans as a preparation for sacrifice, was omitted. Instead of the "*Judica*," the priest recites the Lord's Prayer (as in the Sarum Missal) and a collect. Kyrie, Gloria, Collects, Epistle, Gospel, and Credo, are all retained, because these prayers indicate praise and thanksgiving and not specially sacrifice. At this point occurs a distinct break. In the Sarum use the priest is directed to lift up Chalice and Host in both hands, offering the sacrifice to the Lord, reciting the two sacrificial prayers, "*Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas*" and "¶ spiritu humilitatis." These prayers and gestures were entirely suppressed. **The priest**

V

ii

1:5

ii

1

a

was simply to place the bread and wine on the altar without any ceremony. For the notion of oblation was substituted the collecting of money for the poor man's box, and verses of Scripture appropriate to almsdeeds were sung. In this way the word "Offertory" has come to mean in English "a collection"—a sense wanting to the word in other languages.

After this, "so many as shall be partakers of Holy Communion shall tarry in the choir, all the rest departing"—a rubric which seems to compare non-Communicants to Catechumens, excluded from the "Missa Fidelium." The Preface and Sanctus then followed as in the Sarum Missal. We now enter upon the Canon, which with the exception of one short clause added by St. Gregory, has remained practically unchanged for 1,300 years. Cranmer dared not suppress this hallowed prayer, but considerably modified it. The ancient rubrics of the Canon were all-swept away, and the following substituted:

- (1) The prayer shall be said or sung plainly, and distinctly;
- (2) there shall be no elevation, or showing of the host to the people;
- (3) the elements shall be taken into the hands by the communicants.

All the phrases of the Canon indicative of sacrifice were changed. In the "Te igitur" the words "haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia" were converted into "these ■prayers which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty." In the Memento for the Living the words "pro quibus tibi offerimus hoc sacrificium" are changed into "We commend unto thy^merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled, to celebrate the commemoration of the death of thy most glorious son." Instead of "Hanc igitur oblationem" there is quite a different prayer:

O God, Heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by His *one* oblation, *once* made) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world . . . etc.

In the "Quam oblationem," instead of the words "ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis *fiat* dilectissimi Filii Tui,"¹ these . . . "that they [the elements of bread and wine] may become for us the Body and Blood of thy Best Beloved Son?"*

ambiguous words, capable of expressing either a real or only a virtual presence, are put: "that they *may, be unto us* the Body and Blood of thy Son."

The Consecration prayer, ".Qui pridie," was substantially unchanged.

In the prayer "Unde et memores," where Sarum has "hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam," the new service has "we offer unto Thee *ourselves*, our souls, and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee." All reference to the sacrifice of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech was omitted. Other new, and certainly very beautiful prayers were inserted here, expressing the idea of oblation, but it is only the oblation of the Faithful, united by faith and love to Christ, and not the oblation of Jesus Christ Himself. There was no commingling of the sacred elements. The remaining deviations from the Sarum Missal have no special significance.

The above equivocal service, meant to satisfy the Lutheran without being quite intolerable to the Catholic, naturally failed to satisfy either. Many even of the London parishes refused to conform; Oxford and Cambridge clung to the heritage of the past; open rebellion broke out in Devon and Cornwall. On the other hand, Peter Martyr, Bullinger and their followers were displeased at the amount of Popery in the new service. As a measure of Uniformity it was a conspicuous failure, for it produced the greater diversity. Bishop Gardiner's attitude was curious; "He adopted the policy, whether rightly or wrongly [says Cardinal Gasquet] of contesting every inch of ground with the innovators, and putting a Catholic, even if a strained, interpretation upon the words of the new service." A strenuous upholder of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, he maintained that the Book of Common Prayer was in accordance with these doctrines. The intercession for the living and the dead he understands as a sign that the new service is a propitiatory sacrifice. In the prayer before the Consecration, the priest asks "that these creatures of bread and wine *be to us* the Body and Blood of Christ. "They cannot be," says Gardiner, "unless God worketh it and maketh them so to be." In other words, Gardiner openly taught that the new rite indicated Transubstantiation as truly as the Sarum rite.

This interpretation of Gardiner's brought matters to a

head. Cranmer was driven to repudiate Gardiner's teaching by a more definite move towards Protestantism; and in view of the confusion and dissension caused by the Service Book of 1549, he thought that by 1552 the time had come to go the full length of the Continental reformers. The final step was now taken. The Sarum Missal was changed beyond all possibility of recognition, without any attempt at compromise, and without leaving any possible loophole for Catholic-minded bishops. Everything in the first book upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence of Catholic doctrine was swept away. The Introit was abolished, the Gloria was transferred to the end of the service, the Kyrie was altered and embedded in the Ten Commandments. The intercession for the living and the dead, and the prayer for the sanctification of the creatures of bread and wine, on which Gardiner based his argument, were expunged. In fact, of the Canon little more was left than the words of institution. Nothing of the Sarum rite remained save the Collect, Epistle, Gospel, and Creed. No provision was made as to the time of placing the bread and wine on the table, and ordinary bread was to be used instead of unleavened bread. The table for Communion was to stand in the body of the church, and the minister was to stand at the north side of the table in order to banish all idea of a sacrificial altar. The "Black Rubric" was introduced to explain, lest the kneeling for Communion should be by any persons, either out of ignorance or infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved:

That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental bread and wine remain still in their natural substances; and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

This second Prayer Book was of course swept away by Queen Mary, but was revived by Elizabeth, with slight alterations, in 1559, disappeared again during the Commonwealth, was restored at the Restoration, and reimposed without material change in 1662. The ridiculous story that the

Pope, if his supremacy were again recognized by the Queen, would have approved Elizabeth's Prayer Book, repeated though it is in many-Protestant "histories," is repudiated by all responsible historians, non-Catholic as well as Catholic.¹ That Book was essentially and irredeemably heretical, and it remains to-day the liturgy of Anglicanism[^].

Thus was abolished the hallowed rite which had been the mainspring of religious life in England for a thousand years. The same hand and brain drew up the mutilated Ordination Sendee, from which all reference to "the power of offering sacrifice was deliberately removed. In addition, then, to the evidence afforded by the contents of the Ordinal, Cranmer's treatment of the Sarum Missal makes it abundantly clear that he meant positively to exclude, and succeeded in excluding, from the Ordinal the intention of consecrating a sacrificing priesthood.

CLEMENT TIGAR.

¹ See "The alleged Papal approval of the Anglican Liturgy," by J. ft. Pollen, S.J., *Tint Month*, Sept. 1902, pp.374 sqq.