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ABSTRACT

SARUM USE AND DISUSE:
A STUDY IN SOCIAL AND LITURGICAL HISTORY

Name: Joseph, James R.
University of Dayton

Adviser: Dr. Michael S. Carter

Academic study of the Sarum Use, or the Use of Salisbury, the dominant liturgical tradition of medieval England, has long been overshadowed by a perception of triviality and eccentric antiquarianism inherited from the nineteenth century. Further, the Sarum Use has been in relative disuse in the Roman Catholic Church since the early seventeenth century. Using primarily the research of Eamon Duffy and Richard Pfaff, this thesis seeks to readdress both of these aspects of the Sarum Use and argues that because of the unique history and experience of the English Church in the period following the English Reformation, the Sarum liturgy holds an important place in English religious history. The thesis argues for the revival of serious academic interest in Sarum itself as well as for the active renewal of the Sarum tradition for contemporary Catholic liturgical use within the context of the Church.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW

This study proposes to enter into the historical legacy of the Sarum Use, the dominant Christian liturgical tradition of England before the Reformation. I propose in this thesis to explore the history and unique content of Sarum as a liturgical tradition, to examine the reasons for its importance to English Catholic history, and to inquire into the historical reasons for its fall into desuetude among English Catholics following the Council of Trent (1545-1563). The object of this thesis is to show through historical investigation the antiquity, cultural value, and legitimacy of the Sarum liturgy within a specifically Catholic context. After an extensive historical study of the Sarum Use in its cultural context in the majority of the thesis, the contemporary revival of the Sarum tradition is discussed and argued for in the conclusion.

The choice of the Sarum Use in a study of English Catholics may seem peculiar, as Sarum is chiefly known for the niche and antiquarian interest of the nineteenth-century liturgical scholars, or ‘liturgiologists.’ As a result, the subject has acquired a reputation as trivial, of interest only to an eccentric few who haunt the aisles of English parish churches. I will discuss the reasons for this misconception in the following section. This reputation is, I contend, for the most part undeserved. As the dominant liturgical use of the realm, Sarum was at the center of the Reformation. English interest and disinterest in Sarum over the
intervening centuries is largely indicative of other cultural trends and currents - developments which have continued into recent times. To trace the thread of Sarum is thus a study of the developing ‘soul’, of the English nation, and debates over the continuing relevance of Sarum (or the medieval liturgy in general) can be seen as a microcosm of larger historiographical and political battles of the Reformation and post-Reformation periods.

Liturgy remains central to Roman Catholic belief and practice, just as liturgy in its several forms (Sarum, York, Hereford, Bridgettine, Dominican, etc.) figured prominently the religious life of pre-Reformation England. Though a number of Anglican studies of Sarum exist which trace its history, and detailed bibliographic studies have been done of the medieval liturgy, no recent study on Sarum has to my knowledge been attempted within the Roman Catholic confession. This study will (uniquely, as far as I am aware) offer a history of Sarum as a specifically Catholic liturgy, and go some way in dispelling the air of antiquarianism and triviality which has long surrounded the subject – as well as make the case for Sarum’s revival as an active tradition. Framing the inquiries of this study will be the perspective on liturgy and historical tradition offered by Alcuin Reid in his 2005 book *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*.1 In this work, Reid mentions several principles which guide the authentic renewal of liturgical traditions. Most pertinent to the study of Sarum is his contention that “venerable liturgical antiquity,” descended from authentic and ancient Christian history is immensely valuable for the continuing living tradition of the liturgy. “[W]e understand,” Reid writes, “the worth of, and the respect to be shown to a liturgical rite because of its having a place in living liturgical Tradition that, over a sufficient period of

---

time, has come to be regarded as ‘venerable’ no matter how late it originated. We recall that Saint Pius V accorded such status to liturgies having a tradition of at least two hundred years.”2 This study aims to show that Sarum has a definite claim to such a living ‘T’radition. Because Reid’s criteria for engaging in legitimate revival of an ancient liturgy (as opposed to simply liturgical archaeology) is inescapably bound up with history, this will be the primary focus, aimed ultimately at showing Sarum’s worth as an use of just such “venerable antiquity” as he describes.

In studying Sarum, this thesis seeks to add several perspectives which reflect the historical evidence – in the first place, that 1) Sarum was deeply enculturated for medieval English Catholics, and that 2) practice of the Sarum Use ended not due to any act of ecclesiastical law or because it was found somehow no longer useful, but largely because of state suppression. Particularly when speaking of the liturgy, the Reformation was a pulling-out by the roots of centuries of ingrained culture and tradition. Sarum’s survival among English Catholics in the period immediately following the change of religion was a shadow of its former self. Now devoid of broader cultural and communal meaning, it seemed virtually identical with the Tridentine Roman liturgy of 1570. Numerous Sarum traditions lived on, but in fragmented and in isolated instances. In the second place, though most of this study will be of history, I mean to place the focus of this inquiry on the Sarum Use in the present-day Roman Catholic Church. My interest here, to which I shall return in the conclusion of this study, is to show 1) that interest in Sarum is neither a trivial, antiquarian interest, nor an outgrowth of sympathy for Anglican theology, but is an attempt at the recovery of medieval English Catholic community, and 2) that its recovery ought to be

---

2 Reid, *Organic Development*, 129.
encouraged among English Catholics as an authentic expression of their common history and identity.

That ‘medieval’ as a historical periodization—along with its synonym, the so-called ‘Middle Ages’—has historiographical baggage is a phenomenon already well-noted. Having descended through the controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the ‘Medieval’ as a concept is still today associated in the popular mind with the so-called ‘Dark Ages.’ Current revisionist trends in historiography since the 1980s have re-addressed many common misperceptions. The common tropes of the ‘medieval’ have been deconstructed in numerous works which have sometimes boldly asserted their place in post-modern historiography. Nowhere perhaps has this change in scholarship been more evident than in the study of the English Reformation, especially in Eamon Duffy’s 1992 paradigmatic work The Stripping of the Altars. It is through Duffy that I propose to read the history of Sarum, recognizing Sarum in its cultural context as a liturgy valued and deeply enculturated into the lives of medieval English Christians. In this study, though I use terms such as ‘medieval’ or ‘late medieval’ to refer to a certain period of time as a matter of convention, this should be taken as an act of convenience rather than a reference to any particular strain of historiography about the medieval. It is my object to bypass such words in an effort to get at the medieval on its own terms, locating my study firmly in the strain of historiography represented by Duffy.

---

3 See, e.g. Elizabeth A. R. Brown, “The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe,” The American Historical Review 79, no. 4 (October 1974): 1063–88; Henry Kamen, The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision, 4th ed. (New Haven: YUP, 2014); Régine Pernoud, Those Terrible Middle Ages: Debunking the Myths, Ann Englund Nash, trans. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000[1977]); etc. ‘Post-modern’ as a historical term is mostly associated with the trends of the 1980s and 90s which questioned received interpretations of history as over-generalization and confessional prejudice. The writing of Haigh and Duffy, which I will discuss in the following pages, falls into this category. Throughout this study, I use post-modern and other terms as a sort of shorthand for the back and forth in the historiography of the past century. Like the term ‘medieval,’ it should be taken as applying to a specific set of ideas in a specific time period, in this case the changes in historical writing associated with the late twentieth century.
For English Catholics especially, assessing the legacy of the medieval church has been a constant question posed by both the historical protestant establishment and the inherited culture.¹ From the early claims to lost monastic property to the nineteenth-century Oxford movement, medieval history has been a perennial motif and subtext in English culture. For English Catholicism, this observation is essential: historically, English culture for good or for ill inextricably associates the Church with the medieval, either positively in the form of nostalgic revival or negatively in the form of a sort of presentist disdain. Medieval England is in a real sense the type against which England has defined itself since the Reformation.

In the remainder of this chapter, I include an anecdote of Sarum’s recent revival to illustrate the concrete ramifications of the notion of triviality and antiquarianism which is associated with Sarum, and which have been at least partially responsible for opposition to its revival within the Church. After this, I will briefly explore the history of Sarum’s reception and interpretation in the last several centuries, drawing out the reasons for these notions, which spring largely from the peculiar context of the nineteenth century.

An Occurrence at Merton College, Oxford

In 1996, “The Society of Saint Osmund for the Preservation of the Sarum Rite in the Catholic Church” was formed at Oxford University.² The Catholic students and others involved in this group sought to revive the Sarum Use, the medieval English use of the Roman Catholic liturgy not publically said in the English Church since the suppression of

¹ Throughout this study, I shall be referring to ‘protestantism.’ The lack of capitalization is deliberate, as the use of the term here is to refer generally to the currents of reformism which were circulating in Europe at the time. The term is used here to refer to a general strain of thought, while capitalization is reserved for specific groups of protestants, e.g. Anglicans or Lutherans.
² For a full summary of the events here related, I rely on the testimony of Dom Alcuin Reid, given in a note; see Reid, 130 note 213.
the Mass in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603). Having obtained the permission of
the local ordinary, Bishop Maurice Couve de Murville of Birmingham (r. 1982-1999), the
group organized a solemn Sarum Mass on 10 February 1996 at Merton College chapel.
Less than a year later, solemn Mass was said on the Feast of the Purification, or
Candlemas, footage of which at the time of this writing can be accessed online. At this
point, however, these liturgies abruptly ceased at the direction of Rome. An anonymous
inquirer had contacted the Congregation for Divine Worship, concerned perhaps for the
legality of the celebration. A rapid reply on 18 March from a cleric belonging to the
Congregation, Msgr. Carmelo Nicolosi, read in part “Such celebrations are not lawful and
the reasons advanced to justify them are spurious. As a Catholic in good standing you
should have nothing to do with such activities. The celebration of the liturgy is a most
serious matter and is not to be subjected to esoteric whims.” A further letter of 18 March
to the local ordinary from Archbishop G. M. Agnelo, Secretary of the Congregation,
instructed Bishop de Murville to “ensure that the abuse committed is not repeated.” The
reasons behind this reaction are perhaps easy to recognize. Mindful of liturgical abuses
current in the 1990s, the CDW of the pontificate of St. John Paul II was likely wary of
anything out of the ordinary, as this celebration certainly was. The charge of a certain sort
of antiquarianism is not entirely illegitimate, though it can be contended (as Reid does) that
Quo primum remains in force and the celebration the Sarum Use is entirely legitimate

*The video footage is contained in fifteen parts, the first of which is cited here. “Candlemas 01,” YouTube video, 9:21, posted by
Brunothelabrador,” February 25, 2008, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hl40qck9Y1Q. The celebrant of the Mass was Fr. Timothy
Finnegan, who has since written of the event extensively on his own blog site, “Aspicientes in Jesum,” http://vallebachara.blogspot.com/.
Reid, Organic Development, 130 note 213. Reid dates the letter to 18 March 1997 and the original inquiry to CDW to 21 February;
rapid indeed.
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despite its several centuries of disuse. This fact the CDW, who may in all likelihood have been unfamiliar with Sarum and its history in England, may have overlooked.

Further celebrations of Sarum liturgies at Oxford were halted thereafter in obedience to the Congregation. Unaffiliated with the Oxford Society, however, another celebration of the Sarum Use occurred in the Diocese of Aberdeen on 1 April 2000. Mario Conti, then bishop and seemingly unaware of the 1996 letter from the CDW, celebrated a pontifical Sarum Mass on the occasion of the quincentennial of King’s College Chapel in Aberdeen. Writing to Alcuin Reid on 28 July 2000, Bishop Conti stated unequivocally: “Permission of the Holy See was not sought, and I judged that it was not needed, since the Mass is substantially that of the so-called Tridentine Rite[,]” The bishop’s considered view seems to have been that it was well within his power to grant permission and to celebrate according to a liturgical use very closely related to one for which he already had permission - the vetus ordo, known as the forma extraordinaria after Benedict XVI’s 2011 motu proprio Summorum Pontificum authorizing its wider use.

No other public celebrations of the liturgy according to the Sarum books in the Roman Catholic Church after this date can found by the author. This is indeed the last which Reid, writing in 2005, mentions. Reid, however, seems keen to connect the currently interest in liturgical diversity with a specific trend of the early twentieth-century. In his reporting of these events, he draws a comparison between the celebration of the Sarum Masses at Oxford and Aberdeen and the Mass said at Notre Dame de Paris in 1964 in order to celebrate the eighth centenary of the cathedral. This Mass was said using the

---

8 A fairly strange location to hold a Sarum Mass, since the medieval cathedral of Aberdeen had its own local liturgical use, Sarum being quite as foreign there as York or Rome.
ancient use of Paris, “with Dom Oury of Solesmes assisting in the reconstruction of the ceremony.” He finds a further parallel with the restoration of the Rite of Braga in the 1930s during the pontificate of Pius XI. After centuries of the gradual ‘romanization’ of the local rite in the Portuguese diocese, the local customs were restored with the approval of the papacy. Both of these continental examples reflect a ‘recovery’ of medieval tradition approved by the Church at the time, reflective of the contemporary interest in ancient liturgical forms.

It is in this context that Reid even brings up the contemporary use of the Sarum liturgy at all – that is, as a part of a larger trend of restoring local uses of the Roman rite which reliably pre-date the 1570 Roman Missal. As will be explored later in this study, the provisions of Quo primum, issued with the 1570 Missal, gave permission for the continuing use of liturgies older than two hundred years. Reid’s own opinion on the matter he gives quite readily in a footnote. “In the author’s opinion... both the archbishop of Birmingham and the bishop of Aberdeen acted within their competence, in harmony with liturgical tradition, and in accordance with the precedent of the Holy See” to allow the celebration of the liturgy according to the ancient Sarum books, and not only to allow it but also in the case of Bishop Conti to show enough interest in the old English use to celebrate the Mass personally. The audacity of Bishop Conti seems, however, to be unique.

Presumably due to the legal doubt which resulted from the CDW letter of 1997, no further Sarum Masses have been celebrated with the explicit permission of legitimate authority within the Roman Church. Whether, as Reid and Conti suggest, this authority lies in the prerogatives of the local bishop in the powers reserved under the exemptions granted in Quo primum, or, as the case of the Use of Braga implies, the impetus to restore a disused liturgy must come from Rome, remains unresolved. Regardless, Reid emphasizes
that the revival of local uses is an important and valuable occurrence in the Church, and those uses which possess “venerable liturgical antiquity” can and should be allowed to revive.

In the case of England, church law on such a revival is even more complex. According to Reid, the question of historical intention is important in determining the feasibility of a revival. Any further efforts to celebrate any of the sacraments according to Sarum must, he says, as a matter of liturgical law take into account whatever discussion might (or indeed must) have taken place at the restoration of the English hierarchy. The Catholic hierarchy was outlawed in England from the reign of Elizabeth until their restoration in 1850, upon which occasion the Roman liturgy was adopted in the dioceses of England and Wales. Investigation must be made, Reid believes, as to why Sarum was not then restored. No direct information on that front, doubtless to be found somewhere in the archives of the Diocese of Westminster in the papers of Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman (r. 1850-1865), first archbishop of that see, has thus far been produced, though future investigation of the question is likely. The legacy, however, of the nineteenth century in the unique cultural phenomenon of Sarum is nevertheless an important consideration.

---

11 The restoration of the English hierarchy in 1850, a response to perennial English Catholic demands for a territorial episcopal hierarchy, abolished the old seventeenth century system of vicars-apostolic which had been implemented in the wake of the chaotic ecclesiastical situation of the Elizabethan period. Until the 1850 restoration, England’s Catholics were governed under a system of titular bishops who held the title of vicars-apostolic along with their titular sees, dioceses which had been suppressed or which were now ruled by non-Christian states. In the early nineteenth century, in the time leading up to the restoration, Rome was repeatedly petitioned by Wiseman and the other pre-restoration vicars-apostolic for a resumption of normal ecclesiastical order. Worried by revolutionary and nationalist currents in Italy and anxious for British support in the wake of the general European disorder of 1848, Rome delayed any action for fear of souring relations with London until finally agreeing to appoint English bishops, a decision announced in September of that year. Not all English Catholics supported the change, Augustus Pugin being prominent among them, as there was considered to be a dearth of plausible candidates among the clergy, Wiseman excepted; Rosemary Hill, *God’s Architect: Pugin and the Building of Romantic Britain* (New Haven; London: YUP, 2007), 447-50; John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* (New York: OUP, 1976), 360-63.
The primary concern of the CDW in 1997 appears to have been antiquarianism or the inappropriate treatment of the liturgy as historical reenactment or whimsical indulgence. This characterization is, I argue, at least partly a result of the continuing legacy of nineteenth-century controversies. In the context of my larger survey of Sarum’s history, Cardinal Wiseman is a pivotal figure. It was his influence in 1850 which was decisive in the adoption of the Roman liturgy for the English Church rather than a revival of the Sarum Use. In order to understand why, and the larger question of Sarum’s place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, I will first briefly review the ecclesiastical situation of English Catholics in the 1830s-40s and the emergence of the Oxford movement within Anglicanism, which proved decisive for a revival of interest in the Sarum Use and the medieval liturgy.

English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century

The question of Cardinal Wiseman is itself connected to the larger question of Sarum’s place in the English Catholic revival of the mid-nineteenth century, what John Henry Newman famously referred to as the ‘Second Spring’ of English Catholicism in an 1852 speech before the restored English Catholic hierarchy at St. Mary’s College, Oscott.12 Before the restoration and this ‘Second Spring,’ however, were the social and ecclesiastical

---

12 Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, 362; One of Bossy’s central claims is that this speech was misleading and contrary to actual demographic facts; see 297; Oscott was also the one-time employer of neo-Gothic architect and antiquary Augustus Pugin as ‘Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities;’ Hill, 177ff.
conditions which produced the necessary climate for the broader conservative early Victorian cultural move toward Catholicism and a ‘higher church’ Anglicanism.

The England of the 1830s was in the process of in large measure rejecting what many saw as the decadence and facileness of the Regency and reign of George IV. The younger generation, those early Victorians who would be known to history as ‘Young England,’ were disenchanted with the overspending and decadence then associated with the Georgian era.13 The watchword of the time was ‘reality,’ a more serious and intellectual attitude towards life and a renewed focus on the spiritual as opposed to the material; in the words a recent historian, a firm authenticity and this ‘reality’ was “everything the Georgians seemed to their children to have lacked.”14 The early Victorians sought a more idealistic, multifaceted, and spiritual approach to life than their parents’ generation.15

There was a sense of the rebirth of society along humane and rational lines. These were years of Romanticism in art, philosophy, and literature – of Wordsworth’s verses above Tinturn Abbey, the travels of Percy and Mary Shelley, and Walter Scott’s Waverley and Ivanhoe.16 In art and architecture as well as literature there was a romantic revival. The Picturesque movement gave of the late eighteenth century, characterized by the subject

---

13 This was especially applicable in the area of architecture. Architect John Nash, the favorite of George IV, spent extravagantly on the royal palaces such as Buckingham and the Royal Pavilion. Georgian neoclassicism and Nash’s elaborate English baroque grew to be associated with decadence and extravagance by the time Pugin condemned it in Contrasts; Hill, 84; 90; 154-58.


15 The cultural labels used here are of course generalizations and not descriptive of every culturally-interested English person of the time. The ideals of ‘Young England’ touched all areas of culture: art, architecture, literature, and music. Closely connected with the Romantic and Picturesque movements, it sought to reach beyond the classicism of the Georgian period and reconnect with the concept of ‘reality.’ The classic novel of the movement is Coningsby (1844), by the future Prime Minister and sometime Romantic idealist Benjamin Disraeli; Hill, God’s Architect, 212-15.

16 The colorful medieval pageantry, often derisively called nostalgia, for the England gone-by characterized these novels of knights, ladies, and chivalry. The Gothic genre of Walter Scott was enormously influential both in England and America, where it precipitated the Southern Gothic in the American South. The style was famously and viciously parodied (along with medieval society and the Catholic Church) in Mark Twain’s 1889 novel A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court. The desire for authenticity and the spirit of revival was very strong, however. The medieval revivalism in England engendered scenes like that organized by the Earl of Eglinton, who in the summer of 1839 held a jousting tourney in Ayrshire which was attended by thousands of eager spectators in period dress. The efforts of Pugin, Rock, and Walter Scott all stem from this spirit of the early Victorians, a curious melding of modern technological enthusiasm for the age of steam (Pugin himself was fascinated by railroads) and a love of the romantic vision of medieval society and aesthetic – “Thus to take a steam train to a Gothic tournament was to enter fully into the spirit of this particular age;” see Hill, God’s Architect, 212-15.
watercolor paintings and landscapes of sketch artists like Auguste Pugin gave way to the neo-Gothic championed by his son from the mid-1830s. The Gothic – firm, solid, ancient as the English cathedral– was everything that Georgian neoclassical style was not. The style became very popular in the 1830s, and Augustus Pugin was its foremost champion.

Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (1812-1852), most famous as the co-designer (with Charles Barry, normally credited with the design) of the new Palace of Westminster of 1834, was more pertinently to the interests of this study the designer of a new breed of church building, built in deliberate imitation of the medieval style. Pugin’s most famous literary work, *Contrasts*, cemented his reputation in 1836 as the premiere and firebrand advocate of Gothic buildings. He followed this with works on what he called the ‘true principles’ of architecture, an honesty and purity he felt only fulfilled by the Gothic style. The Gothic, Pugin opined, was honest and thoroughly Christian, unlike the Georgian and neoclassic buildings which deceived with false fronts and aped the falsely perfect symmetrical style of pagan Greece and Rome. Unlike the flimsy and impermanent structures raised by modern people, the Gothic cathedral and solid stone Gothic house had endured through the ages and still stood in spite of them.

The attitude eventually led to Pugin’s theological (or, more precisely, historical) rejection of the Reformation, which he believed to be at the root of English social and aesthetic decay. Pugin converted to Catholicism in 1833, but hesitated about being fully received until the following year, attached as he still was to the restoration of a particularly English Catholicism. In his career, disillusioned with an eventual lack of support for his

---

Footnotes:

17 For Pugin, both of these, social/moral and architectural corruption, were intricately connected; see his visit to Wells Cathedral with his mother in Hill, *God’s Architect*, 104.

18 Pugin’s religion was unique to him and very idiosyncratic. In this he was typical of many of the Romantic Catholics, who generally surprised the more Roman-oriented clergy with their fixation on the romantic vision of the medieval period; Ibid., 121-22, 144.
medieval vision of English Catholicism, he flirted more than once with ‘high church’ Anglicanism, and was caught often between Oxford movement Anglicans who wished to be more ‘Catholic’ and Catholics who could not countenance anything but Italianate, Roman orthodoxy in decoration and architecture. To his fellow Catholics, Pugin was off-puttingly popular with the growing group of Anglican sympathizers with the Oxford movement, who commissioned churches from him in great numbers in the 1840s. The Cambridge Camden Society, founded in 1839 for the promotion of interest in old Gothic churches and antique liturgical features, was within three years of its founding enormously influential in the design of new Anglican churches. Pugin and Puginism was in high demand with them, and it was with the members of this society, and not with his fellow Catholics, that his ideas were most accepted.

The popularity of Pugin’s works springing up everywhere (both designed by and in imitation of him) afforded him access to the highest levels of English Catholic society, a select group of whom were sympathetic to his ideas. Pugin’s circle included the wealthy Earl of Shrewsbury as well as the scholar, cleric, and author Fr. Daniel Rock (1799-1871). Rock, an antiquarian and scholar of liturgical architecture of the medieval period, immediately connected with Pugin upon their meeting in 1836 on their mutual interest in medieval architecture and liturgical objects and furnishings. Rock employed Pugin to draw sketches for his *The Church of Our Fathers*, a multi-volume work on the Anglo-Saxon and medieval English liturgy he would eventually publish from 1849 to 1854. Pugin also

---

19 Newman’s Oratorians, builders of the magnificently baroque Oratory churches in Birmingham and London, along with most English Catholics of the time who were not converts from Anglicanism, looked to Rome and to the Counter-Reformation for aesthetic example and not like Pugin to medieval England; Ibid., 234-35; 258; 447.
became acquainted with then-bishop Wiseman, who also moved at the time in the social orbit of the Earl of Shrewsbury’s estate at Alton Towers in Staffordshire.

These were, as Rosemary Hill calls them, the ‘Romantic Catholics.’ They were motivated by a disillusionment with industrialism, concern for the endangerment of traditional rural life and social hierarchy, and an idealized conception of the social harmony of the medieval period to bring about a renewal of English Catholicism. Like ‘Young England,’ they also longed for a more authentic and permanent society which embraced both the new industrial age and rejected the perceived loose Georgian morals. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, a convert himself and a landed gentleman of Leicestershire, re-founded a medieval Cistercian abbey near his home at Grace Dieu Manor, and employed Pugin to design a hospital from which he and his wife dispensed charity and care to the rural poor. Pugin built and expanded the estates of his patron, the Earl of Shrewsbury, at Alton Towers in the style of the medieval Gothic, in splendid, elaborate color. The Romantic Catholics were inspired by a ‘recovered’ notion of the medieval, and had a highly Romantic, i.e., melancholy, personal, and solitary spirituality and notion of faith, a religion which was at once too medieval and too modern to be immediately acceptable to most Roman clergy or laity of the time. Though many of this small but influential ‘Shrewsbury set’ were enthusiastic converts or born Catholic themselves, they had little knowledge of or opinion in common with most English Catholics, who looked not to the medieval world but to the Counter-Reformation for inspiration and guidance.

---

22 A neo-Gothic ball and reception was designed organized by Pugin for Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in 1842 at Taymouth, the great houses of the Bredalbanes in Scotland. Pugin on this occasion outdid himself, including pipers, oarsmen, barges and boats.
anchoring themselves not in what they perceived to be their protestant surroundings but in
the style and aesthetic of Rome.\textsuperscript{23}

In the midst of this very modest medieval revival among Catholics, the Oxford
movement in the Church of England was taking shape in the culture of British universities
in the mid-1830s, and along similar lines also connected to the larger cultural trends of the
idea of authenticity and Romanticism. Called variously the Puseyites, after one of their
eyear leaders Edward Pusey (1800-1882), or the ‘Oxford movement’ for the university
where they enjoyed their highest popularity and fullest expression, they sought a return to
traditional, ‘high-church’ ceremony and sacramental doctrine in the Church of England.
The movement would eventually produce the \textit{Tracts for the Times}, addresses in which the
authors (mostly by John Henry Newman, later Catholic convert and cardinal) defended the
notion of the Anglican Church as a branch of the whole, universal ‘catholic’ church.\textsuperscript{24} Their
connection to the political cynicism and social idealism of the Romantics was plain, as they
in large part rejected what they saw as the corrupt, political church of the Georgian era.
Tract 90, the most famous of these sermonic tracts by Newman, defends the Thirty-Nine
Articles, the foundation of reformed Anglican doctrine, as being susceptible to a traditional,
‘catholic’ interpretation.\textsuperscript{25} This was the cause of enormous scandal at Oxford and among
evangelical and ‘broadchurch’ Anglicans, many of whom greatly feared anything which
smacked of Catholicism, still widely and pejoratively termed ‘popery’ by large numbers of
English protestants.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} The extent of their medieval attachment surprised Bishop Wiseman; see Hill, 239. This distinction between ‘Roman’ and ‘Gothic’
styles persists in Catholic liturgical terminology, particularly in the classification of vestments.
\textsuperscript{24} The Oxford writers promoted what became known as ‘branch theory,’ the notion that the Church of England was, though reformed
after the Reformation, still predated it and was thus prior to and outside of state control.
\textsuperscript{26} Hill, \textit{God’s Architect}, 248-50, 257.
Sarum Revival in the Nineteenth Century

It was in the midst of these currents that the Sarum liturgy became an issue of interest to both Anglicans and Catholics. On the issue of the liturgy, the Tracts and their supporters, who consequently became known as the ‘Tractarians,’ sought to recover for Anglicanism the beauty of traditional ceremonies, customs, and vestments, drawing out their ability “of impressing our memories and imaginations with the great revealed verities.”27 The recovery of much of the early Christian patristic interest in the symbolic and theological dimensions of the liturgy spurred much of this renewed interest. The theology expressed in the Tracts was of course still reformed and not medieval doctrine, but the move still scandalized many ‘low’ and ‘broad church’ Anglicans who were fearful of creeping popery. Regardless, Anglican interest in the medieval liturgy produced numerous clergymen and scholars interested in the subject.

Those ritualists among the Tractarians, though they were variously accused of crypto-Catholicism and even of socialism (the Anglo-Catholics were Romantics, and often placed in poor parishes and thus became advocates for social reform), were mostly successful in normalizing ‘high church’ ceremony and customs by the end of the nineteenth century.28 Newman and others, however, had converted by the end of the 1840s and entered the Catholic Church. Increasing pressures against the Tractarians by those who wished to expel all ‘papistry’ from the Church of England had brought about a crisis of

27 Newman, Tracts, 100.
28 By the later nineteenth century, the Tractarians had obtained much influence in the Church of England. Their advocacy of a revived ritualism in the Anglican Church - the use of incense, vestments, the sign of the cross, and the mixing of water with wine at the communion service - resulted in much resistance by those for whom the slogan of ‘no popery’ still carried much weight. In a judgement of November 1890, the Archbishop of Canterbury forbade the sign of the cross and water mixed with wine, but allowed eastward celebration, provided the actions at the altar were not obscured; Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Part II (Oxford: OUP, 1970), 333-54.
decision for him and others; could Newman and the Tractarians remain Anglican as well as Anglo-Catholic?

Though this pressure did not cause all of the Tractarians (notably their leader, Pusey, who remained Anglican) to similarly ‘swim the Tiber,’ it did have the general effect of narrowing the middle space Pugin and others who straddled the space between Anglican and Catholic. Catholics too began look askance at the sort of ‘floating’ being done by Pugin and his set, and to insist on respect for the way in which the Catholic Church had developed and adapted since the end of the medieval period and the Council of Trent. Newman himself eventual embraced the Oratorians, a religious order of Italian origin, and championed his new Roman Catholic identity as well as the ‘updating’ of those aspects of the medieval liturgy and tradition which he felt out of place in the post-medieval Catholic Church, issues on which he would clash with Pugin and the Romantics over architecture and by implication the future of the English Catholic Church as either medieval revival or continuous post-Reformation tradition.

Among leaders of the English Catholic community of the time, Augustus Pugin was perhaps most prominent among those interested in the study and practice of the Sarum Use, along with Daniel Rock, previously mentioned author of The Church of Our Fathers. Pugin himself incorporated many Sarum architectural elements in both his Anglican and Catholic churches, meant for the celebration and employment of Sarum ritual traditions, such as the niche-sedillae carved into the walls of the chancel for the use of the celebrant and ministers during the Mass, and the addition of an Easter Sepulcher into the north wall

---

* Hill, God’s Architect, 338.
of the chancel of many of his most famous churches, such as the Catholic parish of St. Giles’ at Cheadle in Staffordshire.30

Pugin’s second wife, Louisa, was received into the Catholic Church in grand style followed by a High Mass according to the Sarum Use and celebrated by Daniel Rock, who ...

... intoned the ‘Veni Creator Spiritus’ ‘in the old Salisbury chant.’ At the end of the ‘Miserere’ the sub-deacon lighted a wax taper, ornamented in the style of the fourteenth century, which rose out of a bouquet of rare flowers. It was decorated in the lower part by three splendid scrolls written in gothic ‘textus quadratus.’ The upper portion of the taper was ornamented with a wreath of brilliantly coloured flowers. Above them, attached to a golden string, was suspended a small scroll, also lettered in gothic text surmounted by an emblazoned device of the Archangel St. Michael overcoming Satan. With this lighted taper in her right hand, Mrs. Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin read her recantation of Protestantism.31

Scenes like this typified the dramatic and romantic predilections of Pugin’s circle. For the Romantic Catholics, attachment to the Sarum Use was a revival of that peculiarly medieval and specifically English Catholic tradition for which they longed. Pugin himself was typical of this aspiration, and it animated his work and career, subordinating his personal reputation for what he regarded as his divine mission of re-Catholicizing English architecture and culture. His early study at the library and cathedral of Salisbury and his early friendship with Daniel Rock (the two would later grow apart, however, over unrelated issues) meant that his immersion in the Gothic ethos and culture of medieval Sarum was deep and wide, an education which enriched his architecture and interior design with both vocabulary and aesthetic inspiration.32 All this was intimately connected with the nostalgic revival and antiquarianism of those who surrounded Pugin and Shrewsbury. It was

32 Hill, God’s Architect, 139; 168; for Pugin and Rock’s falling out, see 340; 486.
however, a “revivalism in the positive sense,” a sense of the past “as a living source of inspiration from which England could regenerate itself.” In the beginning of his career, Pugin himself was confident in the ability of Gothic architecture and the revival of medieval traditions even to do the miraculous and return the Church of England to communion with the Catholic Church, though the disappointments of the failure of the Oxford movement and the Camden Society to encourage mass conversions later disillusioned him from this hope.

One of those who shared this hope for Catholic revival and conversion of England was Nicholas Wiseman, as we have seen one of the Roman vicars-apostolic and associated with the Pugin circle in the 1840s. Wiseman himself celebrated ad usum Sarum for the benefit of the circle of the prominent Earl of Shrewsbury and the Romantic Catholics for some time, and was thus interested in liturgical history and revival. At Easter of 1842, Pugin wrote that “Dr. Wiseman is now compleatly ad usum Sarum which is a great blessing.” Wiseman, however, was (unlike the more insular Romantic Catholics) keen to bring English Catholicism into the Catholic and English mainstream. The ‘Romantic Catholics’ saw English Catholicism as a continuation the medieval tradition, while Wiseman both did not share this view and underestimated its seriousness. Wiseman, the son of Irish parents living in Spain, had spent most of his ecclesiastical career working in Rome, and was critical of the English exceptionalism and seemingly lukewarm attitude toward papal power exhibited by the Romantics like Pugin and Rock.

---

33 Ibid., 212-13.
34 Augustus W. N. Pugin, The Collected Letters, vol. 1, 1830-1842, Margaret Belcher, ed. (Oxford: OUP, 2003), 338; Hill, 264; it is worth noting here that, because no complete edition of the Sarum Missal had yet been produced at this time (Dickinson’s first fascicule would be published nearly twenty years later), Wiseman must have had a sixteenth-century edition or surviving medieval manuscript, or else have transcribed the prayers from one for liturgical use. This implies considerable interest and effort on his part in learning Sarum.
35 Hill, God’s Architect, 239.
36 Ibid., 237.
The conflict between the Romantics and those more attached to post-Reformation ways of doing things, which was to be formative for the newly restored English Catholic Church, came to a spark over the issue of Pugin’s Sarum-revival architecture. Pugin’s churches and vestments, to which many were so unaccustomed, swiftly divided Catholics. Foreshadowing later, post-First Vatican Council controversies around papal infallibility, two camps coalesced as a result which can broadly be termed the ‘English’ and ‘Ultramontane’ Catholics, in reference to their instinctual orientations: either to baroque aesthetic and post-Tridentine customs in use since the time of Elizabeth, or Gothic and revived medieval English tradition advocated by Pugin. The division grew increasingly clear, and Pugin stridently deplored in print those who could not see things his way.

The Roman customs in use by most English clergy did not share many of the distinctive Sarum traditions, and thus much of Pugin’s architectural features went unused and unnoticed, much to his annoyance. The temperamental architect, brilliant but stubborn, as well as both moody and impulsive, complained that his churches did “little or no good for want of men who know how to use them.” The controversy extended to liturgical music, in which Pugin and his circle argued for the exclusive use of medieval plainchant in contrast to the contemporary nineteenth-century practice of classical and baroque music during the liturgy, and also to ecclesiastical vestment style. Pugin designed and advocated for the more ample, medieval design, Gothic vestments, while the English Catholic Church was used to the trimmer, modern-cut Roman vestments. Both of these issues ignited passions on both sides. Both Pugin and the Earl of Shrewsbury left in disgust in 1840 a Mass where music written by Beethoven was used. Likewise, Pugin’s vestment

---

37 Pugin, The Collected Letters, 1, 175.
38 Hill, God’s Architect, 222-23.
designs were censured by Rome after complaint as to their innovative Gothic style was sent to Propaganda by one of the vicars-apostolic, who declared the long, flowing chasubles ‘illegal.’³⁹ Pugin took the censure characteristically hard, writing “if this decision of the propaganda is carried out I have done. I shall give up every hope. I am sick at heart.”⁴⁰ Friends like Bishop Thomas Walsh, Vicar-Apostolic of London, encouraged him not to take the decision poorly, though Walsh himself banned Pugin’s vestments in obedience to the censure. The action was later confirmed by Wiseman in 1840, much to Pugin’s annoyance.⁴¹

The controversy between the two groups broke most acrimoniously upon one of Pugin’s more controversial views on ecclesiastical architecture – his liking for the medieval rood screen, the wooden or metal screen separating nave from chancel. Pugin’s first screen was at one of his early churches at Macclesfield.⁴² As Pugin’s church of St. Chad’s in Birmingham neared completion in 1840, Wiseman criticized the inclusion of the rood screen, saying “I think it of the utmost importance to throw our ceremonies open to all.” This prompted the anger of the donor to the screen, Mr. John Hardman, as well as Pugin himself, who threatened to resign if it was altered. Wiseman backed down in this case, and even seemed to give the Gothic vestments and screen a chance, as he celebrated the consecration Mass of the un-altered St. Chad’s in June.

Pugin and John Henry Newman also developed an antagonistic relationship over the issue of liturgical architecture. Upon first meeting him, Newman thought Pugin uncouth and fond of the sound of his own voice.”⁴³ Pugin’s ideal medieval parish church

---

³⁹ Ibid.
³⁴ Ibid., 201.
³⁵ Ibid., 249.

impressed Newman with its beauty, but at the celebration after its consecration was
appalled by the romanticism and emotionalism of the ‘Romantic Catholics.’ As a result of
its self-conscious medievalism, the ceremony seemed to him to be so much play-acting and
“unreal.” 44 Newman’s tastes in architecture, or what can be divined of them from the
surviving evidence, is indicative from his simply-styled and eclectic private chapel at the
Oratory in Birmingham of a sense of aesthetics more understated, and less arresting with
their political and historical claims than Pugin’s. 45 For his part, Pugin heartily disliked
Newman and his new community of English Oratorians. When they met in Rome some
time later, Pugin commented rashly and impulsively to Newman’s polite suggestion that he
design an oratory church that he had no interest in designing for so un-English and un-
medieval a foundation as the Oratorians. 46 This rather understandably offended Newman
deeply, as he had recently decided upon the Oratorians as his preferred vocation within the
Catholic Church. 47

The next year in 1848, the chasm widened between the Ultramontanes and those
whom they now derisively called ‘Gallicans,’ after the condemned French party of
Catholics who sought more national independence from Rome. A certain Mrs. Bowden,
an acquaintance of Newman’s and a donor for the church at Fulham which Pugin had been
employed to design, refused to allow Pugin’s planned rood screen to be installed. When
Pugin refused to budge on his design, Mrs. Bowden fired him and had the half-built screen
destroyed. Elsewhere, another of Pugin’s builders refused to build a screen, presumably

44 Ibid., 359-60; cf. 399.
45 Though it should be noted that all Newman’s personal vestments (embroidered with his cardinalial arms) still extant at this chapel were
in the Roman, ‘fiddleback’ style most common at the time; see Shawn Tribe, “Cardinal Newman at Birmingham: Liturgical Items (Part 3
46 Ibid., 271.
47 The Oratorians’ choice of church architecture is to great extent indicative of their Roman orientation – the London and Birmingham
Oratories are in the Baroque style while Newman’s Dublin Oratory is like Westminster Cathedral in the neo-Byzantine.
due to the objections of his commissioners. Pugin was infuriated, while the sides of the argument were put to Newman, who opined to Ambrose Phillipps (Pugin’s supporter in the controversy):

Mr. Pugin is notoriously engaged in a revival - he is disentombing what has been hidden for centuries amid corruptions... Gothic is now like an old dress, which fitted a man well twenty years back but must be altered to fit him now... I wish to wear it, but I wish to alter it, or rather I wish him to alter it... I, for one, believe that Gothic can be adapted, developed into the requisitions of an oratory. Mr. Pugin does not."

Pugin’s personal aloofness and stubborn refusal to compromise his architectural principles (along with his perennially over-budget building costs and intense dislike of church building committees) resulted in fewer and fewer commissions for him. His early death in 1852 at the age of only 40 meant also that his interest in Sarum architecture was no longer in vogue. He had nearly singlehandedly revived among Catholics what was normally the province of the Anglican antiquaries. His abrasive personality and arrogance had, however, by his death caused a loss of interest in his unique brand of ideological Gothic purism. Subsequent Catholic architects were more accommodating to pro-Tridentine liturgical ‘modernization.’ The Easter Sepulcher at St. Giles has likely never been used, and many of Pugin’s screens no longer exist, with Cheadle a fortunate exception for modern scholars of his architectural work."

---

49 Other screens were taken out completely at various times in the twentieth century, particularly after the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council; see Hill, God’s Architect, 555 note 54 particularly.
The Restoration of 1850 and Conclusions on the Nineteenth-Century Revival

The conflict between the sort of English Catholicism championed by Pugin and that advocated by Newman and the ‘post-medieval,’ Roman Catholics to some extent exaggerates the conflict which emerged between those who took their inspiration from Pugin and those who now looked the restored hierarchy of 1850. In any event, the latter was after that date in the position of power. Upon Rome’s announcement of the restoration in September 1850, it was immediately speculated that Wiseman would be named a cardinal, which he soon was along with receiving the new archbishopric of Westminster. The restoration, as John Bossy has observed, was designed to restore orderly episcopal governance to Britain, and was largely successful in doing so, largely securing clerical control of things from longstanding lay and Jesuit influences.  

The Ultramontanes who disliked Pugin and the ideas of the Romantic Catholics had something of an ally in Wiseman, who, though he was anxious for the support of Pugin and the other converts, was also equally firm in his support for Rome, and beginning to be wary of Pugin and Rock’s equivocating on doctrinal issues with Anglicanism such as papal supremacy. Despite their long association, Wiseman and Pugin came to rest on opposing sides. For his part, Pugin, whose greatest support later in his career came not from Catholics but from Camden Society members and from sympathizers with the Oxford

---

* Bossy characterizes the restoration somewhat pejoratively as “less the ‘revolution in the moral sphere’ [Newman’s phrase] of which he spoke, than a counter-revolution in the social.” Bossy’s aim here is to support one of his central theses, that the restoration “certainly did not restore, as Newman hopefully affirmed, an English church which had been in abeyance since the Reformation,” and that the restoration of episcopal governance was a “disappointing close” to the experiments in lay and inferior clerical governance which had taken place in the earlier part of the century (363). The phrasing is suggestive here. In ‘counter-revolution’ and ‘disappointing close,’ Bossy assumes an end for the English Catholic community of ever more lay control and definite discontinuity with the medieval order. His focus is almost exclusively on sociology and power structures, missing other dimensions of continuity and assuming a particular ‘end goal’ for the Church, i.e. lay and clerical democracy, which is seldom a helpful method of academic historical inquiry; see Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 361-63.

* Wiseman and others doubted the orthodoxy of Rock and Pugin, who were in their enthusiasm for union with the Tractarians known also to play down papal authority; Hill, God’s Architect, 237; 447-450.
movement, grew increasingly disillusioned with the hierarchy, and penned a passionate justification of screens in 1851. His *Earnest on the Establishment of the Hierarchy* of 1851 betrays his disappointment in the resistance to his vision of the English Catholic Church, as well as his continuing hope near the end of his life of Catholic reunion with Anglicanism, whose members he referred to as “those good and earnest souls who yet man the shattered bark of England’s church.” This virtual acknowledgement of Anglican branch theory (see above) was the final straw for most Catholics. Pugin was called a ‘Puseyite’ in the *Tablet*, and very few Catholics defended him. To this he complained of their ‘narrow-mindedness.’ It is possible that steps were being taken by Newman to bring about an ecclesiastical punishment for Pugin, even in more indulgent circles now thought of as an eccentric architect who had gotten out of his depth.

Pugin’s descent into illness and insensibility and his death the following year ended the controversy, but the English-Roman division (along with others) remained, eventually resurfacing during the modernist crisis in the wake of the First Vatican Council several decades later. Interest in Sarum among Catholics, however, was now virtually extinct. Bound up as it was with Pugin, Rock, and their associates, no one at the time was inclined to broach the subject of its modern revival for fear of the taint of Anglican heresy and English ‘Gallicanism,’ particularly after the Roman liturgy was adopted for England by the bishops soon after the restoration. Wiseman and the bishops had made their choice, and as a result of the historical circumstances of the time Sarum was not restored along with the Catholic hierarchy.

---

33 Ibid., 457; the letter is in a private collection cited by Hill, and postmarked 18 February 1851.
34 Ibid.
35 Cf. Ibid., 398; 401.
A few conclusions can be drawn from this review of Sarum in the nineteenth century. First, a prominent dividing factor between the various groups of English Catholics in the Catholic revival of the early Victorian period was the nature of interest in the medieval Catholic Church, its architecture, liturgy, and aesthetics. Secondly, the ‘Romanizing’ movement of Wiseman and the bishops sympathetic to the Ultramontane position before and after the restoration of the hierarchy was most likely the cause of Sarum not being readopted as the official liturgical use for England after 1850. As a result, use of the Sarum liturgy was probably nonexistent save among the small groups of Romantic Catholics. Further, because of the official adoption of the Roman liturgy, it is doubtful whether this practice was now legally and canonically correct (if it indeed survived anywhere). Lastly, not without some justice, Wiseman and the bishops looked on the ‘Romantic Catholics’ and those interested in the Sarum Use as something like quasi-Anglicans. Pugin was notoriously unable to make up his mind as to whether he found anything wrong with the Oxford movement, and expressed numerous times in his disappointment with the Catholic Church his belief that the renewal of the English Church would come from the Tractarians. Thus, Sarum (by all confirmed accounts) returned to disuse once more until the celebrations previously mentioned at Merton College and Aberdeen in Scotland.

The climate of the nineteenth century, in which English historians were inclined to be positively interested in Sarum eventually gave way to neglect of the subject once again in the early part of the twentieth century, as modern methods of historiography and research took shape, but old prejudices prevailed among the new historians. Local historians and

---

* Ibid., 234-35; 275-76; 457.
academic journals took up the discussion of English parish churches and Reformation history instead of antiquarians and clergymen. As Sarum was not studied as a liturgy at this time but as a historical object within Reformation history, I expand my focus to the historiography of the Reformation in general to focus on the modern historiography, which will also aid in contextualizing this study within the framework of academic history.

The Mid-Twentieth Century: Dickens and His Critics

Any account of the modern historiography of the English Reformation must begin with the late A. G. Dickens (1910-2001), active through the middle part of the last century. Dickens and his colleagues were famously challenged by the revisionist trend in the late 1980s. In his article of February 2004 entitled “A. G. Dickens and the English Reformation,” Christopher Haigh, one of the principal revisionists, gives a concise and relatively sympathetic summary of the contribution of Dickens and his contemporaries to the local studies of the English counties which revolutionized Reformation scholarship in the early part of the twentieth century. Haigh also comments about the nature of English Reformation studies in general, observing wryly that “It sometimes seems to me that Reformation history is just a convenient battlefield in the struggle for the soul of the Church of England – but that is a wicked thought.”

The dominant narrative present in Dickens and most pre-revisionist English Reformation history is progressivist and confessionally (or at least hermeneutically) protestant – that is, it takes as a guiding principle that protestantism was a ‘progressive,’

---

inevitable result of the ‘medieval’ (that is, oppressive) conditions of the late medieval world of the sixteenth century. In the later ‘middle ages,’ the English people were anxious to throw away the ostensibly corrupt and elaborate medieval structure and ceremony of the Church and start again from a place of ‘biblical simplicity.’ The supposed corruption of the Church was connected closely with the complexity of its ceremonies – which were cluttered just as the Church was cluttered with unnecessary corruption and accretion. It seemed to the progressivist historians that the Reformation’s reformed protestant services brought with them not only a church free from papistical elaborations, but new freedom of thought and inquiry which would put England on the road to its bright future as a forward-thinking nation.

This traditional narrative is nearly ubiquitous in English scholarship before the 1980s, and is in some places more blatant than others. In an extreme example, R. R. Reid ends her 1905 study of the 1569 Rebellion of the Northern Earls by writing “The movement which culminated in the Rebellion of the Earls and their followers was essentially retrograde. Its aim was the perpetuation of a system of religion, of government, and of rural economy, which the mass of the nation had outgrown; and its failure was necessary to complete the real as opposed to the nominal union of the English kingdom.”

While stopping short of condemning the entire medieval Church as hopelessly corrupt and inevitably set to collapse, Jasper Ridley in his 1984 biography of Henry VIII makes a point of characterizing the late medieval clergy as worldly and writes that the English “had a low opinion” of priests in general. Throughout his account, the skepticism of the English nation toward clerics and the structure of the medieval Church is axiomatic and

---

foreshadowing of their willingness to embrace the reforms. Though hardly confessionally protestant, there is something of the progressive about this passage. Its broad generalizations, though common enough historiographically, cannot stand in the face of recent revisionist criticism. The narrative however persists, especially outside the confines of academic debate unaware of the changes in the field. Eamon Duffy, the scholar along with Haigh most notable among the revisionists, records the vitriol with which a historically-progressive journalist rejected the general interpretive thrust of Stripping. “[M]ost Britons had,” the journalist wrote, “by the late-15th century, come to regard the Roman church as an alien, corrupt and reactionary agent of intellectual oppression, awash in magic and superstition. They could not wait to see the back of it...”60 The narrative of the ‘bad old days’ of the Middle Ages – that Catholicism and Englishness are opposites – runs very deep both in English history and culture since the late sixteenth century, particularly among who move primarily in circles outside of and insulated from the trends and debates of academic history.

These elements are present in most histories written from the start of professional historical writing and research in the late nineteenth century until the publication of the work of Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy, among others, in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Haigh also credits other developments in Tudor social history, such as the G. R. Elton’s Policy and Police (1985) and Keith Thomas’ Religion and the Decline of Magic (1971), both of which criticized the progressivist narrative of the Reformation.61 Though Dickens by no means presents the progressivist view in its archetypal form (for this the pre-

professional Whig historians must come to mind, e.g. Macaulay and J. A. Froude), the structure is still nonetheless present.

Dickens, whose impressive academic career spanned from the 1930s to the 1990s, was a central figure in the popularization of close, detailed studies of local archives in order to understand the Reformation in England, a development closely connected with the contemporary rise of social history. From the widespread popularity of his work after the publication of his paradigmatic work *The English Reformation* in 1964 and into the 1970s, until the work of the so-called ‘Catholic revisionists’ such as Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy in the 1980s and 90s, Dickens’ school was largely dominant in the historiography.

Dickens wrote his history partly as a rejoinder to the accounts of late nineteenth-century historians who were broadly sympathetic to medieval religion, so-called ‘pre-professional’ Reformation historians such as John Lingard, Hillaire Belloc, and Cardinal Gasquet. Haigh’s observation that Dickens’ *The English Reformation* was the culmination of his and others’ longstanding effort to extirpate the influence of ‘‘neo-Tractarians’, ‘neo-Romantics’, ‘sentimentalists’ and ‘sectarian gladiators’’ upon the field of Reformation scholarship is a significant one. Dickens’ concern was to move away from what he saw as confessional history, to place focus on the ordinary layman in the Reformation as opposed to king, duke, or bishop. This trend of microhistory, a consequence of the growing mid-century popularity of social history and the new, professionally-run archives in the counties, was then the prevailing wind, and Dickens’ professors championed the approach in the graduate environment of the 1930s. When Dickens himself received his degree and began teaching, this study of the Reformation continued with his encouragement.

---

* Ibid., 30-31
All this is to say that Dickens never considered himself a partisan, much less a ‘whiggish’ historian. True to his formation as a social and localist historian, Dickens criticized predecessors such as Maurice Powicke, who had in his 1936 book *The Reformation in England* famously declared the English Reformation “an act of state,” the local and popular character of the Reformation. Very many people in Tudor England, the pre-Reformation Lollards, the parish Bible-readers, the English Lutherans, and the persecuted evangelicals under Mary I, were for Dickens conclusive evidences showing the popular character of the Reformation, and thus the rightness of his social approach to his work. This was one-directional, however. Dickens was seldom interested in popular expressions of Catholicism or in expressions of traditional religious practice. “He did not seem to recognize,” Haigh observes, “that the people could be Catholic too.” That way led to similar pitfalls to those Dickens had criticized in confessional history. To Dickens’ way of thinking, however, “His own views, of course, were not partisan at all, but sheer Anglican common sense.”

Dickens’ interpretation of the Reformation was quite straightforward, and bears similarity to those of others which Eamon Duffy pithily described in *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition*. It was to the narrative that Duffy addressed much of his study: “*The Stripping of the Altars* was a self-consciously polemical book. It had long been an axiom of historical

---


*Ibid., 31.*

*Ibid., 32.*
writing about the establishment of Protestantism in England that the success of the
Reformation had been a more or less inevitable consequence of the dysfunction and
unpopularity of late medieval Catholicism.” 66 Duffy is speaking chiefly of the work of
Dickens as the most well-known example of the progressivist interpretation. Dickens,
however, flatly denied holding to the protestant hermeneutic, English exceptionalism, and
progressivism which Haigh and others had seen in his work, especially objecting to the
characterization of Whig historiography. 67 In response, Haigh pointed out several
examples, quoting particularly this passage from the 1950s on the Pilgrimage of Grace
(1536), also referred to by Duffy in Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition:

‘What serious English patriot,” Dickens wrote, “can wish that the Pilgrimage of
Grace... had succeeded? ... They were swimming directly against that stream which
bore our nation to far higher destinies than any it had attained in the age of neo-
feudalism.” 68

Dickens’ sense of English providentialism was pronounced. The rebels of 1536
wished to “roll back the march of history.” Duffy characterizes as “the purest tosh”
Dickens’ anachronistic projection of a unique and definitely-not-Roman English church
back into the pre-Reformation period. Where Dickens sees the rough, Celtic strains of
native English Christianity in a medieval church like Beverley minster, Duffy is unmoved
by his flight of fancy. Dickens’ invocation of some ahistorical ‘English-only Church’ is also a
symptom of his Protestant-progressivism: “English religion, even in the Middle Ages, must
somehow have remained free of ‘Roman philosophies and forms of administration’
[Dickens’ words] and must either look forward to the Protestantism which was to come, or

67 Haigh, “A. G. Dickens and the English Reformation,” 32. The quote from Dickens is from “The early expansion of Protestantism in
backwards to an unsullied Celtic strain of Christianity, reflecting the purity of the bare crags and vales, and the lonely soul in communion with its maker. 

The historiographical interpretation advocated by Dickens is thus very clear to the revisionists. To Haigh, the tug-of-war within the Church of England between Anglo-Catholics and evangelical elements continues unabated, and is clearly present in modern academic historiography. To Duffy, the naked sectarian conflict which Dickens ostensibly wished to avoid is nevertheless also present in his work.

Dickens’ unabashed Anglican confession, his staunch English patriotism, and perhaps most importantly his almost providential progressivism, simply did not weather the consequences of the social and political changes of the later twentieth century. Corresponding with the turn to postmodernism in many other aspects of academic study, the tendency to question the hermeneutical biases of others and of oneself thoroughly destroyed the unquestioned acceptance of these opinions. Haigh writes tellingly of these three hermeneutics, “They were so very, very fifties – just the kind of stuff I was taught at home, at church and at school in my childhood and teens. Catholicism was bad, and Protestantism was good. The English were special, and we were lucky to be that nation. The history of the Reformation was the history of the Protestants, the victory of biblical Christianity over superstition and priestcraft. This was not an approach to the world that could survive Suez and the sixties[.]” Historians themselves and society in general had begun to doubt the progressive narrative of the ‘great English march of civilization.’
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10 Ibid., 36.
The Later Twentieth Century: The ‘Catholic Revisionists’

The revisionists like Duffy and Haigh recognized the popularity of pre-Reformation religion and the attachment of the majority English religious opinion to various pre-Reformation traditions and patterns of devotion long after 1534. Also common is their insistence on the imposed character of the Reformation and the stress they place on the difficulty of the government’s imposition of official protestantism, especially during the radical changes of Edward VI. Their two most well-known works are Haigh’s *English Reformations* and Duffy’s *The Stripping of the Altars*. Duffy makes quite clear his opposition to the same narrative in the original introduction to *The Stripping of the Altars*:

“It is the contention the first part of the book that late medieval Catholicism exerted an enormously strong, diverse, and vigorous hold over the imagination and loyalty of the people up to the very moment of Reformation.”71 If, Duffy holds, traditional religion was indeed popular and not in inevitable decline by the sixteenth century, the events of the Tudor Reformation must be explained by other means. Haigh’s statement is even stronger:

“A combination of government coercion and individual conversion drove traditional Catholicism from the churches, and replaced it with a Calvinistic Protestantism.”72

At the time their work was published in the early 1990s, it caused a great deal of controversy and accusations of Catholic bias from other historians trained under Dickens’ interpretation. Their confessional identity was assumed naturally to have motivated their conclusions. While Duffy himself is Catholic, the statement was applied also to Haigh, who is not. This caused consternation to Dickens, who, upon being told that Haigh was not a

---

Catholic, is said by Duffy to have exclaimed “Then why does he say such things?” Dickens’ comment implies a concerted movement of confessional Catholic historians pushing a similar set of ideas. Haigh and Duffy, however, were not uniformly similar. So much was Duffy in fact bemused by this notion of a militant ‘revisionist’ faction, and even more by the designation ‘Catholic revisionists,’ that he doubts himself whether revisionist is even a meaningful term, obscuring as it does the differences between his work and that of Haigh and others usually thus called. These differences continue to be discussed.

Ethan Shagan describes the dissimilarities between Haigh and Duffy as the base of much of the continuing discussion in Reformation and Stuart era historiography. Duffy himself attributes to discussion of his own work the blurring of traditional historical divides between the medieval and early modern. While Duffy describes the great and deliberate break with the medieval past sought by the reformers, and the physical consequences of that break in (for example) the whitewashing of churches and the destruction of imagery and liturgical objects, Haigh by contrast emphasizes the political – that is, imposed – character of the Reformation and its seeming dearth of any great theological significance for the average of Englishman or woman until the seventeenth century. For Duffy, then, the institutional and material culture of Catholicism was necessary to late medieval religion, and was shattered by the Reformation, unable to rise again after the enforced suppression of the Mass, pilgrimage, the cult of the saints, indulgences, and prayers for the dead. Haigh on the other hand emphasizes the lingering character of traditional practices and doctrines tolerated in the established church, and stresses evidence suggesting that England was not a
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73 Duffy, Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition, 6.
75 Duffy, Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition, 5.
thoroughly protestant country until rather well into the seventeenth century. The discussion continues among revisionists and others as to when protestant England can meaningfully be discussed and where a post-Reformation Catholic community distinguishable from medieval religion can be said to begin. Both Duffy and Haigh, however, have in different ways succeeded in toppling the dominant Dickens narrative.

Haigh and Bossy

The beginnings of the movement known as ‘Catholic revisionism’ in historiography are in the different, though related, field of study on the post-Reformation English Catholic community. Contemporaneous with the work of Dickens, historians of English Catholicism also consciously moved away from confessional history to a focused microstudy of local communities. John Bossy’s 1976 *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* was groundbreaking in its use of a wide variety of primary sources and its new interpretation of the history of the Catholic community in England during the Recusancy period. In his own review of the relevant documents and records, Bossy famously rejects the traditional picture of Catholics in England as slowly atrophying as a result of protestant pressure until virtually nonexistent in the nineteenth century, only to be revived by mid nineteenth-century Irish immigration. Rather, he emphasizes, Jesuit missions caused a slow growth of the community as a result of the popularity of Jesuit spirituality and Counter-Reformation theology. English Catholicism owes its community in other words not to the medieval *Ecclesia Anglicana* but to sixteenth century Jesuit evangelism.

---

This rejection of any continuity with the medieval period runs through Bossy’s work. In the first chapters, he emphasizes that he sees the community not as a continuation of the medieval Church but as a new creation, having more in common with the English dissenting and non-conformist tradition. For him, the exiled secular priests of the Marian regime were quite literally grasping at ghosts, and their efforts to maintain clerical claims to grandiose authority were “conjuring up the spectre of the mediaeval Church.”

Bossy’s overall claim here – that there was very little if any connection between the pre-Reformation Church and the English Catholic community after 1570 – is in its rejection of the medieval similar to Dickens’ historiography.

Like Dickens, Bossy took as his opponents the Catholic converts from the Oxford movement – Tractarians like John Henry Newman, who held the growth of the Catholic community in England in the Victorian period to be a providential event. On the contrary, the Tractarians have very little to do with Bossy’s account, and indeed represent the ‘neo-Romanticism’ he rejects. Also like Dickens, Bossy has a fundamentally negative view of medieval Catholicism as obsessed by rules and institutional order, while his sympathy with the Jesuits and their spiritually-focused missionary mentality comes through quite clearly. His tendency also to regard this attachment by the secular priests to continuity with the medieval past, which he refers to periodically as “church-nostalgia,” adduces perhaps his impatience with those who only adapted to the missionary situation “at last.”

His assumptions here are possibly a result of his own position within the Roman Catholic Church of the 1970s, a period in which the excoriation of the specter of ‘medieval’ clericalism was very much in fashion and continuity with a the past was being
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77 Ibid., 29; 391. For the general periodization of Bossy’s study, see Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, 4ff.
78 Ibid., 320-21.
79 Ibid., 285; it is worth noting that Bossy relies extensively on Jesuit sources; see Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, 3.
deemphasized in favor of drawing out the bonds between the Church and the contemporary world. Naturally this approach was also applicable to the sixteenth century. Bossy’s identification of emphatically not-medieval English Catholicism with the nonconformist tradition, especially when one considers his grouping of Catholics with Quakers and Unitarians as ‘non-protestant dissenters’ (a somewhat dubious categorization), seems also to have much in common with the ecumenical effort in the wake of the Second Vatican Council to see the Church primarily as a part the larger culture and not apart from it. His assumptions, however, did not remain long unchallenged.

It was in response to Bossy that Christopher Haigh became known in the late 1970s for his controversial response to The English Catholic Community. Though lauding the work’s clarity and observations, Haigh comments that Bossy’s conclusions are often based on inadequate evidence and arguments from analogy. Drawing attention to Bossy’s periodization, Haigh argues in his review that Bossy’s hard distinction between the medieval Church and early modern Catholic community is skewed. Bossy, Haigh points out, is most interested in the communities which formed around the gentry households of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. The nearly exclusive reliance of Bossy on this evidence, and his neglect of other records such as those of the Anglican episcopal visitations and government state papers, blinds him to a more popular view of Catholicism, as well as any notion of continuity of Elizabethan and Stuart Catholicism with the pre-Reformation traditional religion of the medieval Church, or even any identification of conservative religion in general in the early Elizabethan period as Catholic.  

---

Thus Bossy, in his defining Catholicism as a simple, countable community of recusant converts and not as a community formed from the old medieval Church in the wake of the Reformation, necessarily misses the larger perspective. As such, Bossy is not interested in patterns of Catholic behavior, attachment to the Mass, the cult of the saints, or prayer for the dead (all things which would indicate continuity), but in a Catholic community attached socially to the gentry and the mission priests. “Dr. Bossy's book is a study, one hopes, not of a legally defined aggregate but a community, and membership is an idea rather than an act: to see catholicism [sic] as a set of beliefs rather than a public stance causes statistical problems but it is, sadly, historically more accurate.”\footnote{Ibid., 185.} In his eagerness to treat the internal history of the Catholic community, Bossy misses larger external pressures like the common experience of state persecution, a part of the English Catholic history which Bossy hardly mentions in his effort to avoid the taint of the ‘traditional historiography of saints and martyrs.’ Above all, Haigh believes that Bossy’s work failed to show that an English Catholic community existed and when and how it gained cohesion and identity against and with the rest of English society. In fact, says Haigh, Bossy usually excludes the political in favor of the social.\footnote{Ibid., 186; cf. Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 6.} In subsequent articles, Haigh would even make the claim that far from saving the English Catholic community, the Jesuit missionaries actually marginalized Catholicism to the households of the gentry and left English popular religious traditionalism to die a slow death at the hands of creeping protestantism in Anglican parishes as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries unfolded.\footnote{Shagan, Catholics and the 'Protestant nation,' 7.} The Haigh-Bossy debate is thus characterized by a discussion of the precise meaning of English Catholic – Bossy defining the term narrowly and Haigh broadly.
Eamon Duffy and *The Stripping of the Altars*

In contrast to longstanding negative assumptions about English religion before the Reformation, Duffy’s *The Stripping of the Altars* aims to step away from the received interpretation and to place the academic conversation in a larger context – to take medieval religion and its practitioners seriously as a system and community with its own internal logic.85 Significantly, it seeks to understand pre-Reformation religion as an integral part of the English landscape, not as an alien force which must inevitably and eventually be swept away. The effect of ‘stripping the altars’ was not, as it were, throwing off a despised and corrupt medieval past but digging “a ditch, deep and dividing, between the English people and their past.”86

Reaction to *Stripping* was similar to the reaction to Haigh’s revisionist work. Numerous reviewers and readers of the book claimed that Duffy had whitewashed the pre-Reformation period as an England idyllically Catholic. Duffy insisted however that he had “maintained no such thing.”87 In fact, he observed that he had explained his aims quite explicitly in his original introduction, in which he pointed out the need for a study precisely of *mainstream* traditional religion. Though dissent of course existed, a study of medieval English heresy, Lollardry, or witchcraft would have been unneeded due to the voluminous literature on the subject. *Stripping* was just what it appeared to be: a focused study of popular religion and a corrective to a gap in the literature.88 Here again, Duffy described his
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85 Duffy, *Stripping*, xviii.
86 Ibid., xiv.
88 Duffy, *Stripping*, xix. Duffy responds to his critics at length in the introduction to the second edition, addressing the controversy his work caused in the study of Lollardry and Lollards in late medieval England. Duffy’s attempt here to deemphasize the importance of the Lollards and their connection to the reformers of the sixteenth century is a point of some continuing controversy.
aim as “a contribution towards a reassessment of the popularity and durability of late medieval religious attitudes and perceptions[.]”⁸⁹ Pointing out the protestant-progressivism present in Dickens, Duffy posits that he was responding to a real scholarly need to investigate and describe late medieval English traditional religion on its own terms as a system of belief. Discussion of religious dissent was simply outside the scope of his study: “But the book was written in the conviction that it was a mistake to set such dissidence and doubt at the centre of all overarching discussion of the content and character of traditional religion.”⁹⁰

Though his was not the first work to take on this theme, Stripping has enjoyed such a measure of academic and popular success that its central claims about late medieval English religion and its demise have “since gained widespread acceptance.”⁹¹ The size and scope of the book is tremendous, and the depth of research is usually admitted even by those who object to his conclusions. His continuing work has largely been received in a similar way – with acceptance of his central idea but with criticism of some of his methods or omissions in his interpretation of the evidence. Indeed, many of Duffy’s subsequent books, including Voices of Morebath and Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor has been in some degree or other a support of or elaboration upon the central thesis of Stripping. Acceptance of Duffy’s claims has not halted further criticism and discussion by contemporary scholar applying his conclusions in their own ways.
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⁸⁹ Ibid., xvi.
⁹⁰ Ibid., xx.
⁹¹ Ibid., xviii.
Recent Historiography: Post-revisionism

The continuing conversation in the wake of *The Stripping of the Altars* has largely centered on a perceived gap in the narrative of Duffy, Haigh, and other revisionists. While admitting the validity of the claims of Haigh and Duffy, these authors nevertheless still find something unsatisfactory in the revisionists, and attempt to discover weaknesses present in both the received and revisionist narratives. The emphasis, Duffy comments, has shifted from the inevitability of the Reformation and the social viability of pre-Reformation traditional religion to the complex process of support, enactment, enforcement, and resistance to the Reformation itself. This is seen quite clearly in the work of those working from an openly post-revisionist perspective like Ethan Shagan. In *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, Shagan and other historians collected a number of essays highlighting what they consider to be the neglected aspects of the Reformation in England, e.g. the English Reformation as political-cultural agenda. “[T]he revisionist account of the Reformation,” Shagan writes, “has paid surprisingly little attention to political issues, an odd irony given Haigh’s insistence that the English Reformation was largely ‘political’ rather than ‘Protestant.’” Haigh, however, uses a definition of political which is unsatisfactory to Shagan and his post-revisionist colleagues. Like Powicke and Elton, Shagan believes Haigh has too narrow a definition of politics, focused on the king, bishops, and court machinations of the Tudor state. Rather, the focus ought to be on politics at a local, plebian level. New studies of Tudor England have proven the utility for Shagan of a close study of
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93 Shagan *Catholics and the Protestant nation*, 5.
things like the social makeup of the rebels in the Pilgrimage of Grace and their “variety of religious, social, and ‘commonwealth’ grievances[.]”

This study the various essays in *Catholics and the ‘Protestant Nation’* carry out, straddling once again traditional divides between medieval and early modern. Intriguing historical evidence supports the authors’ argument that the situation of post-Reformation England provided no easy distinction between religious and political motivations. Indeed, these motivations were always inextricable, defying neat, modern notions of separation. Recognition of this complex fact is a hallmark of current microstudies extending outside the English Reformation to fields such as the medieval Italian city-states, on whose merging of religious and political culture Augustine Thompson has recently written a close study.

Duffy himself has engaged with this post-revisionist stress on the social aspect of the Reformation, observing that *Voices of Morebath* can be seen as a study of just this aspect which his critics find neglected in *The Stripping of the Altars*. In his microstudy of the village of Morebath in Devon, he admits to being a ‘post-revisionist’ in a number of ways. It describes the impact of the Reformation on a parish level. When Morebath is ordered to end the offering of candles before images and to disband its parish gilds dedicated to the saints for example, this aspect is on full display. Thus, the scholarly conversation on the socio-political complexities of the period continues to expand in scope to all aspects of life in the late sixteenth century.
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94 Ibid., 6.
97 Duffy is as we have seen, doubtful of these distinctions of schools because of his rather serious differences with other ‘revisionists.’
Offered in this same spirit, this thesis is a historical reexamination of the Sarum Use in medieval and early modern history. In what way, in short, did the Sarum Use bind together the medieval Christian community of England? Why did the Sarum Use disappear in the centuries of Catholic persecution only to reappear among particular groups in our own time? Finally, what does the contemporary interest mean for the identity of English Catholicism? This study will attempt an examination of Sarum in its social, political, and religious context, and get at the meaning of the Sarum Use in English Catholic history. Briefly, what this study will observe is that when English Catholic culture positively affirms its medieval history and sees something worthwhile in it, interest in Sarum grows among those inclined to look to native English traditions for a connection to ancient tradition. There is a desire present in these movements, an aspiration to re-grasp what was lost in the Reformation in the suppression of a deeply enculturated way of life, a prime example Christianity’s being what Robert Wilken termed a civilizational, “culture-forming religion.” Sarum is the most visual and poignant symbol and reminder of Duffy’s ‘lost world’ of late medieval England, a fully coherent and richly colorful system of sign and ritual which not only connected an entire people with the divine but also with each other in the emotional and spiritual ties of medieval neighborliness.

The Reformation, as the revisionists continually emphasize, was a violent uprooting of popular religious traditions and the extermination of a way of life, the particularly medieval and English contours of practicing the traditional religion. Practicing the Sarum Use after the Reformation, in an age of its suppression and stigmatization by the wider society, and in secret for fear of capture, Sarum lost much of its medieval meaning and
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mystique. In order properly to understand the full context of Sarum’s history, therefore, one must return to where it began – high medieval England – and take the story to its obscure conclusion in the seventeenth century, the endpoint of its unbroken continuity. Underlying all this is the claim of Alcuin Reid that those liturgical traditions of venerable antiquity and authentic historical pedigree are worthy of revival. It is in showing that this is true of the Sarum Use that this study hopes to have its most important impact in any possible future review of Sarum’s status within the Church.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

The Sarum Use most simply is the ancient use of the Roman rite which was practiced in the Diocese of Salisbury from the late twelfth century, spreading through much of southern England, the midlands, and parts of Scotland and Ireland, only falling out of general use after the 1549 Act of Uniformity which promulgated the first Book of Common Prayer. Salisbury Cathedral, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and consecrated in 1225, became the benchmark of a liturgical standard for much of England from the reign of Henry III to the upheavals of Edward VI. After the failed effort by Mary I to reestablish the Sarum Use in England after her accession in 1553, an attempt which was cut short by Mary’s childless death in 1558, Sarum was once again suppressed by the government of Elizabeth I and afterward James I/VI, and gradually decreased in both use and salience until its revival in the nineteenth century.

Sarum’s fall into desuetude is complex, spanning as it does several centuries of some of the most turbulent and contentious years in the history of the British Isles. This chapter relates what can be known of its early history as a distinct liturgical use, giving some indication of its actual practice. It aims to provide context for the historical question posed by this study: how did a liturgy which was formed in the experience of English clerics and ingrained into the yearly devotional lives of the English people over several centuries disappear? Further, why did the English writers and Anglican divines of later centuries
claim that the Mass was foreign or ‘un-English,’ and how does Sarum complicate this polemical stance? In what follows I describe Sarum’s early history, highlighting in particular its English roots as well as its origins in the early Roman rite.

This chapter will both emphasize the Englishness of Sarum and go some way in explaining what the context of the use itself is and why it became significant to English Catholic history.

The Sarum Use as Historical Subject

Sarum, or Sarisburie, both Latinized corruptions of the Norman French Sarisberic by which the conquering Normans referred to the Saxon town called Searobyrig, originally referred to the ancient fortress town of Old Sarum on the hill overlooking the valley in which the modern city of Salisbury is now situated. ¹ By the early twelfth century, in response to political and other concerns which made the site of Old Sarum no longer suitable, the decision was made to relocate the cathedral to the confluence of the Salisbury Avon and the Nadder rivers, around which the city developed.² The liturgy in use among the secular clergy of Salisbury Cathedral (both old and new foundations) would acquire widespread popularity as a sort of ‘gold standard,’ a set of venerable customs for liturgical worship for the English Church. Together with the substantially similar York Use of the northern dioceses, among several other local uses, it constituted the bulk of the liturgical

¹ The town had been known in Roman Britain as Sorbiodunum, a combination of the Celtic place name, possibly meaning ‘dry,’ and the Latin suffix meaning ‘city.’ The word ‘Sarum’ was formed by a common abbreviation of the Latin Sarisberic. For more on the history of the bishopric, see Gleeson White, The Cathedral Church of Salisbury (London: G. Bell, 1901), 95-98.
² Though, as the thoughtful student of English history will recall, Old Sarum remained a parliamentary constituency even into the nineteenth century, being abolished as the most notorious ‘rotten borough’ only with the Great Reform Act of 1832.
customs of England for some three centuries until the enforcement of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The Sarum Use shares much in common with other English uses, reflecting their common origin in the western Roman rite originating the Gregorian Sacramentary. Sarum is essentially, as one liturgical historian has observed, “the Roman Liturgy previous to the fourteenth century, with a few rare local customs added to it.”*3* Adrian Fortescue, the eminent liturgical historian, commented in *The Mass: a Study of the Roman Liturgy* that “[i]n everything of any importance at all Sarum (and all other mediaeval rites) was simply Roman, the rite which we still use. Not only was the whole order and arrangement the same, all the important prayers were the same too... We must remember that the important elements of a rite are not the things that will first be noticed by a casual and ignorant onlooker[.]”*4* Leaving aside for the moment Fortescue’s evident effort here to minimize the importance of the differences between liturgical uses of the Roman rite, and the misleading observation that his contention that the prayers were all “the same” as the Roman Mass, it is necessary to consider the distinction between a liturgical use and rite, and the exact terms appropriate to describe the Sarum Use in its historical-contextual uniqueness.

In the current age in which both the Roman Catholic liturgy and that of the Anglican Communion, in addition to those surviving protestant communities with any liturgical tradition worthy of the name, have imposed a great degree of liturgical standardization, it is difficult to conceive of the situation of the late medieval period in which most regions of western Europe possessed their own diocesan liturgical customs,
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*3* Fernand Cabrol, *The Mass of the Western Rites* (St. Louis, B. Herder, 1934), 191.

sometimes differing greatly with the somewhat more abbreviated traditions of Rome. This is not to mention the different uses employed by monastic orders, whose missals and breviaries often differed from those of the secular clergy and cathedral canons. Though these liturgical practices shared much in common with Rome, most notably the use of the Roman Canon, it is important to recall that in the various regions of England the calendar, prayers, hymns, colors, and ceremonial differed widely, though an increasing degree of consistency can be observed over time. By the reign of Henry VIII, however, the Sarum Use, or the use of the cathedral of Salisbury, had become more or less standard in the province of Canterbury.

It is vital here to differentiate a liturgical use from a rite, as these can often be used interchangeably. In any study of medieval concepts, one must not impose anachronistic equivalency of terms born of contemporary practice. To this end, several distinctions are necessary. First, a liturgical use (usus) in the sense I take it here, that is, in the medieval sense, refers to the manner in which the worship of the Church is performed in a particular place by particular communities. The 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia (just one source among many which purports to differentiate between them) defines a liturgical use as denoting “the special liturgical customs which prevailed in a particular diocese or group of dioceses.” A liturgical use is thus more specific than a rite, usually formalized, and centered on the authority of diocese(s) and bishop(s). By contrast, a rite (ritus) is defined in the same source as “the whole complex of the services of any Church or group of Churches.” This
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5 The liturgical traditions of the eastern Churches, though vast and storied, have little bearing on our study. Rite, in the sense used in current Roman canon law, of a particular church sui juris, is also quite separate from our meaning. I mean here for the sake of this study only to speak liturgically and not canonically.


distinction of general and specific, however, can be notoriously unclear, as rite and use are often used interchangeably to refer the same thing, even by churchmen such as Joseph Ratzinger, who observed in 1998 “No one was ever scandalized [prior to the Second Vatican Council] that the Dominicans [among others], often present in our parishes, did not celebrate like diocesan priests but had their own rite. We did not have any doubt that their rite was as Catholic as the Roman rite, and we were proud of the richness inherent in these various traditions.” Ratzinger here is somewhat loose with these terms. The terms are thus to some extent fluid, which makes a reliable distinction difficult. One will often hear of the Dominican or Ambrosian rite, when these are more accurately spoken of as uses of the Roman rite.

Though the definitions can be somewhat blurred, especially when terms such as the Sarum Rite are employed (a phrase which I will seek to avoid), it is sufficient to posit that a use denotes a smaller degree of difference in comparison with other uses, while a rite denotes a much larger difference, such as that between the Roman and Byzantine liturgical rites. The usus Sarum may then be placed alongside the other medieval uses (including those others which Ratzinger mentioned in his 1998 address: the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, Bracarian, Carthusian, Carmelite, and Dominican), under the general heading of the Roman rite. Having said that, however, recalling Fortescue’s opinion that everything of importance in the Sarum Use is shared by the Roman rite, such that little of interest is unique to Sarum, I maintain that much of value is to be found in the Sarum Use of the Roman liturgy, particularly when viewed as a lived liturgical reality and not simply a text. In order then to clarify what this study means by the Sarum Use, the next two chapters will
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review its history and development and highlight what sets it apart from other western liturgies.

For the purposes of this study, the distinction between the Sarum Use and Duffy’s term ‘traditional English religion’ is somewhat blurred. Though popular devotion and religious practice, what Duffy terms traditional religion, is too broad a category for a study of this length, I include specifically liturgical (or para-liturgical) practices in this study because I have considered Sarum as an embodied liturgical reality. There was and is a tendency among liturgical scholars to conduct technical and often exclusively textual studies of medieval liturgies which virtually ignore their cultural contexts. In general historical studies, scholars (apart from Duffy) often make little use of liturgical texts, instead making broad, unsupported generalizations about the medieval liturgy and the role of the layperson in it. In the areas of Britain and Ireland where Sarum was dominant, there was no separation between Sarum and the Christian religion and practice simpliciter. Here, Sarum was the Mass, and the Mass was “the heart of medieval religion[.]”

The Sarum Use is not simply a book on which one can print the name Missale ad usum Sarum, but the living liturgical tradition which surrounded it: the seasonal practices and processions, liturgical customs, votive, gild, and requiem Masses, priestly blessings and ritual, and parish celebrations of feast days which made the medieval English liturgy much more than the contents of the missal, encompassing what Duffy terms “the key to the meaning and purpose of their lives.” For this reason I do not seek to separate Sarum from the popular religiosity and liturgical traditions which Duffy describes. In the liturgy, not only was the cleric obliged to say the proper prayers of the occasion, but “lay Christians
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*See particularly the recent study of Kevin Madigan, *Medieval Christianity*, (New Haven, CT: YUP, 2013), 87, 146.

**Duffy, Stripping*, 91.

found the paradigms and the stories which shaped their perception of the world and their place in it.” It was through the liturgy that medieval people marked their births, christenings, marriages, illnesses, journeys, repentances from sin, and made a ‘good death.’ The Sarum Use was an embodied reality in all these various aspects of life for the places where it was in use, and all this is integral to understanding it.

Modern Editions of the Sarum Books and Difficulties of Academic Study

The surviving textual evidence is a logical place to begin studying Sarum. As we have seen, among the scholars of the Oxford movement, interest in Sarum was high, starting with the publication of *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* and *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* in 1844 and 1846 by William Maskell (1814-1890).\(^{13}\) Francis Henry Dickinson, an Anglican country gentleman enthusiast, produced a bibliography of medieval printed service books and the first modern edition of the Sarum Missal since the reign of Queen Mary, the *Missale ad usum insignis et praeclarae ecclesiae Sarum*, published in fascicules between 1861 and 1883. Various scholars, Edmund Bishop, Henry Austin Wilson, W. H. Frere, J. Wickham Legg, and others contributed to other editions of Sarum liturgical books in the mid- and late-nineteenth century, many under the auspices of the Henry Bradshaw Society, formed in 1890 to edit and translate rare medieval English liturgical texts. The Society was associated with editions of the Sarum breviary, manual, and customary. Frere and Daniel Rock (later a coconvent to the Roman Church and mentioned above as a friend of Augustus Pugin) together wrote and edited
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\(^{12}\) Ibid.; cf. 323ff.

\(^{13}\) Richard W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England* (New York; Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 9-10; note that Maskell, and many of the other authors and editors, are contemporaries of Augustus Pugin.
The Church of Our Fathers. In 1877, John David Chambers produced another volume, a commentary on the Sarum liturgy and advice on how to incorporate elements of the ancient ceremony into the Anglican communion service, called *Divine Worship in England in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries Contrasted with and Adapted to that in the Nineteenth*. The book is fussily antiquarian, even employing the anachronistic long s throughout, an appropriate indication of the general tenor of the movement.

The Henry Bradshaw Society and other interested and antiquarian scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, those discussed above as the scholarly incarnation of the Anglican ritualist movement’s interest in the Sarum Use, produced scholarly editions of most of the Sarum liturgical books, arranged here in order of general importance:


F. H. Dickinson’s edition of the *Missale*, remains the edition of the Sarum missal most commonly referenced. It remains the clearest and easiest to follow for the scholar, and was used (in preference to Legg’s edition) in Eamon Duffy’s *The Stripping of the Altars*. This edition, however, is of the later printed missals of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, as well as the reign of Mary I (1553-1558), and not of older, pre-printing manuscript of the Sarum missal which might be helpful in tracing Sarum’s early
history. Dickinson’s *Missale*, as Pfaff writes, can only be reflective of the Sarum traditions found in the printed editions it uses, many of which differ in various respects. Dickinson’s edition is “notoriously complicated to get around in,” as well as being typically myopic for the time in its concern to show the origins of the Anglican prayer and communion service.\(^\text{14}\) Dickinson was a convicted Anglican who saw the Prayer Book as the logical and inevitable final stage of evolution for the Sarum liturgy, an interpretation which influenced his work.

In 1916, J. W. Legg produced a revised edition, *The Sarum Missal, edited from Three Early Manuscripts*, which improved on Dickinson’s. Legg’s manuscripts, which he called A, B, and C, were all three dated 1250-1300. All three of these manuscripts are, however, notably later than the putative origins of the Sarum Use in the years around 1200, and thus the tradition, as Pfaff observes, “has behind it other books and influences, themselves traceable only dimly.” Legg’s version, even accurate to the manuscripts as it is, is itself inferior to the Dickinson in that it is truncated and abbreviated so much as to be unusable for all but a strict study of the textual variations but not for any detailed study of medieval liturgical culture.

An earlier view of the Sarum Use might be found in the medieval gradual dating from close to the consecration of the altars of the new cathedral in 1225, now in the Bodleian Library, Add. 12194. This manuscript (which Pfaff calls G) was edited into a printed edition by W. H. Frere in fascicules between 1891 and 1894 as *Graduale Sarisburiense*. A date in the early years of the thirteenth century seems likely for G, for which Frere and Pfaff posited a *terminus ante quem* of 1220.\(^\text{15}\) But this provides only a small piece of the thirteenth-century liturgical puzzle. Most of the remaining modern

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 416-17.
\(^{15}\) Pfaff disagrees, however, with Frere’s *terminus post quem* of 1203, see his discussion; Ibid., 358.
editions of the Sarum books can be relied upon only as an indication of English liturgy only in the sixteenth century. Proctor and Wordsworth’s *The Sarum Breviary* of 1879-82 is an edited version of the “Great Breviary” printed in 1531 in Paris by Chevallon and Regnault. Still, however much may be learned from Frere’s gradual and the Proctor and Wordsworth breviary, it must be understood with reference to the manuscript from which it was made and the missal, now lost, with which it was meant to be used (and which naturally would furnish the most detailed information on the liturgy). Due to the lack of manuscript missals from the early period, the inquirer is left once again with a good deal more questions than answers.

The study of liturgical texts has a number of interpretive problems which Pfaff calls the “presumption of continuity,” illuminated in his excursus on method in *The Medieval English Liturgy.*\(^\text{16}\) An example of this problem is the Anglo-Catholic concern with the development of the Book of Common Prayer alluded to above. Most of the scholars who produced these editions viewed the Prayer Book as the natural and ‘purified’ evolution of the medieval liturgy, which Pfaff specifically rejects for its faulty teleological approach to liturgical texts. As a result, these Anglican scholars tended to miss differing texts and presume uniformity where none existed. In the first place, due to the large amount of printed and manuscript evidence from the later period (1450-1550), the danger for the historian lies in taking these somewhat more harmonized texts as indicative of a harmony in prior periods which was not actually present, thus producing a false ‘evolutionary’ pattern. These naturally give an impression of textual uniformity which is anachronistic not

\(^{\text{16}}\) Ibid., 147-49; 417-19.
only for periods before printed service books but also for service books contemporarily in use.

Secondly, the grouping of liturgical manuscripts into categories such as Sarum, Westminster, or St. Albans, as was done by many scholars of Sarum, imply more continuity of tradition than truly existed. There was a significant amount of blending in some geographical areas between regional uses. Similarities between traditions imply but do not definitively prove a connection, and the manuscripts are best studied on their own. The liturgical evidence used by modern scholars is often fragmentary and incomplete, and their work is to a large degree reliant on the surviving evidence. Richard Pfaff, author of The Medieval English Liturgy and the primary recent authority on the subject, commented “If a pictorial metaphor... may be offered, it is that of a tapestry rather than a mosaic.” Like a centuries-old tapestry, the evidence is often frayed, faded, damaged, or missing important pieces. Despite this, however, Pfaff observes that “considerable bodies of evidence” survive dating from the late tenth century and after to indicate the general outline of the medieval English liturgy. From these manuscripts, one may reconstruct something of the text and praxis of the Sarum Use, though this reconstruction is necessarily of a later period than the putative origins of Sarum.

This is hardly an exhaustive account of the scholarly difficulties inherent in speaking of a single, uniform Sarum Use in the late medieval period. How then can one speak meaningfully of a historical Sarum Use which is free of harmonizing, historiographic, and confessional teleology? One is left, Pfaff comments, “to look at some features drawn
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18 Pfaff, Liturgy, 1.
from a variety of late manuscript missals... and hope that they will aggregate into something like a coherent sense of... the Sarum Use."¹⁹ In The Stripping of the Altars, Eamon Duffy crucially proposed approaching late medieval religion on its own terms, to take medieval religion and its practitioners seriously as a system and community with its own internal logic.²⁰ I shall seek here to do the same; to approach the medieval liturgy neither as a set of texts in isolation from their historical and contextual practice, nor as an example which relies on a preconceived meta-narrative. This may result in considering practices which a strict scholar of the Sarum texts might object is not specifically tied to the Sarum Use of the service books, or is a practice or tradition shared by other uses, even outside of England. This is deliberate. Pfaff, in his useful and brilliant study of simply the liturgical texts, largely avoids such evidence as literature, sermons, and popular paraliturgical devotion.²¹ Pursuant to the aim of exploring the liturgy as a social and religious reality, I mean in this chapter to take a wider approach. 

In the next section, I will trace the history of the Sarum Use from the available textual and historical evidence, with a view toward presenting a Sarum Use which is inextricably connected with its historical context in the late medieval period.

Origins and Early Development of the Sarum Liturgy

The development of the Sarum Use was gradual and emerged from the Saxon liturgical tradition, coming to fruition as a separate use in the mid-thirteenth century at the cathedral in Wiltshire. The Sarum Use, however thoroughly English, grew out of the
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¹⁹ Ibid., 418-19.
²⁰ Duffy, Stripping, xviii.
²¹ Pfaff, Liturgy, 1-3.
Roman liturgical traditions brought by St. Augustine of Canterbury to the Kingdom of Kent in 597. These traditions, along with Christianity itself, gradually made their way to the settlement of Searobyrig in Wessex, a town in the old Anglo-Saxon diocese of Sherborne.

The early history of the city of Old Sarum was tumultuous. It was built as a fortress town in pre-Roman times and served as a fortification for successive Saxon chieftains after the withdrawal of the Romans in the early fifth century. The town was held by the line of Kenric the Saxon from his conquest of the area in 553, until the uniting of the Saxons under the line of Egbert from 829. Old Sarum had its walls restored by Leofric, Earl of Wiltunscire, at the order of King Alfred the Great in the ninth century. There is some indication of water shortage by various chroniclers of the period on the hill where the city was built (G. White gives ‘the dry city’ as the etymology of the Saxon place name), though modern archaeology has cast doubt on this point. The place was undoubtedly useful and important as a walled stronghold from very early times. The city was sacked by Svein, King of Denmark in 1003, though the church and religious infrastructure of the town appear to have been left undamaged or rebuilt soon after its destruction.

The Saxon city was located within the Diocese of Sherborne, which encompassed much of the west of the old Kingdom of Wessex. In 1075, however, as a part of a restructuring after the Norman Conquest, Old Sarum became the cathedral town of a new diocese. This change occurred under Herman, a Lotharingian, who occupied the see from 1075 to 1078. Under Herman, the diocese began construction of the cathedral at Old
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[22] Pfaff, Liturgy, 36-38.
[23] As in Pfaff, the name Old Sarum is used to refer exclusively to the old fortress city, virtually abandoned in the century or so following the move of the cathedral. New Sarum, Salisbury, or simply Sarum, when used in a geographical sense, refers to the new city founded around the cathedral in the valley after c. 1225.
Sarum, which was completed and consecrated in 1092. It is to Herman and his successor Osmund (later St. Osmund of Salisbury) that the foundation of Salisbury can be traced.

As to the worship and ritual of the cathedral in the early period, there are almost no surviving details before the well-known early-thirteenth century work of Richard Poore, bishop from 1217 to 1228. A general outline is, however, simple to infer. The invariable parts of the liturgy were consistent throughout England and indeed throughout the Latin west, with the central part of the Mass, the canon, being almost identical though all of western Europe. What seems clear enough also is that many of the variable texts of the English books stem primarily from the Gregorian Sacramentary, with some influences from the Gelasian and ‘Young’ Gelasian, an unsurprising conclusion given the Gregorian origins of the English mission.

It is nearly impossible to describe the ceremonial of this liturgy, as the sacramentaries contain no rubrical direction for the Mass, much less any details of the celebration of feasts. Pfaff, however, recognizes several distinct influences present in the early worship of the cathedral. First, there is some indication of a possible monastic influence derived from the cathedral chapter at Sherborne, held by the Benedictines from 993. Herman himself had lived under the monastic rule at St. Bertin from 1055 to 1058. On the other hand, no monks appear to have accompanied Herman in his move to Old Sarum in 1075. The early period is not entirely devoid of manuscript evidence, however. Pfaff observes that “The Roman-German Pontifical, now fragmentarily preserved as BL Cott. Tib. C.i, may reflect conditions at both Sherborne and Sarum, and may well have
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*Bishop Poore is widely regarded as the traditional progenitor of the Sarum Use. See his description in Philip Baxter, *Sarum Use: the Ancient Customs of Salisbury* (Reading: Spire Books, 2008), 33; 34; 42f.

been brought with him by Herman[.]

Reflecting his continental formation, the pontifical is written in two German hands, but includes extensive additions by English scribes. This is very early indication of both the international and local origins of the liturgy in use at Sarum in the late eleventh century.

A second influence is derived from the practice of the secular chapter clergy, who it appears were present from the very foundation of the cathedral. The prebendal system, by which cathedral choir clergy were endowed with various livings in order to support the cathedral foundation, was in use from the move of the diocese to Old Sarum. The prebendaries appear also to have been modelled on the existing secular canons in England. Herman and his successor Osmund established a full body of secular canons at Old Sarum within a few decades comparable to similar foundations in England and on the continent. This tradition of seems also to be in play in the origins of the Sarum Use.

Pfaff also sees a similarity to the foundation of Old Sarum cathedral in 1075 to the move of the see of Crediton in Devon to Exeter under Bishop Leofric in 1050. Leofric’s elaborate liturgical program and the evidence for worship at the cathedral of Exeter in the mid-eleventh century is treated extensively in Pfaff. In the Leofric missal (Bodl. MS Bodley 579), the new bishop of Exeter made numerous additions, many in his own hand, to a Mass book which had been compiled throughout the previous century. These additions did much to turn the book from a simply sacramentary to a functional and practical missal in the full sense, including lectionary- and proper-incipits which improved ease of use. Beyond this glimmer of indication into the early components of the ‘use’ of
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28 Ibid., 351.
29 Ibid., 72ff.
30 Ibid., 353; for the distinctions between sacramentaries, missals, and other liturgical books, as well as their general development in the West; see also Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources* (Washington: The Pastoral Press, 1980), 6ff.
the cathedral at Old Sarum, the scholar may know nothing. The procurement of Mass and office books for the cathedral, where they came from, and how they developed, will likely never be known with certainty.

As for the claims for the influence of Celtic traditions on the early use of Old Sarum cathedral, there is very little evidence for this.31 Traditions derived from the old Celtic rite had slowly been replaced after the ruling in favor of Roman traditions at the Synod of Whitby in 664. Though the influence of some Celtic traditions certainly are possible in the development of the Sarum liturgy at this stage in the eleventh century, especially given the eclectic and murky nature of its sources, Pfaff’s account is largely of the gradual prevalence of Roman practices by the ninth century.32 If Celtic traditions were present in the ritual of Old Sarum and thus later at Salisbury, it is impossible to show with any degree of certainty.

Under the rule of Osmund, the diocese increased in prestige and importance. A man of high station, Osmund may have been chancellor under William I in the years following 1070. As Herman’s successor in 1089, Osmund established thirty-six canons for the cathedral, a number which by Pfaff’s reckoning would have made for quite a tight choir space judging by the dimensions of the cathedral, the foundations of which are still extant.33 The completed building was consecrated by Osmund on 5 April 1092.

It was amidst these developments that Osmund in 1091 wrote a basic constitution for the discipline of the cathedral called that Carta Osmundi, from which one can glean that a foundation of canons was firmly established at Old Sarum, living a life in common
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31 E.g., Baxter, 16. This claim is perhaps tied to the attachment of Anglican historians to supposedly purely ‘native’ traditions and reluctance to acknowledge Roman customs where they are present.
32 Pfaff, Liturgy, 46-55.
33 The source for this appears to be the Holyrood Chronicle, cited in Pfaff, Liturgy, 354.
and receiving grants from the principal and other altars. Though one can be sure that there were episcopal and other liturgies at the cathedral during Osmund’s time, no other source contemporary to his life speaks to his liturgical arrangement.\textsuperscript{34} Popular testament to his saintly life and virtues, reported in the chronicler William of Malmesbury, led to popular devotion at his tomb after his death in 1099, and to his eventual canonization by Pope Callixtus III in 1456.\textsuperscript{35}

Osmund was followed in Salisbury by Bishop Roger, who held the see from 1107 to 1139. Royal Chancellor and one of the most powerful and influential churchmen in England under Henry I, Roger famously fell out with Henry’s heir, King Stephen, whose side he had initially taken in the civil strife with Empress Matilda. Roger was consequently removed from power and stripped of his vast properties, but died in 1139 before the resolution of the Anarchy. Under the direction of Osmund’s potent successor, the cathedral choir was more than doubled in size and a hallway was created around the eastern end of the church. Large choir celebrations became possible in the sanctuary. The endowment of the cathedral was expanded, and under Roger’s leadership the cathedral grew to one of the foremost sees in England.

Some more specifically liturgical information can be gleaned from the reign of Roger’s successor Jocelin (1142-84), who may have had a hand in liturgical revision at Old Sarum. An acta of Jocelin is extant directing revenues to a canon, Philip de sancto Edwardo, for the correction of books. An inventory of service books at the prebendal

\textit{Edwardo}, for the correction of books. An inventory of service books at the prebendal

\textsuperscript{34} The document attributed to Osmund from the mid-twelfth century known as the \textit{Institutio} speaks of the \textit{dignitates et consuetudines} of Old Sarum, and gives some amount of detail as to the cathedral foundation. This document, however, Pfaff believe to be a product of the twelfth century by the research of Diana Greenway, compiled by the pivotal dean and later bishop Richard Poore; cf. Pfaff, \textit{Liturgy}, 355; see also Diana Greenway, “The false \textit{Institutio},” and “1091, St Osmund and the Constitution of the Cathedral,” in \textit{Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral}, ed. L. Keen and T. Cocke, BAA Conf. Trans. 17, 1994 (1996), 1-9.

\textsuperscript{35} See White, \textit{Salisbury}, 101. It is perhaps for this reason of his canonization, and his association with the early liturgy of the diocese, that led to the naming of the Oxford Sarum Use society in 1996, “The Society of St. Osmund.”
church of Sonning in Berkshire from 1220 reports “Unum Missale novum absque epistolis, sine musica et sine gradali, et aliud vetus missale in quo leguntur epistolae, plenum, sine musica.” Both of these missals were in need of binding (ligandum) after years of use, and were noted as “de dono Jordani decani,” referencing Jordan, Dean of Salisbury from c. 1176 to c. 1193. Dean Jordan, then, had donated a “new” missal as well as an old one which were still in use by 1220. Was this missal new in the sense that it was revised from an older version, or just a new copy of an old text? Exactly how early is the development of a unique Sarum ‘use’? Pfaff’s tentative conclusion is provocative: in light of surviving manuscripts and his own painstakingly detailed study of the traditional Sarum sanctorale, it is possible to hold that surviving Sarum traditions and rubrics may predate the general revision of the books in the early thirteenth century under Richard Poore. Furthermore, Pfaff claims, it is “simple, and indeed obvious” that a self-consciously Sarum liturgical use existed well before the move to New Sarum and the new cathedral c. 1225. The Sarum Use therefore contains elements which may be traced to the twelfth-century use at the cathedral. In the following centuries, these patterns would begin to spread across much of England.

The Revisions of Richard Poore and Toward an English Use

After the relatively uneventful episcopacy of Herbert Poore (or de la Poer, r. 1194-1217), in which England had been placed under papal interdict by Innocent III from 1208 to 1213, Herbert was succeeded after his death by his brother, Richard Poore. Both
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Pfaff, Liturgy, 356.
Ibid., 366-69; cf. White, Salisbury, 103-04.
brothers were likely the sons of Richard of Ilchester, curial bishop of Winchester. Richard was previously dean of Old Sarum from 1197 to 1214. Two major developments in Sarum’s history occurred in the reign of Richard: the move of the cathedral establishment to the site of New Sarum in 1225 and the writing of the Sarum Consuetudinary around 1210.

Both the Kingdom of England and Old Sarum Cathedral were beset by problems in the early years of the thirteenth century. The short-sighted actions of King John in antagonizing Pope Innocent III had placed the country under interdict and the cathedral foundation was in need of major changes. The dubious memory of Bishop Roger having caused much ill-feeling toward the cathedral establishment in the town, and possibly environmental hazards associated with the hill-fort, led to the decision of the cathedral clergy in the last years of the twelfth century to move to the valley below. Due to the trouble associated with the interdict, however, the cathedral was only able to obtain the necessary papal bulls in 1219. The land was duly consecrated and the foundations for the cathedral, built in the early English gothic style, were laid on 28 April 1220. A temporary wooden chapel permitted worship on the grounds of the new cathedral until 1225, when the three altars at the eastern end of the building were consecrated. The cathedral, including the impressive 404-foot spire, was largely finished in the next three decades, though final completion of the cathedral dragged on well into the fourteenth century.38

Around the time of these events, there is also evidence for a great deal of liturgical codification and revision spurred by the interest of Poore both as dean and as bishop from 1217, remarkable considering the uncertain situation of the cathedral and the English

38 See White, Salisbury, 16ff.
church during these years. Several surviving documents can be traced tentatively to Poore’s authorship. First as dean, Poore completed the cathedral Institutio, begun several years before as a regulation of the corporate life of the canons. He added language concerning residence, attendance at choir services, and clerical discipline. Poore also undertook a new collection of the cathedral statutes in 1214 in the Nova Constitutio. Around the year 1210, he was undertaking what D. Greenway calls “his great summary of Salisbury procedural custom, the Consuetudinarium... a commentary on and an expansion of the duties of the cathedral staff... [which] was complimentary to the Ordinale (the “Old Ordinal”), probably also the work of Poore... Together, Consuetudinarium and Ordinale made up a general guide to the ‘Use of Sarum.’” Finally, Poore is also known to have authored several diocesan synodal statutes from 1217 to 1219 which in essentials follow the provisions of the Fourth Lateran Council which had closed several years prior. The liturgical provisions of these enjoin that all priests be instructed in the text of the Mass according to the revised (correctum) consuetudinary of Salisbury, that they say the words of the Canon of the Mass rotunde et distincte; and that all parishes have proper appointments for the liturgy and inventory their missals and all books.

The modern printings of the Sarum Consuetudinary and Ordinal, found in W. H. Frere’s The Use of Sarum: the Original texts ed. from the MSS, (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1898-1901), have much the same difficulties as previously mentioned with the nineteenth-century printed editions of the Sarum Missal and Breviary. Frere’s edition is organized
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* Poore left the cathedral in 1214 to be consecrated bishop and assume the see of Chichester. His time here was short, however, as he was recalled to Old Sarum to succeed his brother as bishop in 1217. I assume here the compilation date arrived at by W. H. Frere and accepted by Pfaff of 1210 for the Consuetudinary; see Pfaff, *Liturgi*, 366-67.
* Pfaff, *Liturgi*, 369; Pfaff’s reference is to clauses 57, 63, and 67 of the synodal statutes.
into two volumes, the first including the thirteenth-century Consuetudinary and what he termed the ‘customary’ (really one and the same document at two different stage), and the second including the Old Ordinal and Tonal (a musical document appended to the Sarum Ordinale). His choice to organize this material side by side in parallel columns might perhaps have been useful to his aim of discerning the history of the Book of Common Prayer, but the complicated setup renders other investigation difficult and cumbersome. The volumes are, however, evidence of the complexity of the liturgy of Salisbury, and give some indication of why this set of customs became dominant in England.

There is some evidence that these liturgical and official provisions began to spread from the cathedral to the surrounding parishes quite soon after Richard’s accession as bishop in 1217. Pfaff cites a number of inventories which were made upon the visitation of the prebends to their parishes in 1220. William de Waude, dean of the cathedral, visited the parishes of Sonning in Berkshire and Mere in Wiltshire, and made note of their liturgical books. A number of books in the parish churches as well as their dependent chapels – missals, graduals, and tropers (the latter two being books containing the variable chants of the liturgy) – are called either novus or vetus and their condition described. They run the gamut from books which are sufficiens, nova et pulchra, to those which are tota ruinosa, or vetus sine notula, almost useless for the celebration of any ecclesiastical ceremony.44 The same William de Waude may also have been the vicar of the large parish of Heytesbury in Wiltshire, in which the dean found two missals, an ordinal, and “duo breviaria nova” and “duo breviaria vetera.”

44 Ibid., 370-71.
Even before the move to the new cathedral, then, the traditions of the cathedral were spreading at least in literary form via the prebends themselves to the surrounding parishes and chapels. I must stipulate, however, as Pfaff does, that “it is next to impossible to imagine what relevance its [the consuetudinarium] detailed prescriptions about the rights, duties, and ceremonial locations of the various dignitaries could have had to worship in... the small parish church[.]”45 The use of the cathedral, however, was at least known in these areas if not entirely practicable for smaller churches. They likely adapted the ceremonies themselves.

The *Ordinale* of Poore, a more practical liturgical and calendrical guide, came into use much more easily. The distinction made in the inventories between “old” and “new” is instructive. Why, for instance, Pfaff observes, would Jordan, the dean of Old Sarum in in late twelfth century, give to the prebendal church at Sonning a new missal *sine* epistles, music, or gradual, when the book it presumably was meant to replace was much more complete? The only change to the *sanctorale* is Thomas Becket, a new and popular addition at the time, but this feast could have simply been inserted, as was commonly done, in the older manuscript. What Pfaff calls the likeliest supposition is that the book included the new and presumably better liturgical rubrics of the cathedral, which had been adapted for use by a smaller parish church. Here, then, is possible evidence of Poore’s liturgical reform of the cathedral liturgy spreading into the parish churches, just at the same time a new and splendid cathedral was being built, abundant evidence of Salisbury’s rapid rise in status. The possible conclusion of all these things is the contemporary self-consciousness of a Sarum *usus*. Indeed, the contemporary manuscripts indicate as much in their reference
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45 Ibid., 373.
to the *mos* (custom) or *usus* of Sarum, the first indications of this growing awareness of Sarum as a specific tradition.

Nor did the new Sarum Use stay long an exclusively Salisburian use. In 1223, Gervase, bishop of St. David’s in Wales, ordered that services for the Virgin and for the dead were to be “secundum Ordinale Ecclesiae Sarum.” A short note in the 1240 statutes of Walter de Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester, gives a listing of the double feasts of the calendar of Sarum and a commentary on their rubrics. The list is not prescriptive, however, as it is followed by a listing of feasts in the diocese itself. The rubrics began to adapt Sarum to local conditions. Largely reflective of the liturgy in the later thirteenth century, the Frere edition of the Sarum *Ordinale* gives the rubric governing the Sarum Feast of Relics on 15 September, which provides that “Ubi festum reliquarum hac die non celebrator,” the Mass and prayer for the day would be that of the Octave of the Virgin’s Nativity. In areas outside of the diocese, there would be no need to celebrate the Sarum Feast of Relics, and the question would thus naturally arise if it was permissible to observe the octave feast which fell on that day. In the coming century the use continued to spread, and the issue would recur.

By the time of Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury from 1315 to 1330, the decision was taken to transfer the Sarum Feast of Relics to the Sunday following the Translation of Becket on 7 July, among other changes related to the celebration of the calendar. Martival’s decree of 1319 on the change, “Mandatum ad publicanum statutum pro festo reliquarum,” refers to the *usus ecclesie nostre* as distinct from others, and he decrees that the change be relayed to all the parishes of the diocese. The Feast of Relics being kept on this date
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*Ibid., 377.*
became a notable part of the Sarum calendar, and is used by Pfaff to track the spread of Richard Poore’s reformed Sarum Use as it becomes evident in other calendars throughout England in subsequent centuries.

Usus Sarisburiensis to Usus Angliae

From the turn of the fourteenth century until the abolition of the Mass under Edward VI in years following 1549, Sarum was the dominant custom used in England, Wales, as well as parts of Scotland and Ireland. The reasons for this are complex, but seem to have as much to do with lapses in liturgical standards in other dioceses as it does with the high standard required by the Sarum Use. The nearby Diocese of Exeter, though they enjoyed a period of liturgical distinction under the prolific bishop John de Grandisson in the 1330s (who himself produced an Ordinale in 1337), seems to have dropped off in liturgical activity after his death, with the cathedral ultimately adopting the Sarum Ordinale during the reign of his successor. Despite the retention of several distinctive saints’ days in the calendar of the Use of St. Paul’s (London), by 1414 Richard Clifford, bishop of London, had decreed that the “Antiquum Usum Sancti Pauli vulgariter nuncupatum” was to be abolished and replaced by the customs of the church of Sarum, save for several distinctive London saints whose feasts were to be retained. So complete was this replacement that scholars have despaired that the pre-1414 customs of St. Paul’s are now irretrievably lost, and by the sixteenth century it was unlikely that the clergy of London even remembered their customs had once not been Sarum.
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47 Ibid., 410-11.
48 Though Pfaff here makes a valiant effort to trace what little can be known of the Use of St. Paul’s. There is some evidence which indicates a ‘Londonization’ of the Sarum Use after 1414, particularly in the sanctorale; Ibid., 481ff.
The spread of the Sarum Use was helped considerably by the appearance of the ‘New Ordinal’ sometime in the second half of the fourteenth century. Its origin as well as its means of propagation is obscure, whether through the cathedral foundation itself or somewhere outside, though it is itself painstaking in its rubrical detail and concern with every aspect of the liturgy. In addition to its unknown provenance, the ‘New Ordinal’ is additionally very difficult to grasp as Frere’s *Use of Sarum* includes only the first part of it, those rubrics appropriate to the First Sunday of Advent. This section still contains much in the way of useful material, but the age of Frere’s edited volume and its cumbersome, incomplete format make an understanding of the document difficult. As Pfaff observes with some exasperation, comparison between many aspects of the ordinals are only possible by comparing Frere’s edition to the medieval manuscripts.

In truth Frere’s edition reflects the characteristic difficulty of working with medieval manuscripts with the intention to find the oldest or ‘original’ version. Frere himself observed that many alterations had been made to the Old Ordinal of the thirteenth century such that it included much material which postdated the reforms of Richard Poore. Frere’s edition even includes a section called *Addiciones*, which contains numerous revisions to the *Ordinale*. The disharmony between Frere’s version, Pfaff comments, and other manuscripts of these liturgical additions, indicate the fluid nature of the Sarum rubrics. It seems they were constantly revised and improved, as might be expected with such a widely used set of customs. The confusion which must have resulted from these multiple versions must, according to Pfaff, have resulted in the writing of the ‘New Ordinal’ in the latter part of the fourteenth century.

---

*Ibid., 412-416.*
Much of the scholarship since Frere on these documents has centered on the dating and unity of both the Old and New Ordinals. This discussion has little bearing on my purpose, though it must be stressed, however, that the ‘New Ordinal,’ such as it was at this time, probably varied greatly in its content and breadth. The manuscripts of the document are of varying length and seem to indicate that the idea of a single ‘New Ordinal’ is misleading. Once again it is vital not to project a backformation of uniformity of practice or rubric into a period in which it simply did not exist. One must bear in mind that the Dickinson Missale, the Proctor and Wordsworth Breviary, and the Frere Ordinale and Consuetudinarium are edited versions of multiple printed editions or medieval manuscripts, and reflect the time of their various sources as well as the bias of the late nineteenth-century. Indeed, because of this “convoluted mass of material,” and the multiple hands through which it has passed to come to the eyes of the modern scholar, “it is difficult to get a coherent idea” of exactly how Sarum looked in the high medieval period.9 Having made this caveat, however, it would also be imprudent to deny the existence of any coherent Sarum Use, simply because the contemporary writers assume its existence and its coherence as a set of traditions.

One more historical note deserves attention before I move to discussion of the content of the Sarum liturgy itself. As the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries proceeded, the spread of Sarum to more areas made the confusion over rubrics more and more serious. This confusion was somewhat alleviated in the first half of the fifteenth century when a Bridgettine monk called Clement Maydeston (or Maidstone) compiled a directorium, a volume which in England was known as the Pica or Pie to help with the resolution of

---

9 Ibid., 427.
concurring Sarum feast days. Maidstone also completed a revision of the *Ordinale* which resolved its anomalies and corrected various errors. Before his death in 1456, Maidstone expanded this work into a *Defensorium directorii*, and contributed to a commentary on Sarum’s rubrics. Maidstone shows much passion for Sarum, and his work is clear evidence of the particular Englishness of the Sarum Use, which dominated the liturgical concerns even of non-secular clergy like the Bridgettines, an order formed under the patronage of Henry V, and whose history and composition was almost exclusively English.

The *Pie* was widely regarded as the unofficial standard for a century after it was published. Its provisions were roundly disliked by reformers such as Thomas Cranmer, who deplored “the nombre and hardnes of the rules called the pie, and the manifolde chaunginges of the service,” which he sought to remedy by the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549.

By 1543 however, late in the reign of Henry VIII and nearly a decade after the break with Rome, Sarum still held sway in most of England and Wales, save those places which held to the uses of York, Lincoln, Hereford, and Bangor. In that year, the Convocation of Clergy in Canterbury made the Sarum Use compulsory in the Southern Province, such that, excepting the areas which held to the York Use, Sarum was now the official as well as the unofficial standard for all the lands subject to the English crown. The liturgical customs which had originated in Salisbury from Roman tradition as the *Usus Salisburensis* was now in large measure, through the efforts of several centuries of English churchmen, the *Usus Angliae.*

---

51 All three of these documents were edited and printed by Wordsworth in 1894; see Ibid., 428.
52 Ibid., 538-39.
53 The evidence for the Lincoln Use is somewhat mixed, though there is some indication of its uniqueness which justified its mention by Cranmer in the Preface of 1549; see Ibid., 510ff.
54 Ibid., 8.
The correspondence of this development with the Henrician effort at royal centralization is unmistakable. I shall return to these developments, which Pfaff calls “the end of the story” (it is perhaps his but certainly not ours), in chapter four. In the following chapter, I again take up the issue of the uniqueness of the Sarum Use and its concrete practice in the late medieval English parish.
CHAPTER III
THE SARUM USE IN PRACTICE, 1350-1530

As Sarum spread throughout Britain, it developed to suit cathedral, minster, and parish church. Though most parishes would have owned a Sarum *Ordinale*, these rubrics were always adapted to the space available, the number of clerics, and the resources of the local community. As such, there was less uniformity of custom than is the case in modern liturgical practice. Nevertheless, by the sixteenth century – especially after the invention of printing – a relatively uniform Sarum Use had come into existence. The invention of block printing also greatly eased the obtaining of service books. The first printed Sarum missal was made in 1486 at Basel in Switzerland by a certain Michael Wenssler, though numerous Sarum office books were printed in the years before.\(^1\) The English market never seems to have developed an English supply prior to the break with Rome. Most editions of the missal, up to the last ordered in the reign of Mary I, were printed on the continent by foreign printers. The foreign printers did, however, do the English missal the courtesy of a woodcut scene of St. George and the dragon at the beginning or end of the volume.\(^2\)

As I alluded earlier, many studies of the medieval liturgy either focus entirely on the liturgical text or instead make little use of the text at all and rely on other secondary historical sources which may provide a skewed view of the way in which the liturgy was

\(^1\) Pfaff, 546-47.
\(^2\) Ibid., 549.
experienced by the layperson. I have determined to employ an approach more informed by social history and liturgical theology. Taking Duffy as an example, I mean this section to contribute to the scholarly literature through the introduction of these lenses of interpretation. My project means, however, to go further still than *The Stripping of the Altars* in studying Sarum specifically. While Duffy goes some way in illuminating and describing the medieval liturgy, he does not undertake this study of Sarum but of the ‘traditional religion.’ Further, his treatment of the liturgy is of several specific, though noteworthy, occasions during the liturgical year, and is only occasionally related to the actual text of the rites. What I offer here is a more comprehensive, more thoroughly *liturgical* and social look at the Sarum Use *qua* Sarum, making use of resources which have previously not been put together in the same study, save in a more narrow way in *Stripping*. Recalling once again the assertion of Adrian Fortescue that Sarum is not noticeably distinguishable from the Roman rite in general and is thus unimportant, my aim here is to offer an explanation both of how Sarum differs from the Roman liturgy and why this difference matters for a study such as this of the enculturated medieval liturgy.

In addition to contributing to the scholarly research on the subject, I mean also to direct my conclusions toward the reappraisal of the Sarum Use in the Church – that is, toward any reevaluation of Sarum which may occur in the future by the CDW. As I previously emphasized, the introduction of historical evidence and the recognition of the important place of Sarum in English Catholic cultural memory must be a factor in any such discussions of Sarum’s future. The CDW, very possibly unaware of the layers of historical context and meaning surrounding Sarum, may be able through studies like this one to consider the question more broadly, in a broader manner which the Congregation may not previously have been aware. As I have continually emphasized, Sarum is bound up in the
cultural memory of England and English Catholics, and a recognition of this peculiar history is necessary in any consideration of its revival.

Using the available historical material, then, a general description of a normal Sunday Mass in the Sarum Use is possible. I shall attempt to describe the Mass as it would have been found in a typical parish church with a fair number of clerics (at least three or four) available. For smaller or rural parishes with fewer clerics, the ritual would have been adapted not for a full complement of clerics with a choir, but for priest and parish clerk only, and perhaps a smaller choir. Surviving liturgical material, however, as Pfaff carefully emphasizes, must be taken as *prescribed* and not necessarily a universal description of what actually occurred.

The following is, however, that which can be known from the available sources, and a fairly reliable description of the liturgy which might have occurred in the parish church, attended by people from all walks of life, from mystics like Margery Kempe and clerics such as John Mirk to the humbler members of medieval English society like Roger Martin, a diverse cross-section of English Christianity in the late medieval period.

The Sarum Mass: Sundays and Weekdays

In this section, I attempt to combine and harmonize the descriptions of the typical parish Mass in the Sarum Use which Eamon Duffy provides in *The Stripping of the Altars* with a closer study of the rubrics of the Mass found in *Missale ad Usum Insignis et Praeclare Ecclesiae Sarum*, which furnishes the clearest description of the rubrics of the Mass. Like Duffy’s, our description

---

3 Not inconceivable in parishes who retained a number of chaplains and chantry priests; see Duffy, *Stripping*, 139-40.

4 Duffy’s description of the Sunday parish Mass in the late medieval period is found in *The Stripping of the Altars*, 117-130. For the rubrics and text of the Sarum Mass, I rely for the most part on Dickinson’s *Missale ad Usum Insignis et Praeclare Ecclesiae Sarum*, which furnishes the clearest description of the rubrics of the Mass. Legg’s edition is an earlier manuscript study, but fails to include many rubrics in the interest of abbreviating its length. Our study must thus accept the shortcomings of Dickinson’s edition (which I already discussed above), namely that it is compilation of sources from the later part of our period (1450-1550). Like Duffy’s, our description
to adapt Duffy’s account of the late medieval Mass into one specifically of the late medieval Sarum Mass as it would have been experienced by an Englishman or woman around 1500. I hope to produce an illustration not only of the differences of the Sarum liturgy from that of Rome, but also to give the reader something of a flavor for the spirituality and piety of late medieval England which animated the parishioners’ experience of the Sarum Mass, from which Sarum itself cannot be extricated and remain historically meaningful. The liturgy of the Mass was of course intertwined with this devotional experience of the medieval layperson, and thus the lay aspect which Duffy amply provides is as essential as the text of the Mass itself to any study of Sarum.5

A number of devotional texts survive from late medieval England which give some indication of the nature of lay devotion during the Mass. The Lay Folks Mass Book, a fourteenth-century devotional text in verse for assisting devout laypeople in their meditations, is but one example of this genre.6 In speaking of the medieval lay experience of the Mass, Duffy mentions several others – e.g., William Caxton’s “History and Exposition of the Mass,” appended to his translation of Voragine’s Legenda Aurea, and John Mirk’s Instructions for Parish Priests. By 1530, these devotional texts were in wide

5 Throughout this section I shall be comparing the Sarum Mass to the practice of the Roman Church before the liturgical changes of the Second Vatican Council, namely to the missal commonly known as the Missale Romanum 1962. The text of the MR1962 I use here is the The Daily Missal and Liturgical Manual from the Editio Typica of the Roman Missal and Breviary, 1962, 5th ed., (London: Baronius Press, 2011). The reasons for the use of the preconciliar missal are twofold: first, it is immensely difficult, given the number of changes in vocabulary and structure which have occurred in the Mass between the medieval period and the revised order of Mass promulgated by Paul VI in the MR1970 and most recently by Benedict XVI in the MR2008, to compare the medieval Mass to the one which is the ordinary form of the Roman Mass for the Latin Church today. Secondly, the MR1962, recently authorized for use in the Latin Church as the extraordinary form of the Roman rite (forma extraordinaria) by Benedict XVI in the 2007 motu proprio Summorum Pontificum, bears a much closer resemblance both in form and technical vocabulary to the Sarum liturgy. It would likely be needlessly convoluted, for instance, to compare the prayers in the sacristy of the Sarum Mass to the opening dialogue of the Mass of Paul VI, with which it shares very little in structure. For this reason then, of clarity of understanding, our comparisons will be made to the “unreformed” form of the Mass rather than the one which currently prevails in most areas of the western Church.

6 Dan Jereny, The Lay Folks Mass Book, ed. Thomas Frederick Simmons and John Lydgate (London: EETS, 1879). Simmons postulated in 1879 that the LFMB was written by Dan Jereny, a Norman canon of York Cathedral in the mid- to late-twelfth century, who had primarily had in mind the Use of Rouen (xxxv-xl), though later translators appear to adapted the rubrical direction for English use (lxvi-lxxv). The original was perhaps in Norman French but was in the fourteenth century “drawn into English” in an east Midlands dialect by an anonymous translator (iv; cf. Duffy, 118); see also Duffy, Stripping, 118-19 and John Mirk, Instructions for Parish Priests, ed. E. Peacock and F. J. Furnivall (London: EETS, 1868).
circulation among literate laity, with others also making daily use of primers or commonplace prayer books — breviary offices of the Virgin or simply compilations of various prayers found useful at Mass. These texts have in mind not the Sunday Mass, the ceremonies of which are typically not included in their devotional texts, but the daily Masses, which comprised perhaps the majority of Masses which were frequented by devout laypeople of the period.

*Ad Missam:* “oure ilk day bred graunt vs to day”

The English were required by longstanding ecclesiastical law to attend matins, Mass, and evensong on all Sundays and *festa ferianda*, or the great feasts of the liturgical year. Many chose to attend weekday Masses much more often, and had active devotional lives which frequently brought them to the church. By 1500, a fair number of *nova festa*, such as Corpus Christi, Holy Name, and the Transfiguration had been added, expanding the obligation to attend services but also increasing the vacation from agricultural and other work associated with feasts. So inseparable in fact was the liturgical calendar from the secular reckoning of time that the church year was intimately intertwined with the secular year, such that there was little distinction between them. Feast days became associated with secular occasions like the opening of civil law courts and schools or with the harvesting of crops. On Sundays and holidays (here quite literally holy-days), people were given freedom from servile work so as to attend services and to celebrate the occasion. Taking into account all the Sundays and holy days, the medieval layperson was given a considerable

---

1 Duffy, *Stripping*, 42-52; 156; Daniel Rock quotes an observation of Thomas More on the English custom of hearing matins at the parish church before breakfast: “Some of us lay men thinke it a payne ones in a weeke to ryse so soone fro sleepe, and some to tarye so longe fasting, as on the Sonday to com and heare out theyr matins. And yet is not the matins in every parish, nyther, all thyng so early becomme, nor fullye so longe in doing, as it is in the Charterhouse, ye wot wek” cf. Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, vol. 4, 164-66.
portion of the year off from his farm work or trade. Different holy days were accorded different degrees of respect in this regard, with the result that much litigation was often precipitated by disagreement between workmen and landowners as to the sort of work allowed on one holy day or another. Other church rules dealt with what could be considered work and with the regime of penitential fasting which was imposed for the preceding vigil eve of the feast. This legislation often differed between jurisdictions, even showing a considerable degree of leniency when authorities deemed it appropriate.

Parish churches housed the liturgical celebrations, just as the parish ale-houses sometimes housed the secular celebrations of the great holy days. Inside the English church, the parish rood screens, which Duffy refers to as “the most important focuses of ritual activity in the building,” were in many ways their religious axis. The screens, surmounted by their rood, or large image of the crucifixion, separated the nave, where the people stood or knelt during the Mass, from the chancel, behind which the priest performed the ritual action of the Mass. High altars were often richly decorated, especially those at large churches or cathedrals, demonstrating the level of splendor which laity in late medieval England could lavish on their parishes. Records of the screen of Winchester Cathedral describe the richness of its decoration: “The nethar parte of the hygh aueter beynge of plate of gold garnysylyd with stonys, the front beynge of broderynge worke and pearle; and above yt a table of Imagis of sylver and gilt garnyshid with stones.”

The Mass was a daily occurrence for the parish, and many churches said more than one Mass, including votive and requiem Masses requested by the people. The Manual

---

8 For the ale-house of the parish of Morebath, see Duffy, Morebath, 6-7.
9 Duffy, Stripping, 113.
often included several votive Masses, such as the Mass of the Dead, the Holy Cross, the Blessed Virgin, and of the Holy Ghost, making these texts easily portable and able to be celebrated by any priest on any altar on which he had permission to do so.\textsuperscript{11} These weekday Masses took place not at the high altar but the numerous smaller altars in the nave, and thus were intimately close to the parishioners. One of the most notable features of late medieval piety was the founding of chantries, small chapels cordoned off by screens in larger parish churches and cathedrals which were built by wealthy laypeople for the saying of Mass for their souls after death.\textsuperscript{12} Chantries were endowed with money or the income from land left by the testator. The chantries provided daily Masses for the people, many offering not just a requiem but popular votive Masses like that of the Five Wounds. The chantry also funded the clergy necessary to say them, ensuring that many Masses would be said in parish churches each day which might otherwise have had only one. The chantry priest was also an invaluable liturgical asset, perhaps serving as deacon or subdeacon, by chanting \textit{in choro}, as a confessor, or in some other capacity. Larger parishes could thus rely on a significant number of clergy as a matter of course.\textsuperscript{13}

The wealthy often made great investment in the safeguarding of their souls from Purgatory. Many chantries were built and endowed in English parishes from the fourteenth century to the sixteenth, and said Mass regularly for the souls of the deceased. Most extravagantly, many provided in their wills for the course of requiem Masses known as ‘St. Gregory’s Trental.’\textsuperscript{14} The Trental was a course of thirty Masses which were said over a year

\textsuperscript{11} See \textit{Manuale}, 144; 162; 163; 165.
\textsuperscript{12} Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 114; 369-70; for the connection of chantries to the doctrine of Purgatory, see 301.
\textsuperscript{13} It was, as Duffy notes, a significant repercussion of the suppression of the chantries that the English parishes were left with a significant shortage of priests for these vital parish functions.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 14; 74-76; 370-76; for the origin of the name in a vision of St. Gregory of the torments of Purgatory suffered by his mother, see 293-94; for discussion of the tradition in detail, see Richard Pfaff, “The English Devotion of St. Gregory’s Trental,” \textit{Speculum} vol. 49, no. 1 (1974): 7-50.
after death. Three Masses were said within the octaves of each of the ten major feasts of Christ and the Virgin; Christmas, Epiphany, Candlemas, Lady Day (the Annunciation), Easter, Ascension, Whitsun, Trinity, Assumption, and the Nativity of Mary. The tradition seems to have been connected with the Crusades and their associated indulgences. At each Mass, a particular set of trental prayers was prescribed which connected the captive souls in Purgatory with the captive Holy Land under Muslim rule. In some versions of the Trental, every day of the year the priest was to recite the psalms “Placebo” and “Dirige,” well known to the laity from the Office for the Dead and often directed to be said on their own in late medieval wills for the soul of the deceased. Every day on which the Masses were said, the priest was to say the penitential psalms, the litany of the saints, and the rosary. Though some, such as the author of the didactic treatise *Dives et Pauper*, inveighed against the practice, instructions to celebrate the course of Masses in the ‘pope trental’ were included in many manuscripts and later printed editions of the missal. It is probable that some of the Masses attended by the laity every day were provided by the benefaction of testators who had given money for the Trental.

These Masses were commonly said at the nave altar, close to the people. The phenomenon of the nave altar is critical for understanding medieval English devotion to the Mass. While the Sunday Mass was typically held at the high altar behind the rood screen (which, while a barrier, was still easily able to be seen-through), the daily Masses in the nave were not typically behind the screen but in front of it, with the people clustered in front. The rood screen and altars of St. Helen’s, Ranworth in Norfolk is a famous surviving example of this setup. There was often considerable devotion associated with particular

---

15 See *Dives et Pauper*, vol. 2, P. H. Barnum, ed. (EETS, 1976), 186-92; *Missale*, cols 883*-885*.
nave altars and their images. There is significant evidence that the south altar at medieval Ranworth was the focus of a Lady cult, frequented by the devout expectant women and mothers of the town. The screen behind the south altar bears the images of the three biblical Maries and St. Margaret, surrounded by their respective offspring. This was hardly a unique occurrence. Late medieval devotional gilds were often the source of these requests to celebrate votive or requiem Masses daily in the church, and were dedicated to devotions like the *imago pietatis*, *corpus Christi*, or Holy Name of Jesus. Pious associations of laity formed the societies, endowed nave altars, and paid chaplains to celebrate Mass. These altars were often elaborate. The well-endowed ‘Jesus Mass’ (in honor of the Holy Name) at All Saints in Bristol was provided with a choir and organ, as well as its own stipendiary priest. Such Masses formed the bulk of weekly religious practice for the laity, the more devout of whom (and possibly even the majority of people in general) often assisted at these Masses multiple times during the week. These celebrations were often under the special control of these lay groups, who provided the altar appointments, stipend for a priest, and likely comprised many of those in attendance.

Though the words of the Mass were of course in Latin, they were said so often for the regular attendee and at such close quarters at the nave altar that the attentive parishioner could easily have gained at least a rudimentary grasp of the meaning. There is ample reason to believe that Latin posed little serious barrier for the layperson in the later medieval period willing to make use of the primers or devotional Mass guides such as the *LFMB*, widely available especially after the invention of printing. The evidence of simple

---


Latin prayers contained in the medieval primers and written in medieval commonplace books gives considerable reason to believe that most literate laypeople (by this period not an insignificant number) could be expected to have had at least a moderate understanding of Latin prayers and texts, especially the popular offices for the Dead (the Dirige) and the votive office of the Virgin Mary, the principal component of the lay primer. By the reign of Henry VIII, primers were common aides to everyday prayer for those who could afford them, and Sarum primers were printed both in England and on the continent, though the French continued to dominate the production of Sarum books.

Sarum primers survive in relatively ample quantities, and included as appendices commonly used Latin prayers for the laity like the Penitential Psalms, the offices of the Dead and the Blessed Virgin, as well as vernacular prayers for various occasions such as for specific points of the Mass, and others “to get he grace for synnes, For the kyng; For ty frend lyving; For wayfaring men.” These were often elaborately and intricately illustrated in varying styles from the traditional Gothic to the fashionable woodcut style of Albrecht Dürer.

Nor did the primers ignore didactic concerns. Primers and Mass aides included and translated the parts of the Mass which were voiced aloud by the faithful, and provided vernacular elaborations or explanations of longer texts like the Gloria, Credo, or Pater noster. They often included directions and meditation guides for different parts of the Mass.

---


19 When the printing of Henry VIII’s *Great Bible* of 1539 was shut down as heretical by the French Inquisition, Henry moved production to England whereupon the production of the reformed primers was largely Anglicized, remaining so of course into the era of the Book of Common Prayer; see Raguin, 105.
Mass. Basic prayers in Latin, such as the *Pater noster*, the *Credo*, and the *Ave*, ecclesiastical authorities made an effort to teach and catechize both the literate and the illiterate. This was not the only Latin the layperson seems to have comprehended, however. Devotional directions such as the one below from the *LFMB* indicate some amount of basic comprehension at least of the Latin responses customarily made by the people:

> When þis is saide [i.e., the prayer during the ablutions], knele doun sone, saye pater-noster til messe be done, for þo messe is noght sest, or tyne of *ite, misa est.* þen when þou heris say *ite,* or *benedicamus,* if hit be, þen is þo messe al done; bot þit þis prayere þou make right sone;  

The illiterate could obviously make no use of the guides and primers, but they were not of course left in ignorance. Surviving English sermon books indicate an attempt at oral instruction for these laypeople in the Latin of the Mass. According to the *Speculum Sacerdotale*, on Christmas was to be declared: “and pes is made betwix God and man, where-throuȝ aungels ther-of ioying in tyme of his birthe songe thus: ‘Gloria in excelsis Deo, et cetera.’” On the Saturday before Easter, the homilist might preach “When the apostles regnyd and eny schuld be baptiȝid, þere was noȝt scide but thus: ‘I baptiȝe the in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Amen.’” Each of these examples intimate that

---

8 In the EETS introduction to the *LFMB*, Simmons writes that the medieval faithful for the most part prayed their own, though related prayers while the priest said Mass, though there is evidence of congregational response at the *Orate Fratres*, the *Pater noster*, and possibly the Sanctor. The *Pater noster* at least is clear enough in the *LFMB* “bot answere at temptacionem/set [sic] libera nos a malo, amen” (ix; 46).  
9 See particularly the inscription quoted by Duffy on a fourteenth-century font in the parish church of Bradle, Lincolnshire: “Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Crucifix; Leron the childe yt is need; Duffy, *Stripping*, 53; cf. 54-87.  
10 *LFMB*, 56. Additions and italics mine.  
instruction in Latin prayers was encouraged and even commonplace. Certainly phrases heard many times, perhaps daily, are readily recalled.

Devotion at these daily Masses was personal, quiet, and intimate. The main occupation for the laity was to pray in silence and with attention according to their prayer books or, for the more ‘lewde,’ or unlearned, on their beads.24 The center of this devotion to the Mass was the moment of the consecration, when the Church confessed that the Host was changed into Christ, “bothe flesshe & blode.”25 The parish Mass on Sundays was a rather different experience for the laity than a daily Mass, though the sacring was still of course at its heart. Other, more elaborate ceremonies were performed on the Dominica, or Lord’s Day, which embodied important social bonds and reaffirmed the sense of community which pervaded the medieval parish. These will be highlighted in the following section, a description of the Sarum Mass on Sundays and major feasts.26

Ad Missam: From the Procession to the Creed

On ordinary Sundays throughout the year, the people would assemble in the parish church for Mass after the clergy of the church had sung the office of Prime, that is, around seven o’clock. From surviving illuminations and manuscript evidence, it seems that there

---

24 Devotion to the Rosary was not simply for the illiterate, however, and was widely practiced by many medieval Christians, particularly by the large Confraternity of the Rosary devoted to it. For more exploration of the devotion to the medieval Dominican Rosary and the manner in which it was practiced by the laity as a textual devotion to Scripture and not simply unlettered recitation of memorized prayers, see the recent study Anne Winston-Allen, Stories of the Rose: the Making of the Rosary in the Middle Ages (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

25 LFMB, 20. From the elaboration on the Credo.

26 I assume for this description a solemn Mass, which required sufficient clergy and resources to do, for the purpose of relaying the fullness of the Sarum ritual. This was of course not the Mass of most parish churches every week, though the full ritual was possible on more solemn occasions and more often at great cathedrals. The ranking of feasts in the Sarum Use is according to the old system of doubles, semidoubles, and singles — corresponding to the rankings of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class feasts in the MR1962.
were two candlesticks set on the altar, not six as in the Roman custom.\footnote{Two candles and ‘riddle curtains’ on each side are the classic indications of a traditional ‘Sarum altar.’ Shawn Tribe, ‘Some images of the Sarum Use,’ New Liturgical Movement, October 28, 2006, http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2006/10/some-images-of-sarum-use.html#.VrUIokKfD8.} The priest was assisted by a deacon and subdeacon, as in the Roman Mass, vested on Sundays in albs and amices with the priest in a cope of the appropriate liturgical color.\footnote{Terence Bailey, The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church (Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1971), 13-14. Note that the acolytes wore albs and amices according to the older practice and not cassock and surplice, a more recent development. Baxter names the Sarum liturgical colors as white for Eastertide and feasts of the Blessed Virgin, red for ordinary Sundays, green or blue for ferial days, yellow for confessors, and brown, grey, or violet for Advent, Lent, and fasts/vigils (65). The parish or chapter’s best vestments, usually of gold or silver, were naturally used on major double-feasts, and black was used for requiems; see Voices of Morebath, 37-9; 80-1. Uncolored silk or linen, sometimes embroidered or stained with red crosses and other such depictions, was used to cover the church images during Lent and Passiontide, in a practice known as the Lenten Array; see Henry John Feasey, Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial (London: Thom. Baker, 1897), 1-49. In practice, these colors likely varied widely.} The deacon and subdeacon wore tunicles and dalmatics. They were accompanied by a verger, a thurifer, two acolytes with beeswax candles known as taperers, a crucifer, and other assistants who handled the holy water and missal.\footnote{Ibid.; Rock, Church of Our Fathers, vol. 4, 212. The Church of England retains the office of verger, though it has in the Roman liturgy fallen into desuetude. The office of the parish ‘beadle’ is one of similar import and antiquity.} On solemn occasions, two or three crucifers were required as well as an extra thurifer. Three clerics in copes were also employed on solemn occasions to sing the chants of the processional with the choir. The verger, an administrative officer of the parish bearing a (mostly) ceremonial rod or mace at the head of the procession was vested in a surplice and made way for the sacred company.

Before the Mass began, the priest would exorcise and bless salt and water according to the manual, and, after adding them together, bless the resulting mixture.\footnote{Missale, cols 29**-33*. The rite is found in the missal, but the manual was more likely used as it was more easily ‘at hand.’} This holy water would be distributed to the people after the Mass. The importance of holy water for the medieval laypeople was profound. Holy water was ‘apotropaic,’ or had power to ward off evil, and was used by the laity as the blessing prays, “for putting to flight all power of the enemy.”\footnote{Mosse, cols 29**-33*. “The rite is found in the missal, but the manual was more likely used as it was more easily ‘at hand.’} Medieval society was profoundly imbued with belief in the power and presence of
evil; the holy water “would banish devils and ensure blessing.”\textsuperscript{32} So important was this resource, that in many parishes the parish clerk’s salary was dependent on his distribution of holy water, greatly valued and widely used in the private homes and devotions of the people.\textsuperscript{33}

A procession was prescribed for every Sunday, a feature of the Sarum Use which underlines its place in the popular, public piety of the time. The procession was headed by the verger and his rod, and was followed by the holy water bearer, crucifer(s), taperers, thurifer(s), and finally the ministers. In this order they would go out of the choir, pass through the rood screen to circle the chancel, and on Sundays sprinkling each of the nave altars along the way while the choir sang an antiphon and psalm verse, usually the traditional \textit{Asperges me}. The procession then proceeded down the south aisle of the church while the laity were sprinkled with holy water.\textsuperscript{34} Returning to the screen, it halted at the gate and a processional response was sung and a short prayer invoking divine protection was recited by the priest.\textsuperscript{35}

The priest then faced the people for the Bidding Prayers, or the ‘bidding of the bedes.’ Apart from the homily or sermon, this was the only part of the Mass which was usually said \textit{in lingua materna}.\textsuperscript{36} The priest would enjoin, or ‘bid,’ the people in the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 124; cf. 278.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.; The clerk was an officer of the parish responsible for assisting the pastor in the liturgy by making the responses, preparing the vessels, and singing the epistle in the absence of other clerics. He interacted daily with the parish and was one of them, bringing around the pax-brede to be kissed at Mass and distributing the holy water. For the office of clerk in the medieval parish, see 498; cf. \textit{Voices of Morebath}, 54-55.
\textsuperscript{34} Missale, col 32*: Bailey, \textit{Processions}, 14.
\textsuperscript{35} Missale, col 33*: used on Sundays throughout the year, this antiphon, response, and oration were identical to that of the \textit{Asperges} ceremony of the MR1962 (\textit{Exaudi nos, Domine sancte Pater}), and the Sarum Missal (col 357) also prescribes the \textit{Vidi aquam} after Easter. The ceremony in the MR1962 is simply a trimmed-down version of this procession and blessing; cf. \textit{The Daily Missal}, 895-96.
\textsuperscript{36} The priest turns “\textit{ad populum et dicat in lingua maternal sic.”} The rubrics describe the form of the Bidding Prayer in Latin for general composition in the vernacular; see Missale, cols 37*--38*”; Plaff, 419; this entire ritual is substantially similar to the beginning of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the prayers before the entrance to the eastern iconostasis, as these both arise from a practice common to both the Eastern and Western Churches; see “The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom.” Study Text of the Ruthenian Recension of the Divine Liturgy, Byzantine Catholic Church in America, Online, 1-4.
\end{flushright}
vernacular to pray for the pope, the bishops, priests, their pastors, for the king, queen, lords, community leaders, and for the family whose day it was to supply the loaf for the Sunday blessed bread. Also included would be “all our good parisshe’s,” and for those in particular need such as “all women that be with chylde in this parysshe or any other.”37 The priest would also enjoin prayers for the dead, reading the names of anyone of the parish recently deceased and buried. The prayer ended with the psalm *De profundo* and some associated verses and responses. Once a year at the parish requiem Mass, the list of the names of the deceased, or bede-roll, of the parish for the past year would be read, including especially those who had been benefactors to the parish. This annual ritual was immensely important so that the parish could pray for these souls of their deceased neighbors. Here the social and religious were even more intimately intertwined. “The bede-roll,” Duffy writes, “was a social map of the community, often stretching over centuries, and promising a continuing place in the consciousness of the parish in which he or she had once lived.” The list was the summation of parish communal and religious life. This ritual typically ended with the priest informing his parish of any upcoming feasts or fasts for the week ahead.

The bede-roll was a place not only to pray for the dead but to commemorate what they had provided to the community, often objects of great religious significance not to mention material value – liturgical books, vestments, or chalices. The deceased were commemorated “not as one of the anonymous multitude of the dead, but as the named provider of some familiar object.” The bede-roll of the parish of St. Mary’s in Sandwich bid the parishioners pray for

---

the sawlys of John Goddard of this parsche, of whose goodys was gevyn ii [liturgical] bokys, a grayell and a martologe. Also for the sawlys of Symon Chapman and Juylen his wyf, of whos goodys was gevyn a hole vestyment for a priest of cloth of gold of Luke lynyd with grene tartary, and a chalys syluyr and gylt.\(^3\)

If there were any ceremonies of special significance assigned to the day, these would be performed after the procession and bedes, before the Mass itself began. On Candlemas, for example, the candles were blessed with a similarly apotropaic blessing to that of holy water. Meat, butter, cheese, and eggs would be blessed at Easter, and apples on the feast of St. James.\(^3\) Some days of the year were proscribed for parochial dues, paid in currency or wax, used later for the production of blessed candles. A procession of these offerings was made to bring them to the priest at the screen, and there they were blessed according to the rites of the Manual.

The ministers and acolytes would return to the chancel to vest for the Mass.\(^3\) While vesting, the priest is directed to pray the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, a Latin hymn invoking the presence of the Holy Spirit, to which a verse and prayer, the familiar collect for purity (*Deus, cui omne cor patet*), were attached. Psalm 42 was then recited with its antiphon (*Introibo ad altare Dei*), as in the MR1962. The choir would at this time begin chanting the *Officium*, what in the Roman Mass is called the *Introit* of the Mass.\(^4\) As in the traditional Roman Mass, the *Kyrie* then followed, which in the Sarum Use (as with many of the medieval uses) could be farced or troped with verses the missal terms “prosa,” or prose.

---

\(^3\) Ibid., 335. Nor were the gifts of the poorer classes neglected in favor of these lavish gifts. Sir Christopher Trychay, Henrician-era priest of Morebath in Devon, drew up a bede-roll titled “Orate pro animabus sequentibus,” which names every financial gift to the parish, ranging from 26s 8d all the way to twopence; cf. Duffy, *Morebath*, 48-9.

\(^4\) For these blessings, and others of the Sarum Manual, by no means an exhaustive compilation of the blessings probably in use during this period, see the contents of the *Manuale*.

\(^5\) The *ordinarium* of the Sarum Mass is found in *Missale*, cols. 578-638.

\(^6\) According to the rubrics of the missal, the choir could be ‘ruled’ or not ruled, depending on the solemnity of the occasion. The so-called ‘rulers of the choir,’ anywhere from one to four, would direct the clergy in choir in their chant. They were to be vested in copes and bear wooden staffs, the forerunners of today’s conductors’ baton.
Psalm and other verses could be inserted on feasts into the Kyrie and other parts of the Mass text. Several special verses were also added to the *Gloria* on Marian feasts in honor of the Virgin. 

After a *Pater noster* and *Ave Maria*, the priest approaches the step of the altar, and having finished the following verses and responsa, begins the confession.

The confession is somewhat terser in the Sarum missal than in the MR1962:

> I confess to God, to blessed Mary, to all the saints, and to you, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault: I pray holy Mary, all the saints of God, and you, to pray for me. 

When the celebrating priest had finished the *Confiteor*, the ministers responded with the following, again slightly differing from the MR1962: “May almighty God have mercy on you, and forgive you all your sins; deliver you from all evil; preserve and strengthen you in goodness, and bring you to everlasting life,” to which the priest responds with “Amen,” and the ministers make the same confession, followed by the priest’s *Missereatur*. The priest then makes an absolution of sin, also somewhat differently worded:

---

Footnotes:

42 For the troped *Kyrioi*, see *Missale*, col 98; for those chant settings of the Mass which are still included in the Roman *Kyriale* and are customarily labeled by their troped verses, e.g., the *Missa Orbis factor* or the *Missa Lux et Origo*, see *The Daily Missal*, vff; for the troping of the *Gloria* used on feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, see *Missale*, col 927-934*. The Kyrie used in the 1997 Candlemas Sarum liturgy was the *Deus Creator omnium*, which blends its Latin words with Latinized Greek, opening with “Deus Creator omnium, tu Theos ymon nostri pie, eleyson;” see “Sarum Candlemas 05.” This troping, characteristic of the medieval elaboration of the Mass, originated with the monastic liturgical compositions of the early medieval period and was subsequently dispensed with following the reforms of the MR1570 of Pius V.

There has been a tendency in the historiography and in studies of the Catholic liturgy summarily to characterize these medieval additions to the Mass (e.g., tropes, sequences, orations, verses) as ‘accretions’ or ‘elaborations’ and their excising by the post-Tridentine reform as a ‘purification.’ Reinhold Theisen, for instance, comments typically that the “basic structure of the liturgy had become encased in an overgrowth of ceremonies and rites” and that these “obscured its [the Mass’] essential structure;” see Reinhold Theisen, *Mass Liturgy and the Council of Trent* (Collegeville: St. John’s University Press, 1965), viii. Joseph Jungmann, usually the foremost authority on the history of the Roman Mass, has similar opinions. He speaks of the ‘autumn of the middle ages,’ an example of the same hermeneutical phenomenon; Jungmann, 127-28. Such language is unhelpful and characteristic of midcentury prejudices. If nothing else, Duffy’s study and that of others of the revisionists has revealed the vibrancy of the medieval ceremonies and the attachment with which they were held by many of the medieval faithful. To characterize them as ‘dead,’ ‘meaningless,’ or even ‘obscure’ is classically Dickensian language, save that Theisen as a Catholic is assuming not the coming of the Reformation but the reforms of Trent. Trent, like the English Reformation, was not an inevitable reform of a corrupt and moribund medieval structure but a response to historical circumstances. To characterize the medieval Mass, then, using these outmoded and prejudicial terms seems to as to be both historiographical misstep and anachronism. Theisen’s subsequent characterization of the medieval Mass as ‘non-participatory’ is just as unimaginative, and is likewise belied by recent scholarship in the vein of Duffy.

43 *Confiteor Deo, beatæ Mariæ, omnibus sanctis, et vobis, quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, locutione, et operae mea culpa: precor sanctam Mariam, omnes sanctos Dei, et vos, orare pro me; see Missale, col 579;* for the *Confiteor* of the traditional Roman Mass and the MR1962, see *The Daily Missal*, 904.
The almighty and merciful God grant unto you absolution and remission of all your sins, time for true repentance, and amendment of life, and the grace and consolation of the Holy Ghost. [Ministers:] Amen.

After several more responses, the osculum pacis is made with the priest embracing first the deacon and then the subdeacon with the prayer “Receive the kiss of peace and love, that ye may be fit for the holy altar for the performance of divine offices.” The choir meanwhile has begun the Kyrie chant, farced or not depending on the occasion. The taperers are to deposit their candles on the steps of the altar, and the priest ascends to the center, quietly saying the prayer “Auer a nobis. He then makes the sign of the cross and proceeds with the incensation of the altar as with the prayer (differing from the Roman tradition), “The Lord; may this incense be blessed by him in whose honor it shall be burned. In the name of the Father, etc.” The priest incenses each of the “cornu altaris,” or horns of the altar, as the Sarum Missale allusively terms the corners.

After this, the priest is incensed by the deacon, and he kisses in veneration the book of the Gospel held by the subdeacon. He then moves to the right corner of the altar with the deacon and subdeacon and proceeds to read the Officum, followed by a psalm verse, the Gloria Patri, and the Officium repeated. This is followed by the Oratio, or collect of the Mass, which is immediately followed by the Gloria. While the Hymn of the Angels is sung, the priest reads it himself from the right corner of the altar, after first intoning the incipit. The choir clergy are directed to stand “conversi ad Altare” from the

---

44 Dominus, ab ipso benedicatur hoc incensum, in cujus honorre cremabitur. In nomine Patri etc. The Roman prayer has the terser “Ab illo benedicaris in cujus honorre cremaberis. Amen.”
45 For the acacia wood “horns” of the altars in the Jerusalem Temple, to which this might refer, see Exodus 27:2; 37:25; Leviticus 4:7; 18.
46 For the full rubrics concerning when the Gloria is to be said, which one is to be said and according to what tone, see Missale, cols 582-86. Double feasts of great solemnity often having complicated chants, the principal ruler of the choir, or rector choiri, would on these occasions assist with the intonation.
Gloria to the Alleluia or Sequentia (where one is prescribed), and to make a bow at the appropriate words of the Gloria and signing themselves at “In the glory of God the Father. Amen.” After receiving the blessing of the priest, the subdeacon chants the epistle lesson as is usual. The priest then proceeds to read the gradual, and then the alleluia, or tract if in the Lenten season, with the same ceremony and responses of the Roman Mass. Subsequently, the deacon spreads the corporal cloth on the altar in preparation for the Communion.

The subdeacon at this time is to prepare the elements of the Mass. As in the Dominican Use, he receives bread, wine, and water with the paten, cloths, and chalice from the acolytes. He prepares these for the coming sacring, presenting both elements for the priest to bless with “Bless,” as in the Dominican Use. The priest prays “The Lord; may [this water] be blessed by him out of whose side flowed forth blood and water. In the name of the Father, etc.” The deacon then prepares to chant the Gospel of the day, and proceeds with the gospel book and the taperers to face north. All present then sign themselves at the incipit of the gospel, and the deacon chants the pericope.

After the chanting of the gospel, there might be a sermon or homily. Medieval English homilies have come down to scholars from collections of pre-written homilies such as the Speculum Sacerdotale or the Festial of John Mirk. This is not the place for an extensive study of medieval preaching, but I will attempt a brief summation of the main

---

4 The choir is directed to make a reverential bow at the end of the gradual, alleluia or tract, and sequence if one is prescribed. The Sarum Use has many more sequences than the MR1962. There is one prescribed for nearly every Sunday and feast day. Most of these were removed at the time of the reform of Pius V, though four have survived to the MR1962: the Victimæ paschali laudes of Easter, the Vetus sancte Spiritus of Pentecost, the Lauda Sion salvatorum of Corpus Christi, and the Dies Irae of All Souls and Requiem Masses. 5 I.e., At the words adoramus te, suscipe deprecationem nostram, and Jesus Christe cum Sancto Spiritu in Gloria Dei, cf. The Daily Missal, 910.


8 Instead of a sermon, the Bidding Prayer may perhaps have been said here instead of its place at the screen after the Mass procession, the center of the screen being somewhat inconvenient for a Bidding Prayer which went on at any great length.
ideas which are found in *The Stripping of the Altars*. It is possible that in a well-run parish, Sunday preaching was fairly common. John Mirk, Duffy observes, expected the parish priest to preach as a duty of his office, and the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had made very clear the expectation of preaching at least expected of the bishop. If the bishop was unable, he was to ensure that clergy were present in the diocese who could regularly preach. It is likely that the parishioners of England in the high and late medieval period could expect to hear a sermon preached to them regularly, though perhaps not every Sunday and feast day. Not every cleric was licensed to preach, and it is likely that few were much good at it apart from the few licensed seculars and the friars, Dominicans and Franciscans, whose charism was itself preaching. Sir Christopher Trychay, Duffy’s meticulous and loquacious Morebath vicar, was reputed to be an exceptionally regular preacher in the parish, though only twenty-eight of the two hundred fifty-five beneficed clerics in the Diocese of Exeter at the time were licensed preachers. Notwithstanding, preaching from itinerant licensed preachers and friars was likely a fairly common parish occurrence.

On occasions which call for it, as is the case in the Roman Mass, the Creed or *Symbolum Nicænum* follows the sermon. At “Et incarnatus est,” “Et homo factus est,” and “Crucifixus etiam,” the rubrical direction is the same: “the quire shall incline while they say,” indicating the normal Sarum reverential sign, the bow. In another significant

---

* Duffy, *Morebath*, 175-76.
* Duffy, *Stripping*, 37-8; Many pre-Reformation pulpits were decorated in the spirit not of prayer but of instruction, with images of the four Latin doctors (Sts. Augustine, Gregory, Ambrose, and Jerome). This would seem to indicate at least an intention of preaching and teaching. At least it suggests some passing familiarity with the doctors themselves among laypeople, who might have had some degree of knowledge about their lives or works from the preaching of these pulpits. Instruction was often attempted through art itself, especially on the rood screen, with the Apostles’ Creed being a popular text for depiction; for the influence of sacred art on catechesis of the medieval laity and the extent to which they were instructed by preaching, art, and architecture in church, see *Stripping* 64; 158-59; cf. Duffy, *The Parish in English Life*, 129.
* Though the relatively recent custom of the Roman genuflection is essentially carries the same import, and may have been in use by the mid-sixteenth century, the rubrics of the missal prescribe the bow exclusively.
elaboration from the Roman Mass, while the Creed is chanted by the choir, the book of the gospels is carried to each of the ministers and acolytes to be venerated with a kiss.

Ad Missam From the Offertory to the Ite

The Sarum offertory differs widely from the Roman order, including significantly less and shorter prayers. Having chanted the response “Dominus vobiscum,” and the choir responding “Et cum spiritu tuo,” the priest then reads the Offertory verse, which the choir also chants. The chalice and paten already prepared by the subdeacon, the deacon brings these to the priest, who is directed to pray a shorter variation on the Roman Suscipe sancta Trinitas:

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which I an unworthy sinner offer in thy honor, and in that of blessed Mary and all thy saints, for my sins and offences, and for the salvation of the living, and for the reposed of all the faithful departed. May this new sacrifice be acceptable to almighty God, in the name of the Father, etc.

The priest then incenses the offerings with the prayer “Let my prayer be set forth, O Lord, in thy sight as incense,” as in the Dominican Use. The deacon incenses the priest, and the subdeacon presents the Gospel which he again venerates. The ministers and choir are incensed by an acolyte. The priest then goes to the right corner of the altar for the hand-washing, the prayer for which is significantly shorter than in the Roman mass:

“Cleanse me, O Lord, from all pollution of mind and body, that being cleansed I may be able to perform the holy work of the Lord.” The priest then bows over the elements and

---

55 Suscipe, sancta Trinitas, unus Deus, hanc oblationem, quam ego indignus peccator offero in honore tuo, beatæ Mariae et omnium Sanctorum tuorum, pro peccatis et offensionibus meis, et pro salute vivorum, et requie omnium fidelium defunctorum. In nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, acceperunt et omnipotenti Deo hoc sacrificium novum; The Roman Mass places this prayer after the hand-washing, while at this initial offering is included the prayer Suscipe sacre Pater, a prayer not found in Sarum.

56 Dirigatur, Domine, ad te oratio mea, sicut incensum in conspectu tuo; for the connection to the Dominican Use, see Gregory Dipippo, "The Theology of the Offertory." Again, this prayer is shorter than the Roman.

57 Munda me Domine, ab omni inquinamento mentis et corporis; ut possim mundus implere opus sanctum Domini; The Roman Mass at this point has the priest recite Ps. 20 (23)6-12 complete with Gloria Patri.
prays the *In spiritu humiliates* in the same form found in the Dominican Use: “In the spirit of humility and with a contrite heart may we be accepted, O Lord, of thee; and may our sacrifice and in such wise in thy sight, that it may be accepted of thee this day, and be pleasing unto thee, O Lord my God.” After venerating the altar and signing himself *In nomine Patris* etc., the priest turns to the people and says the *Orate Fratres* in the quiet voice. This is once again different from the MR1962, and interestingly includes *sorores* as well as *fratres*: “Brethren and sisters, pray for me, that my and your sacrifice may be alike acceptable to the Lord our God.” The response was then made by the minsters and people: “May the grace of the Holy Ghost illumine thy heart and thy lips, that the Lord may deign to accept this sacrifice of praise at thy hands for our sins and offences.”

The normal preface dialogue or *Sursum corda*, an ancient feature of the Roman rite, then follows, succeeded by the proper preface. During the dialogue, the subdeacon, covered by a humeral veil, takes the paten and holds it at the foot of the altar until the *Pater noster* as in the Roman Mass. The *Sanctus* is said and chanted as usual after the preface, and can be troped on certain Marian feasts. The priest then quietly prays Canon of the Mass, the consecration having the same lay reverence and devotion as the daily Mass.

According to some medieval illustrations, though not actually found in the rubrics of the

---

*a* V: *Orate, fratres et sorores pro me, ut necum pariterque vestrum acceptum sit Domine Deo nostro sacrificium. R: Spiritus Sanctus gratia illuminet cor tuum et labia tua, et accipiat Dominus digne hoc sacrificium laudis de manibus tuis, pro peccatis et offensionibus nostris.*

*b* Dipippo notes a unique feature of the Sarum requiem Mass after the *Orate Fratres*: “The Use of Sarum has an interesting variant for the Offertory at a Requiem Mass celebrated with the body of the deceased present, and likewise on the monthmind and anniversary Masses. The choir begins the Offertory chant ‘Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriae’ as normal, as far as the words ‘Quam olim Abraham promissisti et semini ejus,’ while the priest performs the Offertory ritual as far as the washing of the hands. The priest then sings the first words of the second part of the Offertory chant, ‘Hostias et preces tibi Domine offerimus,’ which the choir continues. The response to the *Orate fratres* is substituted with the continuation of the Offertory chant, ‘Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine, et lux perpetua lucet eis. Quam olim Abraham promissisti et semini ejus.’”

*c* For the full list and rubrics of the proper *præfationes*, to which the proper *communicantes* are attached, see *Missale*, cols 597-610.

*d* It seems to have been paramount that the priest pray the Canon of the Mass, especially the words of institution and consecration, silently and alone; “lyue wordes, withouten drede/that no man but a prest schulde rede” (*LFMB*, 147.) Duffy relates a pious ad rather confused story from the *Golden Legend* in which a group of shepherds who recited the words of institution one night, turning bread into flesh but also incurring divine wrath and promptly “roasted by a thunderbolt;” see Duffy, *Stripping*, 110 note 61.
missal, at this point the deacon and subdeacon would be given lit tapers to hold during the
canon, likely to shed light on the elevation so that it could be seen by the people.

The elevation of the Host, known to the English as the ‘sacring,’ was the central
moment of the Mass for many if not most laypeople. Because the Host was typically
received by the laity only at Easter, the sacring and spiritual communion, gazing upon the
consecrated Host, were deeply important. Many prayers in the primers and Mass guides
were meant as devotions for the sacring. The following prayer from the Instructions of
John Mirk captures the general attitude of contemplative devotion encouraged for the
sacring:

Ihesu Lord, welcome thow be,
In forme of bred as I the se;
Ihesu! For thy holy name,
Schelde me to day fro synne & schame.
Schryfte & howsele, Lord, thou graunte me bo,
Er that I schale hennes go,
And verre contraceyone of my synne,
That I lord never dye there-Inne;
And as thow were of a may I-bore,
Sofere me never to be for-lore,
But whenne that I schale hennes wende,
Grawnte me the blysse wyth-owten ende. Amen.\(^2\)

The contemporary Prayer Books encouraged this moment as the summit of
devotion for the layperson – to kneel and pray before the elevated Host. So important was
this to the medieval laypeople that clergy were known to complain of their over-eager
congregations running from chapel to chapel in a church where multiple Masses were
celebrated in order to see the sacrings of each Mass as they occurred.\(^3\) Margery Kempe,
the fifteenth-century spiritual mystic and pilgrim, wrote of her experience of a miracle at

---
\(^2\) Mirk, Instructions, 9, 265-81
\(^3\) Duffy, Stripping, 98-99.
the time of the sacring in her parish church in Lynn. “þe Sacrament,” she wrote, “schok & flekeryd to & fro as a dowe flekeryth wyth hir wengys.” She was greatly “desyring to se mor Sacreys & lokyng yf it wold don so a-ȝen.”

Although the text is virtually the same, several rubrics of the Roman Canon differ from the Sarum Missal to the MR1962 (and previous Roman missals). First, at the *Hanc igitur*, the priest is directed not to spread his hands over the offering, as in the Roman Mass, but simply to look upon the oblation “cum magna veneratione.” Second, after the sacring and during the prayer *Unde et memores*, the priest is directed “Deinde elevet brachia sua in modum crucis,” until the crosses made over the Host and Chalice. The spreading of the priest’s arms after the manner of the cross was likely associated at such a high devotional and emotional moment as the sacring with the intense late medieval piety surrounding Christ’s Passion. This rubrical feature is found in other medieval rites, including the uses of Braga and Milan. The English faithful likely knew and noted the custom, associating it with both the Mass and Passion piety.

The canon proceeds through to the *Pater noster*. Here at the words *Preceptis saultaribus* the subdeacon hands the paten to the deacon. The deacon hands it to the priest at the *Liber a nos*. The priest venerates it, and with it covers both the left eye and then the right before signing himself with it “ultra caput.” The *Agnus Dei* then follows. In the Sarum Use, the priest waits until after the *Agnus Dei* to mix the fragment of the Host into the

---

65 See particularly the descriptions of Eucharistic miracles and the Holy Week liturgy in The *Book of Margery Kempe*, 47/21; 139/34; 140/30; 184/26; & passim, cf. The Stripping of the Altar, 119; The *Hanc igitur* was in some uses a simple pointing gesture, such as may have been the practice in the Use of York, though the current laying on of hands was also in use and indeed prevailed by the fourteenth century. There is some indication of the origin of this practice in the laying of hands on the sacrificial victim of the Jewish Day of Atonement, though the gesture was also used for others of the Temple sacrifices and the practice was not universal in the medieval period; see Jungmann, The *Mass of the Roman Rite*, 186-87.
66 Tribe, “Some images of the Sarum Use.”
Chalice, then making the following prayer of thanksgiving, similar to the Roman and Byzantine prayers before reception of Communion:

O Lord, holy Father, almighty everlasting God, grant me so worthily to receive this most holy body and blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that I may thereby be found fit to obtain the remission of all my sins, and to be filled with thy Holy Spirit, and to have thy peace; because thou art God alone, and there is none other beside thee, whose kingdom and glorious dominion abideth for ever, world without end. Amen.67

The priest venerates the corporal and chalice, and kisses the pax-brede which is passed to the other ministers, acolytes, and choir, before being given to the people. The ministers then exchange the osculum pacis for the second time, the priest initially saying “Peace to thee and to the Church of God,” with the response “And with thy spirit.”68 Then the pax was given to the acolytes and to the people.

It is appropriate here to say something concerning the pax-brede, which consisted of an icon of the Agnus Dei or other pious image.69 The pax-brede, or pax instrument (the word brede means something like “full” or “universal”), may have been a substitution for the reception of Communion, received only rarely and usually at Eastertide. Like the bedroll, the passing of the pax was also an indication of the social health of the community. The lay Prayer Books, Duffy notes, often supplied a prayer at this point for peace and deliverance. Like the blessing of holy water and of holy bread at the conclusion of the Mass, the ritual of the pax was strongly connected to the maintenance of order, peace, and protection of the community, and bears certain resemblance to the Eastern practice of

---

67 Domine, Sancte Pater, Omnipotens aeternæ Dei, da mihi hoc sacrosanctum Corpus et Sanguinem Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi ita digne sumere ut mererem per hoc remissionem omnium peccatorum meorum accipere et tuo Sancto Spiritu repleri; et pacem tuam habere; Quia tu es Deus solus, et præter te non est alius, cujus regnum et imperium gloriosum sine fine permanet in sæcula sæculorum, Amen; see “The Divine Liturgy,” 81; Warren comments that this prayer appears also to be shared by the Mozarabic Use of Visigothic Spain, see Warren, The Sarum Missal in English, 51.

68 Interestingly, unlike in the Roman custom, the pax is given even at a low Mass, a possible result of infrequent lay Communion.

69 For Duffy’s full account of the pax-brede ritual, see Duffy, Stripping, 125-29.
communally venerating icons of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. These rituals were added to the Mass on Sunday, and gave “it a communal dimension, expressed in dramatic and time-consuming ceremonial.” Though, like weekday Mass, the sacring and worship of the Host was still silent, contemplative, and solemn, (Duffy’s “countless... sermon exempla” of loquacious parishioners indicate that such chatter was both discouraged and common), Sunday Mass had a communitarian aspect about it which was demonstrably unique.

Though the pax-brede was connected to the reconciliation of quarrels, this hopeful outcome was of course not always achieved. In fact the pax was sometimes the cause of disagreement rather than the solution. Duffy relates several anecdotes revealing competition over the order in which the parishioners would receive the pax, one of which will be instructive enough as to its sometimes problematic nature in an unhealthy community:

In 1494 the wardens of the parish of All Saints, Stanyng, presented Joanna Dyaca for breaking the pax-brede by throwing it on the ground, 'because another woman of the parish had kissed it before her.' On All Saints Day 1522 Master John Browne of the parish of Theydon-Garnon in Essex, having kissed the pax-brede at the parish Mass, smashed it over the head of Richard Pond, the holy-water clerk who had tendered it to him, "causing streams of blood to run to the ground." Brown was enraged because the pax had first been offered to Francis Hamden and his wife Margery, despite the fact that the previous Sunday he had warned Pond, "Clerke, if thou here after givest not me the pax first I shall breke it on thy hedd."

The Mass then continued with the communion of the priest, preceded by the three prayers of preparation:

O God the Father, font and source of all goodness, who, moved by thy loving-kindness, hast willed that thine Only-Begotten One should descent to this lower world for our sakes, and take flesh, which I unworthily hold in my hands [hic

---

It should be noted that the common distinction between the Eastern and Western obscures the fact that this practice ultimately shares a common origin and meaning – that is, honoring God and the saints in the form of images as a way of reinforcing the bonds between the faithful themselves, who communally venerate the image.

A similar social significance is to be found in the post-Sunday Mass blessing of bread, to which I will briefly return at the close of this study of the Sunday Mass; Duffy, Stripping, 126-27.

The MR1962 has two of these preparatory prayers and the Dominus, non sum dignus (both for priest and people), which together with the preceding Ecce, Agnus Dei is absent in Sarum.
inclinet se sacerdos ad hostiam, dicens,] I adore thee, I glorify thee, I laud thee with the whole intention of my mind and heart, and I beseech thee that thou wouldst not forsake us thy servants, but that thou wouldst forgive our sins; that so we may be enabled to serve thee, the only living and true God, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the living God, who by the will of the Father and the cooperation of the Holy Ghost, hast given life to the world by thy death; deliver me, I beseech thee, by this thy most holy body and blood, from all my iniquities, and from every ill; and make me ever obedient to thy commandments, and suffer me not to be forever separated from thee, O Saviour of the world. Who with God the Father and the same Holy Ghost livest and reignest God world without end. Amen. Let not the sacrament of thy body and blood, O Lord Jesu Christ, which I although unworthy receive, be unto me for judgement and condemnation, but may it through thy goodness be profitable to my salvation both in body and soul. Amen.73

The second of these prayers is substantially similar to the Domine Jesu Christe of the Roman Mass, though it is subtly different and somewhat longer. Next, in place of the customary Roman prayer Quid retribuam, the Sarum Use has the priest receive the Host with the words:

Hail for evermore, most holy flesh of Christ, to me before all things and above all things the greatest sweetness. May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me a sinner the way and the life. In the name of the Father, etc.

The priest then receives from the chalice, saying another unique Sarum prayer instead of the Roman Sanguis Domini:

Hail for evermore, heavenly drink, to me before all things and above all things the greatest sweetness. May the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be profitable to me a sinner for an eternal remedy unto everlasting life. Amen. In the name of the Father, etc.

This is followed with a general prayer of thanksgiving for the Communion received:

73 (1) Deus Pater, fons et origo totius bonitatis, qui ductus misericordia Unigenitum tuum pro nobis ad infima mundi descendere et carnis sumere voluisti, quam ego indignus hic in manibus meis teneo: Te adoro, te glorifico, te tota mentis ac cordis intentione laudo: Et precor ut nos famulos tuos non deseras, sed peccata nostra dimittas, quatenus tibi soli vivo ac vero Deo, puro corde et casto corpore servire valeamus; Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen. (2) Domine Jesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi, qui ex voluntate Patris, cooperante Spiritu Sancto, per mortem tuam mundum vivificasti, Libera me, quæso, per hoc sacrosanctum Corpus et hanc Sanguinem tuam a cunctis iniquitatibus meis et ab universis malicis Et fac me tuis semper obediere mandatis: Et a te muniam in perpetuum separari permittas, Salvator mundi: Qui cum Deo Patre et eodem Spiritu Sancto vivis et regnas Deus, per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen. (3) Corporis et Sanguinis tui, Domine Jesu Christe, Sacramento, quod licet indignus accipio, non sit mihi judicio et condemnationi; sed tua prosit pietate corporis mei et animae saluti. Amen.
I give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty everlasting God, who hast refreshed me with the most holy body and blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ; and I pray that this sacrament of our salvation, which I, an unworthy sinner, have received, may not turn to my judgment and condemnation, according to my deserts; but to the preservation of my body and soul unto eternal life.74

Following the communion of the priest would presumably be the people’s communion, which is not mentioned in the rubrics of the Missale. Though I mentioned previously the relative rarity of lay reception of Communion save for the general housel at Easter, there were some exceptions to this rule, such as the mystic Margery Kempe, who devotedly and tearfully received the Host weekly by command of the private vision she had experience of Christ: “Thys is my wyl, dowtyr, þat þow receyue my body euery Sunday...”75

Late receiving the permission of the bishop to follow this divine counsel, she is permitted to receive weekly.

The Communion of the priest was not preceded by the Domine non sum dignus, nor was the people’s by this or the Ecce, Agnus Dei, but immediately followed the priest’s Communion. The formula for giving Communion is uncertain, as the entire procedure goes unremarked upon in the rubrics, but a form is found in the ritual for extreme unction in the Sarum Manual which runs “May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ guard thy body and thy soul unto life everlasting.”76 It is possible that when Communion occurred at Easter and other times, these were the words used.

74 (1) Ave in æternum, 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, etc. (2) Ave in æternum cælestis potus, mihi ante omnia et super omnia summa dulcedo. Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi prosint mihi peccatori ad remedium sempiternum in vitam æternam. Amen. In Nomine Patris etc. (3) Gratias tibi ago, Domine, Sancte Pater, Omnipotens aeterna Deus, qui me refecisti de sacratissimo Corpore et Sanguine Filiæ tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi; Et precor ut hoc sacramentum salutis nostrae, quod sumpsisti indignus peccator, non veniat mihi ad judicium neque ad condemnationem pro meritis meis; sed ad perfectum corporis mei et animae salutis in vitam æternam. Amen; Warren observes Ave in æternum also to be a salutation shared with the Mozarabic Use; see Warren, The Sarum Missal in English, 53.
75 See The Book of Margery Kempe, 5/13-16.
76 Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat corpus tuum et animam tuam in vitam æternam. [translation mine]; Manuale, 111; The same formula is found in the ritual of baptism for the communicating of the one being baptized, see 37.
The laity avoided touching the sacred vessels which held the elements of Communion out of reverence for their special use. They generally kept their hands separated from the Host. A white cloth (known as the ‘houselling-cloth’) held by the acolytes in front of the rood screen served this purpose when they knelt to receive, and most importantly prevented any fragments from falling to the floor. According to Duffy, behind this aversion to touch was the conviction of the presence, power, or “virtus,” of God which was present in the objects with which the elements of Communion came into contact in addition to being substantially present in the Host itself. The belief even grew up that inducing a priest to give one water or unconsecrated wine from the chalice soon after a Mass might cure diseases such as whooping cough.77

The reception of the Easter Communion was deeply connected with management of the health of the bonds between the members of the parish community. “Wherfor, good men and woymen,” wrote John Mirk, “I charch you hevely in Godys byhalue þat non of you to-day com to Godys bord, but he be in full charyte to all Godis pepull; and also þat ȝe be clene schryuen and yn full wyll to leue your synne.”78 When the parish received on Easter Sunday, it was known as “taking one’s rights,” or maintaining one’s place in the community of adult parishioners. To refrain from that Communion was a sign of separation from the community. Because of the holiness of the feast day, “Thys day yeh christen man, in reverence of God, schulde forguye that have gylt to hom, and ben in full love and charyte to Godis pepull passyng all other dayes of the yere.”79 Indeed, the Easter houseling was deeply connected with the reconciliation of personal disagreements and feuds, as common an

77 The Stripping of the Altars, 110-111; for the reference to the curing of whooping cough [or ‘chincough’], see Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie (1862-1910 XVIII/2), 309; Paul M. Zall, A Hundred Merry Tales, and other English jestbooks of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), 100-01.
79 Mirk, Festial 130-31.
occurrence in late medieval England as in our own time. As the appointed guardian of the
distribution, the parish priest could be rather insistent upon this reconciliation. When a
rich woman refused forgiveness to a poor neighbor, the parson in Mirk’s *Festial* declares
that unless she “forgeve the pore woman here trespasse,” the priest would “with-drawe fro
hure here ryghtes that day,” whereupon the rich woman feigns her forgiveness and is
promptly choked by receiving the Host. The same idea is also seen quite dramatically in
another of Duffy’s examples from St. Mary Queenhithe parish in London. In 1529, Joanna
Carpenter seized the arm of Margaret Chamber while waiting for housel at Easter. “I pray
you let me speke a worde with you,” she is reported to have said, “for you have need to axe
me forgyvenes, before you rescyve your rights.” Though she was later hauled before the
church courts for her disruption, “the incident,” as Duffy points out “is eloquent testimony
to the force of the theme of reconciliation and charity in lay perception of the Eucharist.”
Connected with the notion of charity and duty to neighbors, receiving Easter Communion,
one’s yearly houseling, was sometimes connected with the payment of parish dues or the
wages of the parish clerk, such as at All Saints in Bristol when delinquent payment could
result in the withholding of Communion.80 Failure to pay, it was thought, disrupted the
parish community and was significant of strife or incharity which stood in the way of the
Easter reconciliation, and which it was hoped would be purged by confession and
Communion.

After the Communion followed the ablutions, or the ceremonial cleansing of the
priest’s fingers after having touched the Eucharist. The subdeacon is first directed to wash
with wine the fingers of the priest over the chalice to catch any remaining particles of the

---
80 Duffy, *Stripping*, 93-95.
Host, and the priest says the prayer *Quod ore sumpsimus*, as in the Roman Mass. He then says the prayer “Let this communion, O Lord, cleanse us from sin, and make us to be partakers of heavenly healing,” before consuming the water and wine along with the remaining fragments of the Host and Blood. Any remaining consecrated wine in the chalice is then drained into the paten, and the priest is directed to bow in adoration of It, with the prayer “Let us adore the sign of the cross: whereby we have received the sacrament of salvation.” Meanwhile, the deacon after folding the corporal returns with the priest to the right corner of the altar where the ministers say the Communion prayer proper to the day. The priest then says the Postcommunion prayer, preceded by “Dominus vobiscum” and “Oremus.” He then turns to the people once again for the dismissal, *Ite, missa est* or *Benedicanus Domino.* There is no final blessing in Sarum, so turning once again to the altar the priest prays the *Placeat tibi,* as in the Roman Mass. The priest directly signs himself *In nomine Patris* etc., bows, and the ministers, taperers, and acolytes return down the central aisle of the church in the order in which they processed to the altar. The priest is directed to recite what in the Roman Mass is referred to as the Last Gospel, John 1:1-14 (*In principio* etc.), on the way back to the sacristy as the Mass ended. The Sunday’s services were not yet complete, however.

> In many English communities, the blessing of bread followed the Sunday Mass. The tradition has since fallen into disuse in the west, though it is retained in many part of the Christian East, as in the Byzantine Rite. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries,  

---

* The final dismissal may be troped, according to the troped *Kyrie* which may have been used earlier in the Mass; see Missale, cols 635-38.
* After this, when there were clerics in choir and the occasion was a ferial day and not a feast (e.g. rarely, when high Mass was celebrated during the week), a series of psalms, invocations, and prayers, called in the Missal the *preces in prostratione,* were to be said kneeling before the altar.
* In the Roman practice, the Last Gospel is said at the left side of the altar from the altar card. As Sarum his little need for altar cards due to the short length of the *lavabo* and greater reliance on memorization, and in any case altar cards were not yet in use in the sixteenth century, they are unmentioned in the Sarum Missal.
however, the ‘heyday’ perhaps of the Sarum Use, the tradition of blessing the holy loaf was common in most communities and was another sign of the community’s reinforcement of social and religious bonds of status as well as of charity. It was also perhaps a substitute for receiving Communion on most Sundays of the year. The ritual is found in the front of the Missale, but was likely read more conveniently from the Sarum Manual. 84 The priest would first finish the Last Gospel, In principio etc., which was to follow the Mass, and would after several responses bless the bread. Clearly referencing the salvific power of the Mass which had preceded it, the blessing prayer petitioned God to bless the bread “as thou didst bless the five loaves in the wilderness, that all who partake thereof may receive health of body and soul.” 85 Such bread was, like the holy water blessed in the beginning of the Mass, a powerful sacramental with apotropaic significance. As such, it was highly valued by the people just as holy water was for protection from the diabolic. It was reverently kept in the home and carried in the pockets of the devout, along with many other sorts of blessed articles. Likely in mind for such people were the words of the blessings, which often prayed for graces and protection to be given to the one who carried the blessed item.

The bread for the blessing was provided by a family of the parish chosen on a rota. Before the prayer service of matins on the day of the Mass (which as we have seen all the parish would have attended as it would have been held on Sundays and holy days), the provider of the bread would have processed ceremoniously to the high altar and ritually offered a candle to the priest and recited a special prayer of offering. Also as mentioned above, the provider and their household would have been mentioned in the Sunday

84 See Missale, cols 34 **-36** **; Manuale, A: 67. The Missale contains two benedictions of bread (the general blessing is described as ‘another’ blessing of bread), the Sunday version of which only is found in the printed versions of the Manuale. The Sunday blessing, beginning with the gospel In principio etc., is described here.
85 ...sicut benedixisti quinque panis in deserto, ut omnes ex eo gustantes tam corporis quam animae accipient sanitatem.
Bidding Prayer. This as well reinforced the bonds of neighborly charity in the medieval parish.

In some churches, after the blessing the loaf would be divided among the households of the parish “every man to his degree.” The size of their piece depended, like the order of the passing of the pax, on the place of the family in the community, a reflection once again of the social order. Also like the pax, the holy loaf was an indication of the health of the community. It could be the cause of contention for the claiming of too large a piece, a sign of unjust pride, or could alternatively be a sign or occasion of community reconciliation and mutual charity.

The Sarum Use: Particular Traditions and Seasonal Features

The traditions of Sundays and weekdays are of course not the sum of the Sarum Use. The liturgy of medieval England was in use every day of the liturgical year, and framed the lives of English Christians on normal occasions as well as the great feasts of the Christian calendar. While not all of the following elements are strictly liturgical, they were all related to the liturgy of the parish church which the medieval layperson would have conceived of as one and the same with the liturgy itself. Architecture, offering, devotion, and prayer all came together in the parish church and must be considered as integral to the English experience of the Sarum Use as the rubrics and ceremonies of the Mass.

In the last two centuries since interest in Sarum revived in the mid-nineteeth century, a number of features have consistently been identified and highlighted as

---

86 Duffy, Stripping, 127.
87 Duffy provides example of both functions; see the stories of John ‘Kareles’ and Mistress Sharp, ibid., 127-28.
distinctive of the Sarum Use. As such, a description of the distinctiveness of Sarum would be incomplete without discussion of the following points.

Roods and Rood Screens

The rood screen of course served not only an architectural and devotional function but a liturgical one, marking the central axis of the parish church. It served as the altarpiece for the nave altars at which most parishioners would have had they experience of weekday Mass, as well as the place from which the week’s bedes were bidden. Though not actually specified in the rubrics of the missal, the gospel was commonly sung from the rood-loft on Sundays, and was also perhaps the normal place of the parish choristers if no choir loft existed. At Holy Week, the passion narrative of Matthew, Luke, and John were commonly sung by clerics from the height of the rood-loft. The rood screen is a classic example of functional decoration.

The rood screen was much more than a simple barrier. It was an integral element of the rubrics of the Sarum Use. In The Stripping of the Altars, Eamon Duffy comments that “The screen itself was both a barrier and no barrier. It was not a wall but rather a set of windows, a frame for the liturgical drama[.]” The screen was pierced by a door through the dado, through which the clergy and sacred ministers could pass to the choir and sanctuary beyond. This boundary could also be penetrated on some occasions by laypeople, who assembled there for processions in some localities on holy days such as Candlemas and Easter. The barrier was permeable in the opposite direction on the same

---

89 Duffy, Stripping, 112.
occasions. On Palm Sunday and Corpus Christi, the clergy carried the Host out of the screen to process among the people for their worship. More frequently, sacramentals and blessed things came through during and after the parish liturgy. On Sundays, the venerated Gospel texts, the pax-brede, holy water, and blessed bread issued forth from the sanctuary, passing through the screen into the nave. Through the mediation of the screen, the parishioner also glimpsed the most important sight of all, the elevation of the Host, God become flesh on the altar. The rood screen was thus anything but a static, impenetrable barrier, but was a permeable, active one.

The rood screen both separated and unified nave and choir, drawing the onlooker toward recognition of both the difference between heaven and earth and the vital connection between them created by the liturgy. Incense, hushed voices, slight glimpses of the activity at the altar – all of these emphasized the inaccessibility of the divine, while the revelatory meaning and theophany of the Mass was reinforced at those times when the screen was opened and the holy proceeded out. Thus the rood screen functioned as both a barrier and a frame, as it separated the people from the liturgy at the same time as it enhanced the experience of seeing. The medieval way of seeing was capable of complex ways of processing meaning through many images and concepts simultaneously. The screen functioned to focus sight through an hierarchy of images to the summit of seeing – the Host at the moment of consecration.
Sarum Processions

As we have seen, processions were weekly occurrences and served the practical function of bringing the celebrant and ministers to the high altar.90 On particularly solemn occasions, the spectacle could be impressive, with up to three processional crosses, images of saints borne about by several men, and three clerics in copes whose role it was to chant the processional prayers. On Palm Sunday, Corpus Christi, and on the four days of Rogationtide (around the late Spring feast of the Ascension), large processions would wend their way around the churchyard and pause at predetermined ‘stations,’ at which antiphons would be sung and gospels read, which served both an apotropaic function (the reading of the gospel was itself thought to have the power of driving away the diabolic) and a didactic one. At the Rogationtide processions, ministers and people bearing crosses, hand-bells, and banners would ‘beat the bounds’ of the parish, as a means both of praying to God for the driving away of the influence of evil from their homes and for the blessing of the land for good weather and a good harvest.91 Along the way, the Sarum Litany of the Saints would be sung to invoke the prayers of the saints for the parish. On a more earthly note, the Rogationtide procession was a reinforcement of community identity, pointing out as it did the ecclesiastical borders of the parish and ensuring that parish borders were generally known. In Morebath as in other parishes, Rogationtide was also associated with the reconciliation of conflict and the preservation of neighborly charity.92

---

90 Bailey, Processions, 12ff.
91 Duffy, Stripping, 136-39; 217; 279-81; Rogationtide processions which ran into one another could come to conflict, as one suspected the other of driving demonic influences from one locality to the other. The processions themselves could also take on a more parochial-political dimension in the wake of Reformation troubles and controversies; see Ethan Shagan, “Confronting compromise: the schism and its legacy in mid-Tudor England,” in Catholics and the Protestant nation,” 57.
92 Duffy, Morebath, 61-64.
On Palm Sunday and Corpus Christi as well, the Sacrament was carried in procession to bless and sanctify the parish and its inhabitants. Roger Martin of Long Melford described the Palm Sunday procession, in which “a fair canopy” was borne by four yeomen of the parish through the door of the parish church. A similar procedure was followed for the procession of the Sacrament at Corpus Christi. On Palm Sunday, the boughs of yew and boxwood would first be blessed (palms being scarce in medieval England), and then the Host and monstrance would be processed to the Palm Cross in the churchyard, a stone or wooden cross built just for this occasion, which would also be festooned with boughs of yew and box tree in lieu of palms. The procession would wind around to each designated station for prayers and readings, before the monstrance was positioned above the door of the church. The people would proceed beneath the Sacrament on their way back into the building, whereupon Mass would begin.

As major part of the liturgy of the Sarum Use, there was much festivity associated with processions, particularly those of Rogationtide in the warmth of Spring. These processions about the bounds of the parish were according to Duffy “with the exception of the annual Easter communion, the most explicitly parochial ritual events of the year,” and were occasions of beneficence by those members of the parish community who had recently died. Medieval wills are full of bequests of money and eatables “in brede and ale” which were given out at this time at the expense of the deceased’s estate. So great was the atmosphere of festivity and celebration, that the entire ceremony was thought by some of

---

93 Though the Sarum processional describes an elaborate ‘feretory,’ or wooden platform and monstrance carried by two clerks over which was carried a silken canopy by a third, this direction was evidently superseded in some places by a later custom by the time of Martin’s experience of the ritual in the early sixteenth century The Spoil of Long Melford Church, 5; cf. 5 note 22. The observation here is of great interest; “A rare rubric in a mid-15th century missal (British Library, Arundel 109, f. 70) speaks of the ‘modern’ practice of having four clerks to carry, above the feretory, a pallium of silk supported on four staves. Martin therefore is apparently describing this ‘modern’ practice, or rather a localised variant of it (ex inf. David Chadd).

the reform-minded to tend towards irreverence, drunkenness, and blasphemy. Some reformers even called for their abolition on these grounds, though the Rogation processions were retained in a modified form for the Church of England by the reign of Elizabeth I. That medieval religion was a communal experience is nowhere as clear as in these processions, which at once sanctified, protected, and solidified the parish community.

Sarum Lenten Traditions

For medieval Christians, Lent was a time markedly different from the rest of the year. The ecclesiastical calendar was the primary method of telling time and penetrated all aspects of spiritual as well as secular life. In Lent, as in the other penitential season of Advent, the Church forbade marriages in the spirit of penitence. For the forty days of Lent (Lat. Quadragesima) beginning on Ash Wednesday, the faithful were enjoined to abstain from meat, eggs, and cheese in order to tame desire for worldly things through affliction and to remember the Passion. Fasting was also obliged during seasonal Embertides –on the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the weeks around St. Lucy’s Day (13 December), Ash Wednesday, Whitsunday (Pentecost), and Holy Cross (14 September). Fasting was also common on the vigils of other major feasts of the year, in some places including some of the days of Rogationtide. In all, while there were seventy days in total when healthy, adult Christians were expected to fast according to these rules, the majority of them fell during the forty-day Lenten season.

95 It is probable that, though an undue revelry might have occurred in some places, the accusations of the Henrician reformists were connected more with their objection to processions and sacramentals than to a desire to simply ‘purify’ the motives of the participants as all processions were later banned under Edward VI; see Duffy, *Stripping*, 426, 568; for their fleeting abolition under Edward VI, see 452. 96 For the complete catalogue of feasts whose vigils were fasting days, see Duffy, *Stripping*, 41.
Several Lenten customs seem to have been peculiar to the Sarum Use. First, as in contemporary Roman Catholic and ‘higher-church’ Protestant practice, the images of the church would be veiled for the entirety of Lent.97 Every church possessed a set of these cloths, or *pepla*. In contrast to contemporary veils which are usually violet, English image veils seem to have been generally of unbleached linen or silk, off-white in color, and decorated with small, often red, crosses for the Passion. The tradition of the Lenten veil (*velum Quadragesimale*) and rood-cloth was similar. In deliberate imitation of the veil of the Jewish Temple, the chancel and altar were obscured on Lenten weekdays from the sight of the people by a large linen cloth, similarly uncolored and decorated with embroidered or stained iconography of the cross or the story of the Passion.98 Its coloring often took up the entire space of the cloth, such that accounts speak of Lenten cloths which were purple, red, blue, or yellow. Similarly, there was another cloth known as the rood-cloth which hung from the ceiling before the great rood, obscuring it as well through the Lenten season.99 Numerous churchwardens’ accounts speak to expenditures for the cloths, their decoration, or hooks and cord used to hang and draw them. Some of the medieval metal hooks and brackets are still extant.

The *velum Quadragesimale* had the liturgical purpose of obscuring the altar from sight for much of the holiest part of the Mass, a function for which it received the additional name of the *velum Templi* under which it is sometimes known in churchwardens’ accounts.100 At the climax of the Passion of St. Matthew on Palm Sunday, the veil would be lowered at the mention of the rending of the veil of the Jerusalem

---

97 Feasey, 1-12. For the dating of the tradition in England to the time of Alfred the Great, see 14.
98 Ibid., 13-31.
99 Ibid., 32-49.
100 Frere, *Use of Sarum*, vol. 1, 139-40; Duffy, *Stripping*, 111 note 64.
Temple. On the weekdays of Lent, the veil was raised only for the reading of the gospel, and was lowered again at the Orate Fratres, obscuring the Canon of the Mass and the all-important sacring. On the more solemn days of Lent the veil was not used.

Like the rood screen, the veil was a barrier whose function was the obscure what was behind and increase thereby reverence for and the desire to see it. “The veil was there,” Duffy illuminates, “precisely to function as a temporary ritual deprivation of the sight of the sacring. Its symbolic effectiveness derived from the fact that it obscured for a time something which was normally accessible; in the process it heightened the value of the spectacle it temporarily concealed.” Influenced as it undoubtedly is by medieval mystery play and sacred theater, concealing and revealing are in fact some of the primary motifs of Lent and Holy Week in the Sarum Use.

Toward the end of the season, the rood-cloth moved to the center of attention as the people longed to see the rood. The end of Lent naturally drew great attention to the centrality of the cross. On Palm Sunday, the rood would be unveiled for the procession in a uniquely dramatic and impressive manner, remaining so until evensong. At Roger Martin’s Long Melford, and prescribed in some manuscripts of the Sarum Missal, upon the re-entrance of the processio into the church, “a boy with a thing in his hand, dressed as a prophet of the Old Testament, would sing “Look ye, O Jerusalem, to the east and see! Lift, O Jerusalem, thine eyes and see the power of thy king.”

As it will be recalled, the feretory bearing the Host was standing over the church doors where the people had proceeded under it back into the nave. It was then taken in

---

101 There is some indication of the erosion of this custom by the sixteenth century due to pressure from the laity to be able to see the sacring as in other parts of the year; see, 111; Frere, *Use of Sarum*, vol. 1, 140.
procession through the interior. While the procession wound around the nave, a choir of boys would sing the *Ecce Rex tuus* and the hymn *Gloria, laus et honor*. During the *Gloria, laus et honor*, in a tradition dating to the mid-eighth century, the celebrant would bless flowers and boughs, which would be scattered from the parapets of the rood screen before the procession below. In a tradition which may have been shared with other communities, at Long Melford, ‘singing cakes,’ small baked cakes or unconsecrated hosts (their exact nature is unclear) were thrown to the boys of the choir as reward for their service. The procession moved to its culmination at the entrance to the rood screen, as on Sundays. The veil was theatrically drawn from before the great rood, and the anthem *Ave, Rex noster* was sung, for which Duffy gives the following translation:

Hail, our King, Son of David, Redeemer of the World, whom the prophets proclaimed the saviour of the house of Israel who is to come. You indeed are the saving victim whom the Father has sent into the world, for whom the saints have waited from the beginning of the world. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest.

The people knelt for the anthem and the clergy kissed the floor in veneration. Following this, the Mass began. At the Mass of Palm Sunday, similar to Good Friday, the Passion narrative (on this occasion according to St. Matthew) was sung from the rood-loft by three clerics, with the words of Christ sung in a deep bass tone.

There can be no question of the comprehension by the laypeople of at least the basic meaning of the rich ceremonies of Palm Sunday as well as those ceremonies of Holy Week still to come. *The Book of Margery Kempe* includes three chapters which amount to a mystical lay meditation on the ceremonies of Holy Week, and John Mirk’s *Festial* and *Speculum Sacerdotale* include copious notes for clergy as well as homiletical material on

---

103 Ibid., 22-25; Hutton, 183; Feasey, 53ff; for the blessing of the flowers thrown from the rood-loft for the procession, once again seen as powerful sacramentals, see Missale, cols 255-57.
the ceremonies, which were meant not only to provide sermons for these occasions but also to inform the laypeople, who were likely to ask questions of the priest either before or after the ceremonies “of thynges that towchen to servyce of holy chyrche, and namly of thys tyme.”

For those laypeople who were attentive to preaching and teaching (provided they had a reasonably educated and helpful parish priest), the Church provided ample opportunity for understanding the ceremonies of Holy Week.

Sarum Holy Week: Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter

After the splendid procession and Mass of Palm Sunday followed naturally the three holiest days in the Christian year: Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Saturday vigil night and Sunday of Easter. Due to the complexity of these ceremonies, in what follows I shall seek to emphasize only those aspects of the Triduum ceremonies which are unique to the Sarum Use, assuming a degree of familiarity with the traditions of the common Roman Holy Week.

Holy Thursday

The Mass of Holy Thursday was known in the medieval period as *Dominica in Cena Domini*, or ‘Sharp’ or ‘Sheer’ Thursday, for the cutting of hair and beards which was observed by those who had grown them for Lenten penance. The day was also known as Maundy Thursday, possibly after the *mandatum*, or command given the disciples by Christ at the Last Supper, or for the *maund*, or baskets, in which the alms to the poor were kept

---

which were given on this day. This occurred at the ‘Maundy’ or the ceremonial washing of feet which was kept separately from the Mass itself. The ceremony of foot-washing was not a purely liturgical event in the medieval period. The custom was kept in royal courts such as that of England, France, and Spain. In England, the Sovereign would wash the feet of poor men, and the King’s Almoner would be instructed to give alms in the form of cloth, shoes, or coin. English monarchs such as Edward II are known to have kept the tradition before the Reformation, and Elizabeth I and James II are known to have continued the practice afterwards, though the ceremony fell into disuse in England after the accession of the Hanoverians. The custom of the monarch distributing ‘maundy money,’ however, after services continues in contemporary times on this occasion, though without the traditional washing of feet.

Three Hosts would be consecrated at the Mass of Holy Thursday. One would be consumed at the Mass, and the other two reserved for the next day, Good Friday, on which day the consecration of the Host was forbidden. Each of the altars of the church was then to be stripped of their cloths and washed with wine and water by bundles of twigs, symbolic of the stripping from Christ of his garments and his scourging. Sermon material such as that in Mirk’s *Festial* drove home the import of these ceremonies, even referencing so small a details as the five crosses on the altar stone which were individually washed and scourged to make a didactic point on the five wounds. The pax was also not given on the Maundy, “for Iudas betrayd Crist thys nyght wyth a cosse.”

---

105 Feasey, *Holy Week Ceremonial*, 96; 107ff; for the Chrism Mass, see pp. 102ff.
106 Ibid., 110-11.
110 Mirk, *Festial*, 126; “The auter-ston bytokenyþe Cristis body [at was drawon on þe crosse as ys a skyn of parchment on þe harrow, soo [at all his bonys myȝ be told. The besom [at hit ys waschen wyth, betokenyþ þe scorges [at beton hys body, and þe þornes [at he
Good Friday

No Mass was to be celebrated on Good Friday. In the Sarum Missal, the day is known as *Feria sexta in Paraceve*, using the biblical description of the day as that of the Paraceve, or day of preparation for the Sabbath. The MR1962 names the day *Feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini*. Instead of Mass, a particularly solemn liturgy commemorated the Passion. The narrative of St. John was read in its entirety, with “a small dramatic embellishment.” At the words “They parted my garments among them,” two clerics removed plain linen cloths which had been placed on the altar for the purpose. The traditional Good Friday intercessions were then prayed for Church, Pope, and the whole world, each followed by the customary versicle *Flectamus genua* etc. A veiled crucifix was brought into the view of the people, at which point to *Impropria*, or ‘Reproaches,’ were sung, in a form somewhat abbreviated from that in the MR1962, but still opening with the convicting words of the prophets of the Old Testament put into the mouth of Christ “O my people, what have I done unto thee, or wherein have I wearied thee? testify against me. Because I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, thou hast prepared a cross for thy Saviour.”

The crucifix was unveiled three times, with each unveiling preceded by the priest’s chanting of the words “Behold, the wood of the cross, on which hung the salvation of the world. O come, let us adore.” Psalm 67 was then chanted with the antiphon “We adore thy

---

was crowned wythall. The watyr and þe wyne þat hyt is washen wyth, hitokneþe þe blod and þe watyr þat ran downe aþyr þe spere from Cristis herþ þat waschet his body. The wyne þat is powred on þe v crosseþ, hitokneþe þe blod þat ran out of þe fyue wondys principale of þys body” [emphasis mine]. This reference to both the washing and the absence of the pax on this day would seem to indicate a significant degree of lay comprehension of the ceremony, or at least the effort to bring about such comprehension.

cross, O Lord, and we praise and glorify thy holy resurrection; for lo, by the cross joy hath come to the whole world.”

Following this was perhaps the most iconic moment of the Sarum Holy Week, the ceremony known as the “creeping to the Crosse.” The choir would sing the antiphon *Crux fidelis inter omnes* with the traditional sixth-century hymn *Pange lingua gloriosi* in honor of the cross, as in the Roman liturgy of Good Friday. To these chanted verses, “[c]lergy and people then crept barefoot and on their knees to kiss the foot of the cross, held by two ministers.”

The tradition seems to date to Anglo-Saxon times, and was associated with a great penitential spirit. According to some accounts, there seems even in some places to have been a custom of electing to have the hands beaten by the priest with a “disseplynynge rod” at this time as a sort of ceremonial (and, it might be supposed, literal) corporal penance. The Creeping was a frequent target of reformist criticism, but was exceptionally long-lived. The Creeping survived into the reign of Elizabeth. Duffy reports of an Anglican bishop complaining of “some cereteyn persons,” who “go barefooted and barelegged to the churche, to creepe to the crosse.”

Almsgiving in the form of coin, wheat, eggs, or produce brought to the church seems to have been traditional on Good Friday. The Sovereign was no exception, save that the shillings which he was accustomed to give on this day were customarily melted down and formed into sacramentals called cramp-rings, circlets of silver which, because of their association with St. Edward the Confessor, were thought to be helpful in the miraculous curing of epilepsy.

---

112 Ecce, lignum crucis, in quo sahls mundi pependit, venite adoremus. 62 Crucem tuam adoremus, Domine, et sanctam resurrectionem tuam laudamus et glorificamus; ecce enim propter crucem venit gaudium in universo mundo. Ibid.; Missale, cols 316-33.
113 *Pange lingua gloriosi prælium certaminis*, not of course to be confused with its more commonly-sung Corpus Christi counterpart by St. Thomas Aquinas of the same incipit, *Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium*.
114 Duffy, *Stripping*, 29; Hutton, *Stations*, 188-90; In contrast, both clerics and laypeople are directed by the MR1962 to adore the cross *simplici genuflexione*, though the ministers are directed still to remove their shoes and genuflect thrice before adoring the cross; see *The Daily Missal*, 383.
115 Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, 279-80; for the antiquity of the practice of the Creeping, see Feasey, *Holy Week Ceremonial*, 120.
What Duffy calls "the most imaginatively compelling" of the events of Good Friday was still to come, however: the Easter Sepulcher. After the Creeping, the priest would pray a confession and then the *Pater noster*, and after several additional preparations receive one of the two remaining Hosts which had been consecrated the previous day. With this the liturgy ended, and evensong (that is, Vespers) was directed to be recited, not sung or chanted in view of the somberness of the day.

After evensong, the Sarum rubrics directed that the priest remove his vestments and shoes, donning only a simple surplice. He was to retrieve both the cross which had just been adored and the third and last of the remaining consecrated Hosts of the previous day which had been placed in a small pyx. These he took to the north side of the chancel to the recess in the wall of the church which was known as the Sepulcher, ceremoniously laying both cross and Host into a wooden chest which was rested in the wall. This chest and its Sepulcher were essentially stand-ins for the casket of Christ Himself, and the vigil kept around them was substantially similar to medieval funerary traditions, also involving candlelight vigils kept in honor of the dead. Here the parishioners would keep watch over the corpse of Christ, as it were in the manner of one of their own, until Easter morning.

The priest intoned the first doleful verses of Psalm 88, “I am counted as one of them that go down into the pit” etc., and incensed the Sepulcher chest. The space about the Sepulcher would customarily be illuminated by many candles, which had been purchased by the gift of individual donors or families. These candles were lit and placed

---

117 Customarily, the pyx in which the Sacrament was normally kept was used for this purpose after being taken down from its customary place suspended above the altar. Tabernacles for storing the Sacrament had not yet come into general use. The pyx for use on Good Friday was often very costly and decorated with precious materials; see Duffy, *Stripping*, 30; Feasey, *Holy Week Ceremonial*, 164-65.

118 It should be noted that, as the Sepulcher was often inside the rood screen, this is another example of the screen itself being a fluid and penetrable barrier at certain times of the liturgical year, and not a simple partition.

on a wooden frame about the Sepulcher, which could often be elaborate even for such a temporary structure. At Long Melford, this frame seems also to have been used as the Tenebræ herse, an arrangement that was perhaps fairly common.120 Some rubrics directed that a taper be lit and placed in the Sepulcher itself with the cross and Host. Rich hangings and curtains in gold, white, and purple were also customary elements of the temporary Sepulcher shrine. Parish accounts are replete with expenses for the Sepulcher hangings and cords used to tie and draw them about the recess. The people kept watch over the Sepulcher until Easter morning, making sure the candles were looked after properly and that no one disturbed the shrine. Some accounts mention “brede, ale and fyre” which was provided to several parishioners or the parish clerk for this duty.121

The Sepulcher tradition grew slowly from the end of the fourteenth century, when it was only in use in a few English parishes which show the richly decorated Sepulcher cover cloth on their parish inventories of goods.122 The tradition increased steadily in popularity from this time until the middle of the sixteenth century, by which time it was nearly universal save in a few rural localities in which it had not yet been adopted.

The Easter Sepulcher was both the name of the tradition and a feature of ecclesiastical architecture.123 Essentially a recess in the wall, or more rarely a covered stone

---

120 On the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Holy Week the service of Tenebræ was held in the church, which consisted of matins and lauds (morning- and evensong) of the day. The people would have of course been in attendance. The word itself is the Latin for ‘darkness’ and is derived from the practice of gradually extinguishing the candles (normally anywhere from 15 to 25 of them) which were held in the Tenebræ ‘herse’ or large candelabra, normally of wood and made for the purpose. The Tenebræ service remains a part of the Roman order of Holy Week, though it is regrettably not widely attended by the laity nor practiced in parishes. In English custom, it seems that an additional larger candle was left lit throughout the three days and kept hidden behind the altar, a practice which seems to have been symbolic of Christ Himself; for the services of Tenebræ, which I shall not dwell on here, see Ibid., 84-113; for the description of Roger Martin, see The Spoil of Long Melford Church, 3-4; notes 14-15.

121 Duffy, Stripping, 30; Feasey, Holy Week Ceremonial, 168-69.

122 Hutton, Stations, 191.

platform such as that which survives in some English cathedrals, the Sepulcher resembled a stone shelf, similar to the piscina, built with enough space to rest the Sepulcher chest. Other arrangements, such as a separate chapel in some large churches and cathedrals, could also be used. The stone was commonly carved with the scene of Christ’s Resurrection and emerging from the tomb to step over the sleeping Roman guards. The chest itself was very often intricately decorated as well, also with biblical scenes. The location Easter Sepulcher was also valued by medieval parishioners as a place for their own burials. Many of the gentry built Sepulchers to be used by the parish in which they themselves would be buried, while the poorer folk of the parish desired burial as close to the Sepulcher as possible in order to receive the prayers of those who kept watch on Good Friday eve. “The association of one’s own burial,” comments Duffy, “with that of the Host at Easter was a compelling, eloquent, and above all a permanent gesture.”

It’s theological and didactic meaning were powerful, and felt clearly by the laity who were devoted to the tradition. The Easter Sepulcher made visceral the teaching of the Church, “not merely on the saving power of Christ’s cross and Passion but on the doctrine of the Eucharist. With its abundance of lights and night watches it constituted an especially solemn form of public worship of the Host, in many communities far more elaborate even than the Corpus Christi procession.” The decoration of the chest and Sepulcher bore a didactic message on which the parish could sometimes spend liberally. Duffy describes a new chest purchased in the 1470s by the parish of St. Mary Redcliffe in Bristol, “which had an image of the risen Christ, a model of Hell complete with thirteen devils, four sleeping soldiers armed with spears and axes, four painted angels with detachable timber wings, as

---

123 For a description of the Sepulcher chests, see Feasey, Holy Week Ceremonial, 141ff.
124 See Ibid., 138-141; Duffy, Stripping, 32-33.
125 Duffy, Stripping, 31.
well as representations of God the Father and the Holy Ghost ‘coming out of Heaven into the Sepulcher.’” In parishes which could not afford such an expense, however, the chest was built anew every year from materials like wood or canvas, though this could also be highly decorated, as at Leverton in the Lincolnshire Fens, where it was richly gilded.\textsuperscript{127}

So great was the devotion to the Sepulcher, a structure existing merely one day out of the year, that bequests were often made by wealthy testators of embroidered or otherwise richly decorated bedclothes or hangings meant to decorate the shrine.\textsuperscript{128} During the brief time it was in place, the Sepulcher shrine was covered with a rich cloth and curtained by costly drapery, both of which were decorated with scenes of Christ’s Passion and Resurrection. Individual donors, rich and poor, similarly to those parishioners who contributed to the building of rood screens, also donated to the construction, carving, decoration, and gilding of the Sepulcher chest. Many parishes had Resurrection or Corpus Christi gilds which existed to fund the lights and watchers about the Sepulcher.\textsuperscript{129} These societies sometimes paid all year by subscription to fund a large lamp or candle, the Sepulcher light, to burn before the shrine until Sunday.

\section*{Vigil of Easter on Holy Saturday}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{127} Hutton, \textit{Stations}, 190.
\textsuperscript{128} E.g., Duffy's example of Cecily Leppington of Beverley, who left "my best oversee bed called the Baptest as an ornament to the sepulchre of oure Saviour Criste Jhesu at the fest of Ester;" Duffy, \textit{Stripping}, 33.
\textsuperscript{129} A point of some importance is the question of the difference between the medieval tradition of the Easter Sepulcher and the still-practiced Roman custom of the Altar of Repose (see \textit{The Daily Missal}, 558-59). Commenting on this question, Feasey writes that the two customs in the late medieval period existed parallel to one another after the introduction of the tabernacle as a place of reservation, the Altar of Repose coming into being because it was not at that time considered proper to say Mass at an altar where the Sacrament was reserved in the tabernacle. "Hence," says Feasey, "probably arose the custom of preparing a secondary altar on Maundy Thursday." By way of simplification, the Easter Sepulcher was combined with this ritual such that in Sarum the Reposition is unknown. The Altar of Repose has, however, been the only of the two to survive in the Roman custom; see Feasey, \textit{Holy Week Ceremonial}, 176-77.
\end{footnotesize}
The Sarum Vigil of Easter, or *Sabbato Sancto in Vigilia Paschae*, was in earlier times like that of the Roman rite in general held on the evening of Holy Saturday in anticipation of the Sunday. Western liturgical custom gradually transferred the observance of the liturgy to the day-time, and thus the ceremony was much less popular than the Mass of Easter morning, when the parishioners would have received Easter ‘rights.’

The Sarum vigil Mass is substantially similar to the Roman. Following the blessing of the new fire and the pascal candle, a procession followed into the church where the deacon would chant the *Exsultet* and impose several blessed grains of incense into the wax of the paschal candle. Then followed the customary readings from the Old Testament with prescribed orations, tracts, and the usual response *Flectamus genua* etc. The Litany of the Saints was sung, which preceded the blessing of the baptismal water. Mass was celebrated and followed by evensong, at the end of which the deacon chanted the new Eastertide dismissal with the Alleluia once again included: *Ite, missa est, alleluia.*

Easter Sunday

Before the Mass of the feast on Easter morning, the clergy gathered in choir for the conclusion of the Sepulcher ceremony. All the lights in the church, candles and lamps, were lit and a procession with two higher clerics and two thurifers and taperers was made to the Sepulcher shrine, which was then incensed. After genuflecting, the Host was removed

---

123 The ritual seems to have been held by the twelfth century in some places in the afternoon; see Feasey, *Holy Week Ceremonial*, 186; the vigil Mass was restored to the more ancient practice of the vigil in post-1955 Roman missals after the reform of Holy Week in the pontificate of Pius XII; see *The Daily Missal*, 592-93; cf. *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae instauratus* (Rome: Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, 1956).

125 The ceremony is found in *Missale*, cols 334-358.

126 In some places, it seems to have been customary to light the new fire with light from the sun by means of a burning glass or crystal. In some places flint was employed. In the latter case it would seem that the celebration had already drifted into the day-time; see Feasey, *Holy Week Ceremonial*, 187.

127 Duffy, *Stripping*, 30-31; the ritual itself is found in *Missale*, cols 357-60; *Processionale*, 91-94.
from the Sepulcher chest and taken in procession to a place on the north altar of the
curch. In some places, the pyx placed in the Sepulcher was itself an image of Christ
crucified and doubled as the cross venerated on Good Friday. The image was made with a
recess in which was placed the Host for the burial in the Sepulcher. In this case, the image
itself was placed on the north altar, whereupon the procession faced it and the presider of
the ceremony would intone the antiphon Christus resurgens etc., for which Duffy gives the
following translation:

Christ, rising again from the dead, dieth now no more. Death shall no more have
dominion over him. For in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Now let the Jews
declare how the soldiers who guarded the sepulcher lost the king when the stone
was placed, wherefore they kept not the rock of righteousness. Let them either
produce him buried, or adore him rising, saying with us, [Chorus respondeat]
Alleluia, Alleluia.

After a response and oration in honor of Christ’s Resurrection (Deus, qui pro nobis
Filiun), the clerics and people present would perform the creeping to the cross just as they
had on Good Friday. Afterward, all the crosses and images in the church, including the
great rood, were finally uncovered. The sprinkling procession was done, with the post-
paschal antiphon Vidi aquam etc. in place of the normal Asperges me. The clerics present
would then chant the daytime office of Sext.

An elaborate procession followed, with priest, deacon, and subdeacon, with a holy
water bearer and three processional crosses, as well as the two thurifers and taperers. The
entire company then sung the Easter hymn Salve, fèsta dies, at the conclusion of which they
turned back toward the cross and sang the antiphon Sedit angelus ad sepulchrum Domini
etc.:

An angel stood at the sepulcher of the Lord, clad in shining raiment: the women
beholding him, filled with exceeding great terror, stood afar off. Then the angel
spake, and said unto them, Fear not, I say unto you, for he whom ye seek among
the dead now liveth, and the life of mankind now hath risen with him.

124
Three clerics vested in copes then sung the verse from the pulpit:

Praise him who was crucified in the flesh; and glorify him who was buried on our behalf, and adore him who rose from the dead. Fear not, I say unto you, for he whom ye seek among the dead now liveth, and the life of mankind now hath risen with him.

A response followed this, \textit{V: The Lord is risen from the grave. R: Who hung for us upon the tree.} The oration for the Mass of Easter day was then said, \textit{Deus qui hodierna die etc.}

The Mass of the day was said later, and contained not the Roman sequence \textit{Victimæ paschali laudes} but a lengthy sequence \textit{Fulgens praeclara rutilat etc.}, which put Christ’s victory over death and the Devil in stark and dramatic Latin verse. This Mass was perhaps the most lengthy of the year, as it included not only this protracted sequence but also the people’s Easter Communion, which as we have seen usually included every man and woman in the parish canonically and sacramentally allowed to receive. Spreading the houseling cloth in front of the rood screen, each layperson knelt to receive the Host from the priest, having reconciled their differences with their neighbors. The way they began and sustained their activity during Holy Week – in the Palm Sunday procession, the Creeping, and the watch before the Easter Sepulcher – was the way they also ended it, that is, affirming not only their devotion to God, but also their charity toward one another and their commitment to Christian neighborhood. Of course, medieval society, like our own, had no shortage of discord and failure to live up to their own standards, but the ritual of Holy Week, as well as the preaching which reinforced it, clearly had this ideal in mind.
Sarum *Sanctorale* and *Temporale per annum*

It is not necessary here to go through every tradition of the Sarum *sanctorale*. This has already been amply covered by scholars like Duffy, Pfaff, and Ronald Hutton in their collective work on medieval religious and folk traditions based on the liturgical calendar. I will draw attention here only to a few of the many seasonal traditions of the calendar. I discussed above Lenten and Holy Week traditions, but the Sarum year had many other observances, some of which, like the seasonal Embertide fasts, were already mentioned. In many cases, these festivals and holy days were, like Embertide, closely connected to seasonal and agricultural events, in which the profession most of the population was occupied. As the ecclesiastical calendar was the main method of reckoning time in the medieval period, dates for the holding of fairs, the conducting of civil elections in towns, the collection of rents, and the changing of municipal officers were often held on ecclesiastical festivals. The Anglo-Saxons held their wheat harvest festival of ‘hlaef-mass’ or ‘loaf-mas’ on 1 August, which came to be called Lammas Day. Though actually the Feast of St. Peter in Chains on the liturgical calendar, Lammas Day was kept as an English folk festival on a para-liturgical basis. Every 1 August, the English were accustomed to bring the first fruits of their cereal harvest to the church to be blessed and eaten as blessed bread. On Lammas Day as well, there were held fairs, elections, rent collections, and the changing of city officials. Though the tradition of Lammas Day was later lost, it seems to survive in the customary blessing of herbs and first fruits prescribed in the Roman Ritual for the Feast of the Assumption on 15 August, just several short weeks later.

---

*Hutton, Stations, 330-31; for Michaelmas in medieval England and Scotland, see 348-49.*
Midsummer, in which trees and grasses are at the peak of their growth and the sun was at its closest to the earth was considered a time of great significance as a sign of strong and renewed life after the celebration of Easter, Whitsun, and Corpus Christi. In the midsummer was kept the feasts of St. John the Baptist and Sts. Peter and Paul on 24 and 29 June. The days between these two feasts were very widely celebrated with outdoor frivolity and bonfires kindled by children and youth in celebration of what was known as ‘Midsummer Eve,’ on which “yn þe worschip of Saynt Ion, men waken at evyn, and maken þre maner of fyrys.” Mirk’s *Festial* explains to the people the meaning of these three fires in a homily for the day: “On ys clen bonys and no wod, and ys callyd a bonnefyre; anoþer is of clene wod and no bonys, and ys callyd a wakefyre, for men syttyth and wakyth by hyt; the thryd ys made of bonys and wode, and ys callyd Saynt Ionys fyre.” The fire of bones, it was said by some, was useful in driving away venomous dragons as well as symbolizing St. John’s “brenynge love and charyte to God and man.” The second fire of wood gave light, and so brought to mind the Baptist’s message of the coming Light of Christ, while the third of bones and wood brought to mind the martyrdom of St. John, whose body was, according to popular tradition, burned. It is, as Hutton emphasizes, difficult to prove that these customs were universal, but the Tudor kings, Henry VII and Henry VIII, seem to have also kept this midsummer custom of bonfires and festivity for the feasts of St. John and Sts. Peter and Paul. One can thus be reasonably sure that the midsummer bonfires were a common feature of the social calendar, and provide a unique example of the blending of the social and religious into the living tradition of Sarum.

---

136 See Ibid., 185; for Mirk’s note on the driving away of dragons, see also Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, 299-300; Hutton, *Stations*, 313.
The liturgical calendar was in many myriad senses connected to the agricultural year. The sowing of seed was just as important as the harvest of the crop. Following Christmas, the fields would be ploughed for the sowing of grain. In many places, plough gilds existed which maintained lights in the parish church.\footnote{Hutton, Stations, 124-33.} The function of the gilds was not only devotional in order to pray for a successful harvest, but also immensely practical. As, apart from the wealthiest, most parishioners could not afford their own plough, the communal plough was loaned out which could sometimes be found resting in the church when not in use, as at Great Yarmouth in Norfolk and Holbeach in Lincolnshire. In some localities, ‘Plough Sunday’ was kept on the first Sunday after Epiphany, when the ploughs were blessed for the sowing season. On ‘Plough Monday,’ there was in East Anglia and elsewhere the tradition of ‘drawing the plough,’ where the plough (presumably the communal one) was taken around to each house and money collected for the parish.

In some places the proceeds seem to have gone to the upkeep of the plough-light, in others to the young men’s gild. In the latter case, the young men are said to have strapped themselves to the plough and threatened (presumably only jokingly?) to plough up the front yard of any house which refused to contribute. There may have been a certain ritual to this - a song, dance, or even a play which was performed while the plough was brought around. A parish ale festivity was sometimes also held to raise additional funds.\footnote{Duffy, Stripping, 13. Duffy observes that this tradition left its mark even in the parish church buildings, so important were these lay activities: “At Carston in Norfolk the magnificently carved beam of the plough-galley [presumably the place atop the rood screen on which were placed the plough-lights] survives, with its fertility prayer and its final pun on the fund-raising plough ales or festivals: ‘God speele the plow / And send us all corne enow / our purpose for to mak / at crow of cok of the plowlete of Sygate / Be mery and glade / Wat Goodale this work mad.’”} On ‘hock [or ‘hoke’] days,’ which fell on the Monday and Tuesday of the second week of Easter, the young people of the parish held a further festival in which the young men and

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{God spede the plow / And send us all corne enow / our purpose for to mak / at crow of cok of the plowlete of Sygate / Be mery and glade / Wat Goodale this work mad.”}
\end{flushleft}
women would, each on their allotted day, bind and hold the opposite sex hostage (again, presumably in a spirit of good fun) until the prisoner paid ‘hock-money’ for the parish or for the young men’s or women’s gilds. This is a prime expression of the medieval fascination with occasionally upending normal social structures; in many places it was exclusively the young women doing the Hocktide capturing. It was young women also who on the eve of the Feast of St. Agnes (21 January) could find the identity of their future lovers in a dream or vision upon retiring to bed for the night. Another example of this tradition of misrule is found in the ‘boy-bishop’ celebrations, in which a young boy of the parish was given episcopal vestments to wear and headed some liturgical activities for the day, usually on the feasts of St. Nicholas and Holy Innocents during the Advent and Christmas season.

Another unique occasion was the Sarum Feast of Relics, held after its transfer in 1319 on the Sunday following the Translation of Becket on 7 July. As we have seen, this was one of the earliest elements of the Sarum Use, deriving from the festival at Salisbury itself to honor the relics which were kept in the cathedral. As Sarum became the most widespread English liturgy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the feast became a common feature of the calendar in which the relics of all saints were honored. Pfaff notes a rubric of this feast found in some manuscripts of the Sarum Processionale which is of significant interest. After the procession returned to the church, “they there are to read the names of the relics in the mother tongue (in lingua materna); and meanwhile they are then
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139 Ibid.; Brand, Popular Antiquities, 187; for the connection of Hocktide to episodes of traditional misrule in the wake of Christmas and Easter, see Hutton, Stations, 207; the tradition of Hocktide is similar to the Polish custom of Śmigus-dyngus, or Dyngus Day, held also on Easter Monday and Tuesday, on which boys and girls practice similar antics; see Christopher Buck, Religious Celebrations: An Encyclopedia of Holidays, Festivals, Solemn Observances, and Spiritual Commemorations (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011), 271.
140 Memorable perhaps for Keat’s The Eve of St. Agnes, which dramatizes this tradition.
141 Hutton, Stations, 103-4.
to wash the relics, with the choir following.” This great care and reverence was characteristic of other expressions of medieval devotion to the saints and reflected the attachment to the cult of relics. Churches with important relics of apostles, martyrs, or popular English saints could expect many pilgrims on this day when the relics were brought out as well as the saint’s feast day. The fact that the names of the relics were read aloud in the vernacular should also not escape notice – the feast was meant to be a catechetical one to teach the power and reality of the saints to those who had assembled. Saints were of course of inestimable importance to pre-Reformation devotion in England, and the nation had one in particular with whom it identified and to whom it was devoted.

English Veneration of the Saints: St. George

Other saints, like St. George, were extremely popular as symbols of English identity. English veneration of St. George seems also to have been intimately tied to the Crusades. The growth in his cult may be attributable to the martial Plantagenet monarchs – Edward III and Henry V – over the two centuries following the official establishment of the liturgical feast in England in 1222. Until the Reformation, the premier English order of chivalry celebrated his festal Mass at the chapel of Windsor Castle every 23 April. In 1415, the feast was raised to one of major commemoration with equal status to Christmas by

---
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132 Pfaff, Liturgy, 419-20; Processionale, 150 [translation mine; the punctuation of the Latin is from Pfaff], Pfaff connects this rubric to the tendency toward the “extendibility” and “fussy excess of details” characteristic of the “New Ordinal” of the fourteenth century.
133 cf. Duffy, Stripping, 190-91.
134 Hanael P. Bianchi, "The St. George's Society of New York and the Resurgence of England's National Holiday," New York History, vol. 92 (Winter/Spring 2011): 54; McClendon, 7; This royal encouragement may have been an effort to replace the less martial Edward the Confessor as England’s patron and as a deliberate rival to the French St. Denis during the Hundred-Years War (1337-1453); see Hutton, Stations, 214.
Convocation. Archbishop Chicheley referred to St. George, “as it were the patron and special protector of England.”

Veneration of St. George spread widely through the parishes. Many religious gilds were from York to Devon which took St. George as their patron. As with many of the other medieval gilds and corporations, the dedication to St. George often entailed magnificent ceremonies on the patronal feast day. At Norwich, in a tradition which historian Ronald Hutton dates to 1420, one corporation dedicated to St. George celebrated his feast with a succession of rituals: “First the corporation heard mass at the cathedral... followed directly by a banquet. The next day, the guild provided a procession including a model dragon and people attired as George himself, St. Margaret, and their retinue.” Images of St. George, model dragons, and costumed knights and maidens were also found paraded in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Leicester, Canterbury, and Stratford-upon-Avon, among numerous other towns, in what were popularly known as the ‘ridings’ of St. George. The use of dragons and knights, a reference to conflict with the diabolic, is reminiscent of the Rogationtide processions, which also juxtaposed banners to portray the cosmic conflict between good and evil. Additionally, mystery plays of the legend of St. George appear to have been performed in Lydd, New Romney, Morebath, and Plymouth. Also at Morebath, the cult was particularly strong as St. George was the parish patron. The donations of the young men’s gild appears to have funded the light before his statue and an expensive new image of the saint in 1531. By the reign of Henry VIII, the feast of St.
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146 McClendon suggests that St. George’s lack of a central location for his relics in England helped his cult in becoming attractive for a wide variety of places throughout England; McClendon, 10; for the list of places which hosted gilds dedicated to St. George, see McClendon, “A Moveable Feast,” 7.
George was becoming a national celebration, potently blending patriotic and religious enthusiasm.

Like other solemn Masses in the Sarum Use, the liturgy of St. George’s Day would have begun with a religious procession through and outside the church, bearing banners, candles, incense, and images or statues of the saint. The Processionale prescribes the chanted response *Filiæ Hierusalem*, taken from the Passion of St. Luke, for the feast if it falls on a Sunday, which gives the feast an added depth with a reference to the events of the Passion.\(^1\) The larger, public processions which were sponsored by the gilds or localities would have been separate, though not unrelated events. One might surmise that the image of St. George may have been the same in both instances, as in the statue in the procession at Canterbury.

The paraded image of the dragon was of course no idle one. St. George’s legend was intimately associated with the monstrous creature which he was known for slaying. Surviving sermons were replete with descriptions of the chivalric St. George rescuing the daughter of the king from the dragon and enjoining the people of the pagan city to convert. In the Norwich procession, the princess (and the one portraying her in the day’s festivities) was even given the affectionate English name ‘Margaret.’\(^2\) In Mirk’s *Festial*, George boldly shows no fear in the face of the dragon, to the great rejoicing of all:

> Then callyd George þe pepull aȝeyn, and bade þay schuld not be aferd; for yf þay wolden leue in Crist and take fologht, he wold befyr hom all sle hym and so delyuer hom of hor enmy. Then wer all so glad, þat xx þowsand of men, without woymen and children, we followed, and þe kyng was fyrst followed and all hys houshold.
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\(^1\) *Processionale*, 145; for the general history of English veneration of St. George, see Hutton, *Stations*, 214-17; McClendon, “A Moveable Feast,” 5-7.

\(^2\) *Spesulum Sacerdotale*, 129-33; Mirk, *Festial*, 132-35; for the princess’ popular name given in Norwich, see McClendon, “A Moveable Feast,” 12.
Nor does St. George balk at the tortures which the “Emperour Dyaelisian” commands him to undergo once he discovers George’s conversion of the city. The theme of violence and death and their ultimate vanquishing by resurrection is strong, a point particularly potent in the Springtime of late April. The homilist describes the horror in detail. George in sequence being crushed by a millstone, baked in a lime-kiln, and being made to drink poison, from all of which he is miraculously delivered. Finally, one night in his prison cell, “God come to hym wyth gret light, and bade hym be of good comfort; for in þe morrow he schuld make an end of hys passion, and so com to hym into þe io[y] þat euer schall last.”

The next morning upon refusing once again to sacrifice, Diocletian “made to smyte of hys hed; and soo passed to God.”

Appended to the homily in the _Festial_ is also a short narration of a vision of St. George which was experienced by an Antionchene priest during the First Crusade. St. George commanded the priest to bring his relics to Jerusalem while the city was under siege. When the priest arrived, however, “þe Saracens weren so strong wythin” that the siege was in jeopardy. St. George, the homilist declares, was responsible for the Christian victory in winning the Holy City, with that saint even wearing the habit of a crusader: “Then com Seynt George, cloþyd yn whyte, and a red crosse on hys brest, and ȝode vp þe laddyrs, and bade þe cristen men com aftyr hym.” The claim of assistance from St. George was made by the soldiers of Richard I in the Third Crusade, and seems to have become common knowledge, despite the ultimate failure of the campaign.

Not unintentionally, therefore, the white field with the red cross – a common crusader emblem recalling the white of purity and the red of Christ’s blood – became a banner used with great frequency as the symbol of the patron of the realm, and was connected both to his legendary dragon-slaying and his assistance in the crusade. Indeed,
so potent was the symbol of the flag of St. George that this banner was the only one exempted from the later suppression of the banners of saints, becoming over the next century or so the secular flag of England through its association with the national patron.\footnote{Perrin, British Flags, 40.}

After the civil procession to the church, the celebration of St. George would begin with the vesting of the priest and the chanting of the choir. Most of the texts assigned by the Sarum Missal are those of the Common of One Martyr, with the general themes of martyrdom for belief in Christ and godly fortitude in the face of hardship (the Sarum common includes an obscure medieval sequence, the Organicis canamus). The prayers differ from the Roman prayers for St. George. Most notably, the secreta prayer for the Mass prays for God’s clemency, “so that through these sacred mysteries we might by thy triumph conquer the ancient enemy.” The prayer employs language of conquest and triumph for the feast of the soldier-saint closely associated with the Crusades. The postcommunio recalls his martyrdom and the strong theme of resurrection found in his legend: “Having been satiated by the sweetness of the celestial altar, almighty Father, we beseech thee that by the intercession of blessed George thy martyr, we might become participants in His resurrection by whose death we are redeemed.”\footnote{(Secreta in partu) ut per hæc sacrosancta mysteria antiqui hostis tentamenta, te triumphante, vincamus. (Postcommunio) Mensæ celestis satiati dulcedine, humiliter te rogamus, omnipotens Pater, ut, intercedente beato Georgio martyre tuo, resurrectionis ejus simus particeps, cujus sumus morte redempti [translations mine]; see Missale, col 737. For the less effusively martial prayers of the Roman Mass of St. George, see The Daily Missal, 1237.}

The ‘ridings’ of St. George about Canterbury did not survive the Henrician prohibition against the so-called ‘abuse’ of images. As the entire notion of the feast was a plea for the intercession of St. George, it is perhaps unsurprising that the town’s image of St. George was taken in 1538 by Cranmer’s chancery and presumably destroyed soon
Henrician legislation could be notoriously contrary, however. Despite the official condemnation of the patronage of saints contained in the Ten Articles of 1536 and subsequent injunctions, feasts in honor of the apostles, the Virgin Mary, and St. George, patron of England, were retained. The cult changed irrevocably, however, as a result of the more radical measures taken against the cult of the saints under Edward VI and late Elizabeth I. Gradually St. George became a figure like Britannia or John Bull – merely another national personification and devoid of the layers of meaning, public celebration, and prayers for intercession which the saint had evoked in the medieval period.

The liturgical year was full of celebrations which occurred with great frequency, giving the medieval English laypeople a constant stream of feast days on which they were obliged to attend Mass and public prayer, but on which they also could expect a great deal of festivity. Once again, there was no separation between the liturgical calendar and the social, communal, or professional one. The liturgy provided the frame of reference for time and season, as well as giving order and recognition to the social relations (good or ill) of the parish community. In nearly all aspects of popular custom and tradition, the liturgy played a central role as the determinate of what was expected. It is perhaps in this aspect that the Sarum Use left its deepest mark on the people of England, a mark which survived social chaos and persecution during the next century after the Reformation as the next chapter will explore.
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154 Hutton, Stations, 215.
155 Duffy, Stripping, 394.
156 For the transfer of this idea to America and the revival of English affection for St. George in the nineteenth century, see Bianchi.
CHAPTER IV
SARUM USE CATHOLICS IN PROTESTANT ENGLAND

The periodization of this study has now transitioned from the medieval and Reformation to the English Catholic community, subjects usually studied separately, though recent post-revisionist historical work has sensibly attempted to connect the study of early modern Catholicism to the mainstream of English history.¹ John Bossy’s *The English Catholic Community*, the primary work on English Catholic history, is fraught with historiographical assumptions. Bossy viewed the English Catholic Church not as a continuation of the medieval but as a new creation of the Counter-Reformation, more vital and missionary, and less institutional and clerical than its medieval and Marian forbearers.² This opposition between medieval and post-medieval Catholicism is a species of Bossy’s larger sense of discontinuity between the ‘spectre of the medieval church’ and the consciously post-Marian, Counter-Reformation Church.³ Bossy’s characterization of the ‘traditionalist,’ ‘sleepwalking’ clerics of the defunct medieval church and the adaptable, missionary Jesuits is but one example of his perceived discontinuity. This characterization of Queen Mary has been criticized by historians like Duffy in 2009’s *Fires of Faith*, in which he sees much that was politically astute and akin to the Counter-Reformation in the
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² See Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 4; 15-16; 21.
decisions made under Mary. Other post-revisionists have questioned the ‘separatist’ view of post-Marian Catholics, and emphasized or nuanced their political activity.¹

The continuity between the medieval English Church and the one constituted (or re-constituted) by the missionary priests – as I maintain is shown in the liturgical and devotional habits of the post-Reformation English Catholics – is the interest of this chapter. The continuity was not complete. Due to the tumultuous changes discussed in the last chapter and the loss of Sarum’s English enculturation, historical differences are bound to be observed in liturgical practice before and after the Reformation. Removed from the medieval, monocultural context as it was, however, Sarum nevertheless endured for a time as Sarum. The purpose of this chapter is to trace the later history of the Sarum Use through the Elizabethan settlement and into the seventeenth century, and thereby to draw out both continuities and losses.

The history of this period for the English Catholic community is admittedly fragmentary. Such evidence provides considerable reason, however, to posit the existence of a community of ‘Sarum Use Catholics’ which existed from the accession of Elizabeth at least to the sometime around the fall of the Stuarts in 1688. This section means address these pieces of evidence and attempt to form them into a coherent whole, creating something of a sketch of the Sarum Use after its suppression. Before this, however, I shall attempt a review of relevant historical background for this period.

There is no need to summarize the religious changes under the Tudors, changes which violently and rapidly suppressed much of what this study has painstakingly described thus far. For the religious changes of the period, in particular those liturgical developments to Sarum which occurred under Henry VIII and Mary I, I direct the reader to the extensive work of Eamon Duffy in *The Stripping of the Altars*. Consequently, I move immediately to the reign of Elizabeth I. When the new Queen came to the throne in November 1558, she was not long in reorganizing the religion of the realm, just as her predecessors had done. Parliament passed new acts reasserting the royal supremacy and reformed theology. All the English bishops save one, fourteen in all, lost their positions rather than conform, a testament to the moderate success the Marian regime, which had zealously sought to reform and harden the resistance of the English episcopacy to protestantism. Several prominent bishops, including Cuthbert Tunstall, Prince-Bishop of Durham, and Archbishop Heath of York, spoke against the legislation and in passionate defense of papal primacy. The one conformist was Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, who had conformed under all the previous monarchs. Bishop Thomas Goldwell of St. Asaph’s, a redoubtable opponent of the supremacy, escaped to the continent and was the
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2 Richard Simpson, *Edmund Campion*, Peter M. Joseph, ed. (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing, 2010), 59; Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 195; cf. 23; 99; Kitchin, however, about whom Duffy has notably said that he was a "timeserver who would doubtless have become a Hindu if required, provided he was allowed to hold on to the See of Llandaff," might be given at least a bit more credit for backbone than Duffy allows. His subsequent refusal to consecrate convinced evangelical Matthew Parker, Elizabeth’s preferred choice for Archbishop of Canterbury, evinces his continuing conservatism. Because of this refusal, the rumor arose that Parker was consecrated by John Scotry, deposed Edwardian Bishop of London, at the Nag’s Head public house in Cheapside. The pub was not apparently the place of the consecration but of a celebratory meal which took place afterwards. Though perhaps unfounded, the story was in circulation among Catholics decades after the event and refuted by those who had attended the consecration according to the new rites on 17 December 1559; see “Nag's Head Consecration,” in *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, Ebenezer Cobham Brewer, ed. (New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1952), 636.
only one of the deposed bishops to engage in continuing resistance. The other bishops quietly conformed to the settlement.\(^6\)

Whereas Mary had been permitted to have the Mass in private, with very few exceptions the Elizabethan government universally disallowed the Mass.\(^7\) The liturgy of the English Church was the Book of Common Prayer, with slight modifications from Cranmer’s starkly reformed version of 1552. The Eleven Articles, forerunner to the classic 1571 statement of Anglican doctrine of the Thirty-Nine Articles, were passed denying most traditional doctrines. Catholics were largely excluded from court and from Parliament which soon passed restrictive Elizabethan laws against Catholic practice.\(^8\) On the royal supremacy and the suppression of images, saramentals, and other traditional practices objected to by the protestant party, the queen was firmly in the reformed camp.\(^9\)

Throughout England, images and Catholic liturgical objects were once again defaced or destroyed, and the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer enforced and supplied with its necessary accoutrements – a simple wooden table, communion plate and cup, and English service books. The old Sarum books were confiscated and also defaced or destroyed. All memory of the traditional religion was to be extirpated from the parish churches.

The questionnaire from the episcopal visitation, which has not survived save in constantly repeated quotations, was a sort of prophecy of future anti-Catholic invective. Duffy references in particular the language calling the old service books as “trifling

\(^6\) Academics too were not allowed to teach or to take their degrees without swearing to the oath. New College, Oxford, in particular was purged of papist opinion, having been just recently repopulated by Catholics in Queen Mary’s reign; see Fires of Faith, 200-201; cf. 22.

\(^7\) Spanish Place in London, in the reigns of Elizabeth I through Charles I the residence of the Spanish ambassador, was one of the only places in which the Mass was permitted in England after the 1559 settlement. During this time is was a refuge for Catholics seeking the Mass. Presumably the liturgical use was usually that of the Spanish court, not Sarum, though in such desperate straits this perhaps hardly mattered to the harried English Catholics; see “Parish History,” St. James’ Roman Catholic Church, 2015, http://www.sjrc.org.uk/page7/parishhistory.html.


\(^9\) Duffy, Stripping, 569-578; for the impact at Morebath in Devon, see Duffy, Morebath, 172.
tromperie for the sinful service of the popish priest,” and “feigned fables and peltering popish books.” Over time and as traditionalist hopes for a change of religion faded away by the 1560s, the remaining ‘tromperie’ in the parishes was gradually either sold or destroyed. The official pressure on English Catholics in Elizabeth’s reign produced three distinct response groups of English Catholics: ‘church papists,’ recusants, and the Catholic exiles abroad.

‘Church papists,’ Recusants, and Exiles

Beginning from the new Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559, those who denied the royal supremacy as well as those who refused to attend services were subject to increasingly severe penalties. The provisions of the Act of Uniformity required that:

every person and persons inhabiting within this realm or any other of the Queen’s Majesty’s dominions shall diligently and faithfully... resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed... where Common Prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of let, upon every Sunday, and other days ordained and used to be kept as Holy Days, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly, during the time of Common Prayer... upon pain of punishment by the censures of the Church, and also upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit for every such offence twelve pence, to be levied by the Church-wardens of the parish where such offence shall be done..."  

Priests who refused or failed to use the Prayer Book were punished with loss of benefice and imprisonment. Laypeople who spoke “in derogation, depraving or despising the said book,” or who disrupted the prayer service itself, were fined 100 marks (2/3 of £1 or 13/4) for a first offence and were punished with loss of all their property and life imprisonment upon the third. The act also revived the Edwardian restrictions on Mass attendance,
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10 Ibid., 576; cf. 584ff.
prescribing an imprisonment of six months for a first offence and life for a third. Those derogatorily called ‘church papists’ sought a compromise by attending Anglican services while maintaining traditional belief and practice in private. There were varying levels of ‘church papist’ conformity, from grudging but compliant attendance at services to noticeably inattentiveness or rosary praying during the communion service.\(^2\) Those who objected more strongly to the services, however, called such people not only ‘church papists’ but ‘temporizers’ and ‘schismatics’ for their attendance at all.

The term *recusant*, from the Latin *recusare*, or ‘refuse,’ came into use for those who failed to attend the Anglican services and instead made use of nonconforming priests. There were a number of these clergymen, ordained in the reign of Queen Mary, who were kept as chaplains and hidden in the households of the Catholic gentry.\(^3\) The fine for recusancy was initially merely a shilling, not a large amount for the gentry families who were customarily fined, but the fine soon rose precipitously for repeat offenders. However, as many magistrates and churchwardens early in Elizabeth’s reign remained sympathetic to Catholic opinions, it remained for a time relatively easy to avoid the penalty for failing to attend church. Magistrates and churchwardens were usually reluctant to alienate their neighbors or develop a reputation as a fanatic. As a result, Catholics of lower station soon attached themselves to the estates of the gentry, and in these places Catholicism survived in England. On the estates, local Catholics heard Mass, confessed, performed devotions, and interacted with an increasingly demoralized and dwindling clergy.\(^4\)

\(^3\) Ibid., 254-59.
\(^4\) Ibid., 49-50; 78-100 *passim*; notable in these gentry households is the central role played by Catholic gentlewomen as community leaders and instigators of their husbands’ conversion or nonconformity to the recusancy laws; see Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, 153-56.
In 1562, English Catholics petitioned the Council of Trent, then long underway on the continent, for a firm ruling on the question of attendance at protestant services. Rome responded firmly in the negative, ruling that attendance showed indifference to heresy and schism, and caused significant scandal. English Catholics were thus caught in a difficult position – either remain loyal to Catholicism and face destitution, or conform and face the guilty consciences which balked at such deception. For their part, the new missionary priests (to whom I shall come below) insisted on recusancy, emphasizing the moral evil of cooperation with schism. It took some time, however, for this to permeate society, and it was only with the concerted effort of the missionaries and Jesuit promotion of the Spiritual Exercises and examination of conscience that the ‘church papists’ were encouraged either to conform entirely (thus leaving the Church) or embrace recusancy.

Pius V’s papal bull *Regnans in excelsis* of 25 February 1570, though probably an expression of the pope’s genuine outrage, did little to help matters and in fact probably exacerbated them. Exercising the papal power to dethrone princes, the Pope declared Elizabeth deposed and excommunicate, and absolved her subjects of their duty to obey the sovereign. However, the great Catholic powers of Europe would do little to enforce the bull and the chance that Elizabeth’s Catholic subjects would overthrow her was remote. The stark choice for English Catholics was made even more so. “Catholics could now be charged with being traitors, and they could be face with ‘the bloody question,’” i.e. of whom they would support if a Catholic army invaded England. A Catholic, John Felton (Bl.), was arrested and later martyred for the treason of nailing a copy of the bull to the

---

palace of the bishop of London near St. Paul’s. News of the excommunication gradually filtered through to English Catholics after 1570, and made their difficult situation worse.

The next year, Parliament passed more restrictions and sanctions on recusants. The new laws of 1571 made it high treason to accuse the queen of heresy or schism or to question her legitimacy. To reconcile individuals or absolve them of schism was forbidden, as was bringing any papal bull into the country or ‘popish’ articles, such as rosaries or crucifixes. Anyone granting absolution for schism or representing the pope was now subject to penalty of death by ‘drawing and quartering,’ and those helping them were liable to confiscation of property and imprisonment for life. The English Catholic community was drawn increasingly underground, and they were increasingly short of material resources, safe places, and clergy. These restrictions, known later as the Penal Laws (especially in their Irish context), survived in varying degrees of severity until the Catholic Relief Acts of 1778 and 1791. Full Catholic emancipation allowing election to office and to Parliament was only to pass in 1829.

Meanwhile, numerous zealous Catholic aspirant clergy and academics had begun to leave England after 1559, notable among them William Allen. Allen had become convinced of the need for educated English Catholic clergy to minister to Catholics still in the country. Thus in 1568, he organized the founding of a college at Douai in Flanders in order to “replace the dwindling number of loyal Catholic priests in England.”[16] The College soon received both papal support and the patronage of the Emperor, in whose territory Douai was situated. Allen was called to Rome to advise Gregory XIII in 1585 and made a cardinal in 1587. The first clergy were ordained sent back to England by 1575. By 1578,
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fifty-two priest-graduates of the college would be on mission in England. In addition to the
secular clergy, the English mission soon attracted the attention not only of English secular
priests but also of the new Society of Jesus.

Fr. Allen had already been angling for some time for Jesuit assistance in the English
mission. Allen and the exiles resented that English Jesuits, including the famous orator
Edmund Campion, had been sent to various mission locations around Europe but not to
England. Annoyed at the oversight, Allen wrote several times to Fr. Mercurian, the Jesuit
Superior General, for the aid of the English Jesuits as well as to various other authorities.
The Pope and the Jesuit leadership, understandably anxious about the dangers of a mission
to England and the inability of the normal Jesuit rule to be followed there, delayed decision
for some time before the mission of Frs. Campion and Persons was authorized by special
papal instruction in 1580. They were to bring along the elderly Bishop Goldwell as
ordinary, though he would later return due to ill-health.

The lack of a bishop was to prove to be a severe handicap, as only some of the
sacraments could be had in England without the assistance of a bishop, and holy oil for
Extreme Unction was also thereby scarce. Mass books were rare as well, both the old
Sarum books (many now being destroyed by Elizabethan pursuivants or priest-hunters) and
those newly printed editions coming from the English Catholic presses in Flanders and
France and smuggled into the country in defiance of the edicts of 1571. Without a bishop’s
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17 It seems that the distinguished Fr. Owen Lewis, a former Oxford colleague of Allen, was accused of partiality to his Welsh countrymen
at the college, to the resentment of English seminarians. In the ensuing controversy, Pope Gregory ordered Jesuit management of the
English College, which Allen re-founded on the model of Douai; see Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 25-26; Simpson,
Campion, 137-40.

18 The instructions provided that the object of the mission was exclusively religious and not political, aimed at the spiritual well-being of
English Catholics, necessary because of the papal bull of Pius V. The priests were to aim to convert not convinced protestants but
‘church papists’ and those wavering, in addition to caring for and encouraging the souls of recusants. They were to seek to live in
community, or if that was not possible at least to visit often with each other, to wear lay clothes, to seek first to convert the upper class
(“on account of the greater fruit to be gathered”), and to avoid open dispute with heretics. They were to be taciturn, tactful, and of simple
habits so as to forestall scandal due to their behavior. "Finally," the instruction provided, “they must so behave that all may see that the
only gain they covet is that of souls;” see Simpson, Campion, 140-42.
authority, confusion on sacramental and other issues reigned. Proper authority was to prove the largest administrative problem of the mission, as seculars and Jesuits fought over tactics, laity, and resources. When Fr. Blackwell was appointed Archpriest alleviate the confusion, numerous seculars objected to his closeness to the Jesuits and appealed to Rome. The archpriest regime soon broke down. Controversy over structure persisted for decades after. The history of the Archpriest Controversy, the facts of which are generally covered in Bossy, have yet to be rigorously studied, but the evidence of developing conflict between secular and religious clergy is quite clear. It was not until the devising of the regime of vicars-apostolic in 1685 that something akin to normality was recovered.

The Council of Trent and *Quo primum*

One final historical development has bearing on this study – the liturgical legacy of the Council of Trent, which closed in 1563. The council’s aim had been both to preserve and defend the ceremonies and rites which had come under attack by protestants, especially Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, as well as to produce an authoritative reform of the Roman liturgy in response to criticism of various abuses. A number of commissions produced the new edition of the *Breviarium Romanum* by 1568. The commission which was created to revise the Mass books and other liturgical ceremonies after the council produced the *Missale Romanum* by 1570 (commonly called the Missal of St. Pius V). These reforms were conducted in accordance with what the papacy considered the use of

---

the city of Rome in “former times.” A restoration of the Roman Mass of the eleventh century was their guiding principle, along with what some scholars refer to as a centralizing, ‘Romanizing’ impulse. This is seen amply in the document’s heavy penalties for printers who do not observe exacting standards of printed consistency and accuracy. As a result, in the subsequent reform work of the late 1560s many of the medieval sequences, tropes, and other elaborations of the Mass were suppressed in favor of a shorter, trimmed-down ceremony based not on the florid and lengthy ritual of western Europe but the briefer, simpler use of Rome itself. The Mass of the MR1570 was largely a briefer version of the medieval ceremony. Further preventing abuses and deviations from the Roman rubrics, the Congregation of Rites was founded in 1588 under Sixtus V, a body which centralized liturgical authority and responsibility for liturgical law in the Roman Church.

In keeping with this late sixteenth-century zeitgeist of Roman standardization (albeit only for the Roman Use itself), the bull Quo primum was published with the new Missale in 1570, and in the front of every edition subsequent until the reforms of the 1960s. Its provisions stipulate not only the obligation to follow the new universal Missale Romanum, but also specifies the manner in which that missal is to be printed and spread beyond the Alps by papal authority. What is important here is its provisions regarding other

---

*Jungmann, 136. Jungmann’s use of the phrase “distorting accretion” here is indicative of his overall bias against later developments in the liturgy and in favor of its supposed ‘antique’ form in the early Church. Jungmann’s archaeologism is noted by other, including Reid; cf. Reid, Organic Development, 151-59.

*Theodor Klauser, A Short History of the Western Liturgy, 2nd ed. (Oxford: OUP, 1979[1969]), 118; it is difficult to separate this language from its post-Second Vatican Council connotation, but the universalization of the Roman ‘use’ is undisputed; cf. Jungmann, 138; Reid’s insistence should be recalled here that the ‘restoration’ promoted by the reform of 1570 was not antiquarianism or radical simplification, but a recovery of the streamlined Roman liturgy of the eleventh century Gregorian reform period; cf. Reid, 32.

*Sixteenth-century print culture was fraught by problems – printing errors and confusions, as well as piracy, plagiarism, and imitation. This was a significant fear for the pope and others who formulated Quo primum, and the strictness of their regulations on printing indicates their concern that all copies of the Roman Missal printed in Catholic Europe be uniform and read the same so that all would pray the same words in the liturgy; for the problems with accuracy and legitimacy in sixteenth-century print culture, see Adrian Johns, The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 30-31.


*Ut autem a sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia ceterarum ecclesiarum matre et magistra tradita ubique amplectantur omnes et observant ne in posterum perpetuis futuris temporibus in omnibus Christiani orbis... celebrari juxta Romanae Ecclesiae ritum consuevit vel debet alias quam juxta Missalis a nobis editi forum formantur aut recitetur... Volumus autem et eadem auctoritate decernimus ut post hujus
legitimately constituted liturgical uses, of which Sarum is one. The document virtually encourages the continuing use of legitimate liturgies which predate 1570 by two hundred years or more:

“[It is unlawful... to celebrate Mass according to any rite other than the Missal promulgated by Us...] unless [the same was] from the very first institution approved by the Apostolic See, or by custom which from the very institution was decorously observed in the celebration of Masses for over two hundred years, from which we by no means revoke the aforesaid constitution or custom of celebration;”

From this it is clear that the Sarum Use, as we have seen in continuous use in England since at least the early thirteenth century if not before, did not fall under the suppressions required by Pius V. In fact, Rome was encouraging of the continuing use of other liturgies which were of sufficient age, and indeed this encouragement led to the survival of regional uses like the Ambrosian and Mozarabic as well as the uses of religious orders like the Dominican and Cistercian. Due to the unique situation of the English Catholic community in the years following the promulgation of *Quo primum*, however, Sarum eventually fell into disuse and obscurity. In what follows we shall attempt to trace the reasons why this occurred and how long the Sarum Use remained in use amid these difficulties.

---

26 Ibid.; "nisi ab ipsa prima institutione a Sede Apostolica adprobata, vel consuetudine quae vel ipsa institutio super ducentos annos Missarum celebrandarum in eisdem Ecclesiis assidue observata sit a quibus, ut praefatam celebrandi constitutionem vel consuetudinem nequaquam auferimus" [translation mine].
Later Sarum Use and the ‘Sarum Use Catholic Community’

This study, as it seeks in part to point out continuity between medieval and early modern English Catholicism, began in the high medieval period. My contention here is that liturgy and devotion can and must be viewed as signs of continuity. That sixteenth-century Jesuit Fr. Edward Oldcorne, the colleague of autobiographer John Gerard, believed in the medieval *legenda* of St. Winifred enough to kiss and lick a blood-stone from her river at Holywell during his mission to the area in the 1580s is, I maintain, a fact of some significance and indicates his context as still fundamentally an adherent of the traditional religion, or at least not on the whole very different from his medieval predecessors.27 His actions imply continuity where historians who follow Bossy have insisted there is none. In what follows I attempt to review the surviving evidence which indicates that Sarum customs and traditions appear to have survived in continuity with the pre-Reformation period among ‘Sarum Use’ English Catholics.

Survival of Sarum Feasts and Fasting

Some Sarum traditions were long-lived and hard-dying among English Catholics, particularly those associated with the festal calendar and with feasting and fasting. Easy to keep up in the home without incurring the penalties of the law, these practices are some of the firmest indications which exist as to the continuance of Sarum traditions after the final Act of Uniformity of 1559. Indeed, Bossy has observed that the state did little to interfere with these private practices and when it did enter this arena, such as the act of 1563

---

imposing abstinence on Wednesdays, it supported traditional practices from the criticism of puritan reformists.  

The Jesuit historian and antiquary Fr. John Morris, S.J., who in his now nearly forgotten 1890 article for *Archaeologia* addressed this very issue of post-Elizabethan Catholic calendar and rite, drew attention to the issue of calendar and dating in looking at this subject, both of which were in shift by the end of the sixteenth century. The 1580s saw the introduction of the new Gregorian calendar by Pope Gregory XIII. Catholic countries were quick to adopt the ‘updated’ and revised calendar, but protestant countries such as England and the Lutheran German states were slower in doing so. England only adopted the new style of dates in 1752 in the reign of George II. \(^29\) English Catholics thus used the same, un-reformed dating as their Anglican neighbors, and this meant that they could much more easily keep the medieval fasts in simple continuity with the traditional Sarum calendar of feasts and fasts rather than adopt the revised calendar.

As we have seen, many days in the Sarum liturgical year were set aside as days of fasting and penance in preparation for feasts. The Henrician Reformation’s suppression of the observance of fasting for most of the traditional holy days and those feasts days themselves was confirmed by the final loss of official observance in the Elizabethan calendar of 1560. Most saint days were suppressed and the medieval practice of vigil fasting gradually disappeared. On the continent as well, the more rigorous English practice had either never been followed there or had been replaced by less stringent customs. Many conservatively-minded English Catholics kept up these traditions, however, probably in

---

stubborn reaction to protestant insistence that they give them up. This in large measure
distinguished the Catholics from Anglicans in the counties of England before the arrival of
the missionary priests in the 1570s. The practice was extremely resilient among the older
recusants and was held to tenaciously by English Catholics, even when living abroad on the
continent in less rigorous communities like Catholic areas of the Netherlands.

The seminary priests and Jesuit missionaries, trained as they were in a non-
monastic, non-ascetic tradition, were disinclined toward this attachment to additional fasting
and abstinence. The introspective Jesuits especially were concerned that such practice was
held to too strongly. Fr. Persons wrote that such people “relied on such external practices
as living on bread and water on Fridays, vigils and most of Lent, and things like that.” At
the ‘synod of Southwark’ of 1580, however, the missionaries decided to be cautious in this
area so as not to offend local tradition. In his account of the meeting, Persons wrote that he
and the other Jesuit and seminary priests decided that “the best resolution seemed to be,
and most conformable to piety, reason, and union, that nothing should be altered in matter
of fastings from the old customs...” For the most part, Fr. Persons and the early Jesuits
were as disinclined to force change is this area as he and the other seminary priests were
uncomfortable with lay (and probably Marian priestly) attachment to the practice itself.
Fellow Jesuit Fr. Jasper Heywood (also spelt Haywood), in charge of the Jesuit mission
from late 1581 while Persons was in France, was more assertive in his suggestion of the
updating of practice to Tridentine norms. Fr. Heywood around this time issued a set of

---

54-55; Fr. Oldcorne seems to have been an exception.
* Morris, “The Kalendar and Rite,” 120-21; from Person’s papers, Stonyhurst College MSS, Grene’s Collection, P. fol. 128.
instructions from East Anglia which substantially eased seasonal fasting and abstinence restrictions, including an exemption from Friday fasting for all Catholics in England.33

In these instructions, Heywood also exhorts all to follow the Roman liturgical custom promulgated at the Council of Trent. I shall return to these instructions for their liturgical suggestions, but much like these ineffective recommendations Heywood’s suggestions were largely ignored by clerics and laity due both to the attachment of the English to Sarum custom and to the relative impotence of Heywood’s authority in the confusing ecclesiastical structure of the English mission. Nevertheless, Heywood’s suggestions were not only ignored but also condemned by more traditional laymen and women. Alban Dolman, an elderly non-Jesuit clergyman, wrote at the time that the Catholic gentry were “greatli scandalized” by the “erronius doctrine” which Heywood was promoting.34 Fr. Morris provides the following account of what must have been typical of lay reaction to Heywood’s meddling:

Three years after this father Jasper Haywood furnishes a curious proof of how strongly the English clung to their ancient ways. On one of the Rogation days [25 April and three days before Ascension] he was the guest of a gentleman whose wife was a Catholic and who himself was what the Catholics called “a schismatic”; one, that is, who went to the Protestant church but was a Catholic at heart. Father Haywood and the gentleman ate meat, the lady and others ate fish, and in consequence a discussion arose. Father Haywood argued the question against the English fasting days, and his host was so offended that he went out and brought back a copy of the Proclamation against the Priests. “Does that touch you?” he asked. “Certainly,” answered Haywood; “but I am safe in your house.” “That I have never promised you,” said he; “and I am not so pleased with your way of living and thinking that I should risk my life and goods for you.”35

33 The First and Second Diaries of the English College, Douay, and an Appendix of Unpublished Documents, edited by the fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory, Thomas Francis Knox, ed. (London: David Nutt, pub., 1878), 353-55; the document itself was apparently found in the archives of the old English Chapter, F. 2, 525. The paper bears no exact date, but seems in context to be from the period around 1581/82.
34 Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 112.
35 Morris, “The Kalendar and Rite,” 121; the account is from More’s Historia Missioanis Anglicanae.
“Father Heywood was,” Morris comments, “in consequence of his want of discretion in such matters, soon recalled from England” because of this incident, which must have caused a considerable and heated controversy. Dolman’s comments, reported by Bossy, suggest the seriousness with which lay Catholics took Heywood’s easing of discipline. It is certainly possible that, having been preached to by the Anglican establishment about the uselessness and non-scriptural nature of the Sarum fasting tradition, these English Catholics had come to regard the practice as sacrosanct. In any case, the practice remained in the English Catholic community for several centuries afterwards, though with decreased observance over the course of the seventeenth century. Certainly the writing of some English clerics in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is marked by despair at the falling off of the tradition of fasting.36 Dispensations for the eating of ’whitemeats’ (e.g., eggs, butter, cheese, etc.) during Lent, originally proposed in Heywood’s list of suggestions, increased by the beginning of the eighteenth century. By 1720, Bishop Gifford in London had responded to lay demands by allowing meat three days in the week during Lent, and conceded both eggs and cheese, an easing which soon spread elsewhere to the English apostolic districts. Bossy indicates that the clergy were largely split, somewhat along Jesuit-secular lines, on the easing of restrictions, with the seculars “convinced that any concession was one more victory for the Flesh over the Spirit.”37 Dispensations from the stricter Sarum rules continued to be granted into the late eighteenth century.

As Bossy rightly points out, the prevalence of fasting in the recusant community was a sign of its relative high status. Fasting after all means little to those who eat meagerly as a

matter of course. Further, Heywood’s fasting rules themselves reveal something of the
diversity and difficulty with which householders ensured that the rules were followed. The
household, especially if it was a gentry house which hosted a community of dependent
Catholic tenants, was though to have responsibility to see that all followed the fasting and
abstinence rules. In many recusant households which employed or were hosting
protestants, some doubt arose as to whether these could be provided suppers on fasting
days. Heywood assured that they could be served supper “for the avoyding of any notable
detriment.” Presumably this was to disguise or dissuade their adherence to the old rules
becoming widely known. Bossy reports, however, that more than a century later in 1691
the Hampshire secular clergy forbade the serving of meat to such people on abstinence
days.38 The fasting rules were largely left uneven in England until the eighteenth century.

On reconnaissance of the English Catholic Church for the Pope in 1634, Fr.
Leander Jones reported the frustrating irregularity of the dates for feasts and the practice of
fasting for vigils and Lent. Observing that several different liturgical uses and calendars were
in use in England, and the confusion and difficulty of this situation, Jones commented that
“This defect, however, is easily remedied if, through the said consultation of ancient
English ritual and synodal decrees, the feasts and fasts are collected with suitable certainty,
and the matter referred to the Apostolic See.”39 Papal review did not occur however until

---

38 There was some trouble about this rule, which put a large burden on Catholic farmers to provide alternative meals to protestant farm
laborers. Bossy suggests that it developed into a *modus vivendi* in the north through a “liberal use of dispensations;” see ibid., 113.
39 Quintus defectus est difformitas in observantia festorum & jejuniorum, duma li alios morem atque usum sequuntur; hi Romanum, illi
Gallicanum, alii Sarisburiensem. Atque ita non eadem apud omnes festa, aut idem jejunandi modus. Facile autem tollitur hic defectus,
si, per concilium praeememoratum consultis antiquis Angliae Ritualibus & Synodis, festa et jejunia in certam redigant consonantiam, &
ad Sedem Apostolicam referant confirmandi causa; see “Apostolicae Missionis Status in Anglia,” in *State Papers collected by Edward, Ear of Clarendon*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Printing House, 1767), 263 [translation mine]; it is instructive that Fr. Leander Jones
more than a century after the writing of Jones’ report, and the local priests and later vicars-apostolic were left to adjudicate the situation on their own.

In the 1770s and 1780s, the vicars-apostolic in London converted the Friday fast into simple abstinence and the Lenten fast to fasting only on Ash Wednesday and during Holy Week. Saturday abstinence, Bossy observes, seems to have been dropped in the same period. A letter of Pius VI in 1777 retained only the holy days of the Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Easter, Ascension, Whitsun Monday, Corpus Christi, Sts. Peter and Paul, Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas. All other vigil fasts, work restrictions, and Mass obligations were dropped, though the Pope apparently expected in return that Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent and Advent would become additional fasting days. In cases of grave necessity, the work restriction could be waived by a competent pastor. These provisions seem not to have taken hold in some aspects, however, as a further letter from Bishop Walsh in 1830 reports the permission of Pius VIII to drop the abstinence of the feast of St. Mark, the three days of Rogationtide, and Saturdays, all feasts which were presumably dropped in the papal letter of 1777 if not before. Sarum customs survived in this form into the nineteenth century, when the adoption of the universal Roman use regularized the customs of fasting and penance.

The celebration of feasts from the Sarum calendar continued as well in the recusant community, though ended somewhat earlier than the fasting customs did when Urban VIII imposed the Roman calendar universally in the middle part of the seventeenth century. Before this, though errors concerning the calendar were understandably rife given the

---

40 Ibid., 115; Morris, "The Kalendar and Rite," 122.
42 Ibid., 514-15.
confusion of dates, many Catholics appear to have not only celebrated Easter according to the Sarum Use, old-style dating, but also to have kept the Sarum Feast of Relics at least as late as 1603.\textsuperscript{44} Very likely the confusion caused a hybrid of calendars to develop in the same communities, and fasting according to the Sarum calendar likely failed to match up with the less stringent, differently-dated Roman feast dates and fasting practices. There was likely great diversity according to region and clergy.

In the Elizabethan and early Stuart era, it appears that English Catholics were still very much attached to medieval traditions of boisterous celebration on occasions like Christmas, Easter, and Candlemas. It was common for the pursuivants to track and capture priests at these busy seasons. The tradition of fasting upon the vigil, attendance at first vespers and Mass, and breaking the fast with a special meal was a common tradition of the gentry Catholics of England which they inherited and continued from pre-Reformation times. The Benedictine school at Douai, Bossy points out, retained a full medieval Christmas tradition (complete with a boy elected Christmas-king, in a festivity reminiscent of medieval traditions of misrule) until sometime in the eighteenth century. A relatively genial and unmistakably medieval spirit is evident in these Christmas traditions which does not seem to have survived the mid-seventeenth century troubles associated with the Cromwell and the Civil War.\textsuperscript{45} The celebration of the full Sarum calendar of course grew more difficult to sustain with the fasting traditions until the reduction of holy days in 1777.

The eighteenth century saw numerous requests by English Catholics for English feasts with Sarum lineage to be celebrated on their local, Roman calendar. Fr. Morris reports the 1722 request of Bp. Bonaventure Gifford, vicar-apostolic of London, for a

\textsuperscript{44} Morris, “The Kalendar and Rite,” 119-20; though Morris’ example is of those who celebrate according the Gregorian reckoning, he comments that this is the only example of such ‘updating.’

\textsuperscript{45} Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 118; see sources in footnote 25.
proper Mass and office of St. Augustine of Canterbury. Supplements to the Roman breviary published in London in 1734 contain the feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury as a greater double, and also the feast of St. George for England as a double of the first class, complete with its own octave. In 1749 at the request of Henry Benedict Stuart, Jacobite Duke of York and then a cardinal, extended several additional English saints’ days to the whole of England, including Sts. Edward the Confessor, Edmund, and Thomas Becket. Subsequent decrees restored the Venerable Bede, Sts. Wulstan, David, Cuthbert, Alban, and William of York, as well as the Translation of Thomas Becket, among numerous others, to the English local calendar by 1774. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have seen the inclusion of more, including the martyrs of the Reformation in England and Wales commemorated on 4 May. Sarum saints have thus survived far after the native English rites which once commemorated them to be recast in the continual incarnations of the MR1570 down to the current Roman Missal and breviary in use in the Roman Rite.

The Society of Jesus and the Missal of 1570

The proclamations of Pius V were not meant to touch liturgical uses like Sarum, which could trace its antecedents back more than two hundred years. As products of the Counter-Reformation themselves, it might be expected that the Jesuits would favor the use of the missal promulgated in Quo primum by Pius V in 1570. As time went on, their influence at Douai College and at the English College in Rome grew expansively, and it is the Jesuit martyrs like Frs. Edmund Campion, Thomas Garnet, and Henry Walpole,
among others that are most remembered for their work. As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that their influence extended also to the liturgical predilections of English priests, who if they were not Jesuits certainly knew many Jesuits and worked in their company, providing spiritual direction and confession to laity who grew increasingly attached to Ignatian spirituality. 49 Especially in the early years of the mission, however, strategy, simple rivalry, and desire on the part of the seculars for episcopal oversight often put the Jesuits and secular English priests at odds over all manner of issues. O have already mentioned above the firestorm which resulted from Heywood’s instructions on fasting, which caused sufficient controversy for his removal.

It appears that the Jesuits, as well as being generally in favor of the continental, less stringent fasting practices (as well as their own, more stringent spiritual examination practices), were also the main support behind a drive among English clerics to use the new Missale Romanum of Pius V. The change in the liturgical habit of the exiled English priests at Douai first appears, as Morris noted in 1890, in April 1577 on the feast of St. George, when a certain Fr. Laurence Webb returned to Douai from Rome and taught the new Missal to the priests and seminarians present: 50

This day, that is to say the Feast of St. George... Therefore, in the space of five months, twenty priests are made from our theologians. Further, all these daily celebrate Mass according to the order of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pius V; the same rite of Mass was taught accurately and diligently by the venerable priest Dr. Laurence Webb, who himself being lately in Rome, learnt his manner of order and proper ceremony with precision. 51

---

49 A look at the Autobiography of John Gerard evidences the frequent use of the Spiritual Exercises in England. Non-Jesuit priests surely both underwent the Exercises and recommended them to the laity in their care; Gerard, Autobiography, 28-31; 33-34; 58-59; 176-77; 189; 200; 236; 243-47.
50 Probably the same Fr. Laurence Webb mentioned as having been present at the founding of the Douai College, see “Fr. Persons’ Memoirs,” in CRS, ii, 190.
What is clear from this entry is the obvious pride which the chronicler takes in the achievement of twenty new priests, all trained and equipped with knowledge of the new Roman Missal of 1570, ready, presumably, to follow the mission of saving souls from heresy and schism in England. The new missal was perhaps symbolic of their mission from the Holy See, which had blessed and provided the instructions for their enterprise and financially supported the College. As such it would be sensible to suppose that those educated at Douai would be more likely to use the new missal out of loyalty to the papacy and desire to identify themselves and their mission with it.

Those who continued to use the Sarum books seem to have been the older priests, many still in England who had used it all their lives and were probably loath to give it up for the new, Roman missal. The new edition of Simpson’s biography of Edmund Campion comments, somewhat creatively, that “One can imagine perhaps the new Roman-trained Jesuits and seminary priests smiling at ‘the old boys’ still continuing with the Sarum usages, and the old men deliberately doing so to emphasize their Englishness and their disdain for the new-fangled ways.” Many of these Sarum missals, breviaries, graduals, and other books were destroyed under Edward and Elizabeth (only a handful are still extant today), the Marian priests likely found it increasingly difficult to use the old English books. As this older generation passed away, usage of the Sarum books naturally declined.

Differences in the use of liturgical custom, in constant use every day for the celebration of Mass, naturally became an issue upon the landing of Campion and the first Jesuit missionaries in 1580. The sources speak of a small ‘synod’ held in secret at a house near the church of St. Mary Overy’s (now St. Saviour’s) in London at which several

---

*Simpson, Campion, 190.*
important issues were discussed. Among discussions of attendance at protestant services and the necessity of excluding politics from the mission, the assembled Jesuits and seculars appear to have also discussed the issue of liturgical use, mostly related to the fasting rules and calendar to be followed by clergy and laity. The little gathering decided prudently to keep usage the same and unaltered in places that still remembered the Sarum and other medieval customs. In places which had fallen out of practice however, they were not to be re-imposed and the people were not bound to fast. Presumably in these places the Roman custom was encouraged by the Jesuits as a universal baseline.

Several years later around 1582, as it will be recalled, the acrimony over Fr. Heywood’s encouragement of Roman usages spread through much of the English laity. His list of aforementioned disciplinary suggestions given from East Anglia read in part:

It is wished w⁹ one consent and greatly desired of worshipfull men that all would follow the Romane use in their office and service, as a thinge commended to all the world by the whole concell of Trent.¹⁰

It is unclear whether this was a particular provision objected to by those who eventually achieved Heywood’s dismissal from the mission after the controversy erupted. The fasting rules, as the ones most likely to affect the daily lives of the laity, were of course the primary cause of their ire. The two issues cannot really be separated, however. The Sarum calendar of feasts, used with the Sarum Missal, were the determinants of the dates for fasting. The communities which still fasts according to the Sarum calendar and according to the Sarum custom likely had recourse to a priest with access to a Sarum Missal which was used regularly. Many communities were likely to have a missal which had

⁹ Ibid., 188.
¹⁰ Douay Diaries, 354.
escaped destruction by the authorities. Despite the dismissal of Fr. Heywood, however, the Jesuits continued to promote the Roman customs.

It is difficult to get at a full picture of the ‘lived experience’ of the liturgy from such fragmentary and anecdotal sources. Some small indication of recusant liturgical usage in this period, however, can be gleaned from John Gerard’s *Autobiography*, another of the few surviving accounts of English Catholic liturgical practice in this period. As a Jesuit himself and trained at Douai, Gerard was probably a practitioner of the new Roman use, as he arrived in England in the 1580s. After some time ministering to the English Catholics, his betrayal and arrest landed him eventually in a cell at the Tower of London. Unable to perform his functions as a priest openly, he celebrated Mass in secret in the Tower cell of his devout lay neighbor, and with the connivance of his jailer on the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 September), with no access to missals or altar cards. Presumably he had this Mass memorized, a much more difficult proposition in Sarum which includes a lengthy sequence, *Alle-œleste necnon et perenne* –luya, than in the Roman Missal which does not, another indication that he used the more abbreviated Roman Missal rather than celebrating according to the Sarum Use.55

Fr. Gerard and his brother Jesuits in his *Autobiography* do preserve some medieval English traditions, however. I have already mentioned Fr. Oldcorne’s reverence for the traditions surrounding the popular medieval saint, St. Winifred of Holywell in Wales. Fr. Gerard himself tells of a custom similar to St. Gregory’s Trental early in his time in England. It happened that the widow of a Catholic man in the county of Stafford was plagued by a strange light which appeared every night in her bedroom and flew through her

---

bed-curtains before disappearing. She sent for a Catholic friend who in turn asked a priest, who suggested that the light asked for her conversion. The widow became a Catholic, but the light still appeared nightly. Other priests were consulted, who suggested that her husband (who had previously died without recourse to Extreme Unction and Viaticum) was in Purgatory and in need of prayers. In a decision which brings strongly to mind all of Duffy’s research and observations about medieval funerary and requiem customs, the priests and the widow decided that thirty days of Masses would be said for her husband’s soul, “according to the old custom of the country.” When this was done, three lights were seen flying away, two supporting the third. The light, Gerard reports, was not seen again.

There is also some evidence that the Jesuits might not have exclusively used the Roman books in the early period of the mission. Fr. Morris recounts some interesting indications from the trial of Fr. Henry Garnet, the Jesuit Superior in England who was implicated and executed for his alleged involvement in the Guy Fawkes incident of 5 November 1605. Garnet was accused by Sir Edward Coke of praying for the success of the plot “by the use he made at Coughton of a verse of the hymn for the vespers of All Saints’ day, 1605.” The form of this verse, Morris says, is of the Sarum breviary and not the Roman, as was the form of the Mater Misericordiae prayer Garnet invoked at his execution by the authorities several months after his trial in 1606. As Morris observes, Fr. Garnet noted that his execution was on 3 May, according to the old dating style, and thus the Sarum feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross. The constant repetition of the theme and

---

7 Ibid., 46-47.
8 Morris, “The Kalendar and Rite,” 120.
image of the cross in his speech before martyrdom is thus intimately tied to the liturgical
day.

In short, thought they in some measure were the strongest impetus behind the
‘Romanization’ of the liturgy and its accompanying customs, the Jesuits cannot be
straightforwardly classified this way. As with any of the missionary priests, their daily contact
with the laity and their living among them in the houses of the gentry meant that they had
contact with people whose experience of Catholicism was imbued with Sarum and with
medieval piety and traditions. Edmund Campion and John Gerard would have used a
Sarum Missal if this was the book available in the place in which they found themselves.
The missionaries typically carried a breviary but a missal was much more difficult to
conceal. It is possible that the Jesuits, particularly those of the younger generation who
would eventually have no significant memory of the Marian period, thought the older
Marian priests using the Sarum books old-fashioned. Further, the largely itinerant Jesuits,
famous for their travels to America and Asia in later centuries, were very likely to favor a
liturgical use which was tied to no one of the European kingdoms but to Rome. Certainly
the peculiar use of England or any other nation would have been out of place in India or
China, and it was indeed a Jesuit desire to be uniform in their use throughout the Society.
Nevertheless, it would be too strong to classify the Jesuits as ‘against’ Sarum. Their
promotion of the new missal, however, amounted to the same thing, as their neglect of it
and promotion of the Roman Missal in England meant that Sarum became increasingly
rare.
Sarum Liturgical Books and Early Modern Print Culture

While a considerable amount of evidence exists to indicate the longevity of Sarum feast dates and fasting practices, the issue of how long the Sarum liturgy was actually celebrated after 1577 is somewhat more obscure. In the reign of Queen Mary during the regime's wide-ranging attempt at restoring the traditional religion, there were five printed editions of the Sarum Missal, eight editions of the processional, and six of the manual. This number of printed books flooding into the English market to replace the ones destroyed under Edward was quite significant for the survival of Sarum. The public restoration of Sarum of course did outlive Mary herself. The change in religious settlement which occurred with the re-imposition of the Act of Uniformity in 1559 meant that the old Latin service books which had been re-imposed under Mary were once again rounded up by royal commissioners and destroyed. Those recusant Catholics and Marian priests left in England were forced to hide their service books (Sarum, York, Hereford, even French diocesan books were commonly used) from discovery by the commissioners and later the pursuivants who hunted and destroyed books, vestments, altar plate, and priests with equal efficiency. The recusants needed very few books besides the missal and manual, as underground choir services and high Masses were of course impracticable. Those exiles who founded Douai College may have brought some Sarum books with them, though Simpson's biography posits that in Douai they may also have used the local diocesan order. The same is perhaps true of the English College in Rome, which probably switched
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to the Roman Missal earlier than the exiles at Douai. Very likely there was a diversity of usage in private among the exiles in France and Flanders until the Roman Mass arrived with Fr. Laurence Webb in 1577.

After the Elizabethan settlement, Catholic liturgical books had to be printed on the continent and illegally smuggled into England. John Fowler, whom Duffy calls the most important Catholic printer of the Elizabethan period, escaped to the continent upon the accession of Elizabeth, and printed both the writings of prominent Catholics like Allen and catechetical and devotional works. These would then be taken in secret England to avoid the government prohibitions on Catholic literature. Liturgical books, however, are curiously absent from publication lists until the early seventeenth century. Catholic polemical and devotional printers do not seem to have printed any more Sarum books after the last Marian editions the later 1550s.

In the early years of the seventeenth century, perhaps as English exiles realized that official English protestantism was not going to be overthrown any time soon, liturgical books started to be printed. In 1603, Clement VIII issued a volume of liturgical litanies and prayers for the Catholic faith in England and Scotland. Printed books for the English market grew smaller and smaller, and thus easy and swift to conceal. In 1604, English printer Lawrence Kellam printed an edition of the Manuale for the use of English Catholics, but put the title in the lengthy form of Parisian liturgical books: Sacra Institutio Baptizandi, Matrimonium Celebrandi, Infirmos ungendi, Mortuos Sepeliendi. Ac alii nonulli Ritus Ecclesiastici juxta usum Insignis Ecclesiae Sarisburiensis. This edition, unlike
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62 Duffy, Fires of Faith, 201.
previously printed Sarum books, is printed in Roman characters. In 1610-11, Kellam produced another, 12mo Sarum Manual. The manual seems to have been the book most commonly and latterly printed according to the Sarum Use. The first Roman Ritual included in a Roman book for use in England was not printed until 1623, and use of the Sarum baptism, marriage, and other services likely continued long after this date. At St. Omer’s in 1623 and 1626 was printed an event smaller (8vo) Missale parvum and a Roman Manuale of Pius V for priests in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Both of these bear the emblem of the English Jesuits, and the Manuale interestingly includes the Sarum marriage service among the otherwise exclusively Roman content. The prevalence of Roman books did however increase through the seventeenth century. Roman books containing the ordo and canon of the Mass, selections from the Temporale and Sanctorale, and extracts from the Roman Ritual appeared, such as that printed in Antwerp for England in 1615 and 1626, and were just as small and proved just as handy for seminary priests to carry in tight situations. Traces of Sarum survived largely in the (pre-1969) marriage service, which the Council of Trent wished to be kept to some degree according to local traditions. The symbolic bestowal of gold and silver upon the bride and the putting of the wedding ring on several fingers in turn descend from elements of Sarum inserted into the marriage ritual for use in England. Fr. Morris had in his possession in 1890 a sixteenth-century manuscript copy of the Manuale according to the York Use which had had its marriage form changed to Sarum. The volume by all accounts had not left York, and later
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66 Ibid., 336.3-.9; Morison, English Prayer Books, 141.
68 Ibid., 128; see note a “Si quae provinciae aliis, ultra praedictas, laudabilibus consuetudinibus et ceremoniis lae in re utuntur, cas omnino retineri Sancta Synodus vehementer optat. Sess. xxiv. Cap. 1. De Reform. Mat.”
69 Ibid., 128; Missale, cols. 830*-832*; The Daily Missal, XXXX.
formed a part of the priest’s library of St. Wilfrid’s up to 1881. “This would seem to imply,” notes Morris, “that the Sarum form of marriage superseded that of York, even in York itself, towards the end of the reign of Elizabeth.”70 The Sarum marriage service thus may have become an ‘English recusant standard,’ perhaps some indication of why elements of it survived into the MR1962. Celebration of the Sarum Use itself, and other aspects of its ritual (the evidence of fasting and feasts he does not address), Morris insists died out fairly quickly after the adoption of the Roman books by Douai in 1577, dying a “natural death,” never having been suppressed “by the strong hand of authority.”71

In the later part of the seventeenth century, Latin liturgical books were briefly printed in London during the short reign of the Catholic monarch James II. The royal printer made an edition of the Roman Ritual in 1686 which was the first Latin liturgical book in the medieval red-and-black style printed in England since Mary’s reign. A Catholic almanac was printed for the Chapel Royal under King James which, although following the Roman custom in its particulars, gave the designation “Sundays after Trinity,” according to the Sarum custom instead of “Sundays after Pentecost” as in the Roman convention.72 When the revolution of 1688 ended the momentary tolerance, however, it was necessary for English Catholics once again to import books printed on the continent. By the end of the seventeenth century as well, the new books printed were exclusively of the Roman custom. Those communities who may have retained use of the Sarum books must have had to rely on the editions they already possessed.

More popular and devotional literature seems much quicker to change over to the new missal and office of Pius V, possibly a result of the popularity of the Roman usages as
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marks of defiance and loyalty to the papacy in reaction to the regime. Post-Tridentine primers were printed as early as 1583 by G. F. Flinton, supervisor of Fr. Persons’ press in Rouen.\footnote{Printed Literature of the English Counter-Reformation, vol. 2, 200; cf. 201-226.} An English guide to the Roman Latin Breviary followed in 1617, intended for laity as well as clergy.\footnote{Ibid., 192.} Latin and English primers according to the “reformed” use of the Office of the Blessed Virgin date from 1599, complete with “lyke graces priuileged,” indicating a sort of changeover in this popular devotion, seemingly seamlessly, from the medieval Sarum primers to the post-Tridentine ones.\footnote{Ibid., 227.}

The drop in demand for Sarum books starting in the seventeenth century is telling. It indicates that by the 1688 revolution the celebration of the Sarum liturgy was relatively rare, practiced by only a few communities and these likely in rural areas isolated from contact with the continent. The drop in demand for Sarum books was combined with an abundance of Roman books. The great supply of Roman books in production and use after 1570 compared with the relatively tiny production of Sarum books implies naturally that Sarum books would have been significantly expensive. It is possible as well that some priests or communities ‘switched’ as a result of the financial expense involved in obtaining a Sarum Missal or other book. Though it is conceivable that those attached to the Sarum Use would have kept up its use, those who kept using their Sarum books after this would have had to repair their binding and retouch their fading ink, a labor-intensive and frustrating process when it would have been relatively simple to purchase a new, Roman book. The presence of the Sarum marriage ritual in the later printed Roman editions, however, suggests that some ceremonies of the Sarum Use might have been more popular.
and resilient than others. It is conceivable that Sarum baptism, weddings, and funeral customs might have survived much longer than the Mass itself.

It seems unlikely to posit any sort of ‘Sarum Use community’ after around 1688 at the latest, and those in the latter part of the century only using some few parts of the Sarum tradition for more customary occasions like the sacrament of marriage. How long certain communities might have used the Sarum Missal or any aspect of Sarum, such as the marriage service or other parts of the manual, cannot be known by available evidence, but it seems likely to put 1688 as around the latest date for Sarum’s use in this public manner. One more piece of slight evidence deserves attention, however, which, if genuine, may necessitate extending this tentative *terminus post quem*.

The Sarum Use in the Eighteenth Century?

A final piece of evidence dates from significantly after 1688. It is found in a nineteenth-century historical account of the famous invasion of England by Prince Charles Edward Stuart, the Jacobite pretender, which ended in the disastrous battle of Culloden, the battle which finally ended the hopes of the Stuart line of regaining the throne. According to the narrative given in John Charles Cox’s *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals*, on 4 December 1745, the advancing Jacobite army entered Derby from Scotland and prayers were ordered to be said by the military chaplain in “the great church” of All Saints,’ now Derby Cathedral. The plan of ‘Bonnie Prince Charlie’ was to invade England with his army of Scottish Highlanders in the face of the massive numbers of Georgian
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76 The *terminus post quem* is of course much later for the lay fasting and calendrical practices discussed earlier.
troops which were arrayed against him. Culloden was still several months off, and the
Jacobite cause had Catholic hopes high.

According to Cox’s 1890 work, Mass was celebrated on the morning of 5
December on the marble altar of the church. It was reportedly said by a French priest
according to the post-Tridentine, Roman custom. The reader is told that several English
recusants of Derbyshire, presumably local Catholics sympathetic to the Jacobite cause,
were caused much “dissatisfaction” by the Mass being in said according to the Roman use
instead of their accustomed Sarum (unknown, says Cox, to anyone but those “versed in
continental rites”). The Sarum Use, Cox writes, was “then in vogue amongst the Romanists
of England.” It is unclear exactly what Cox means by this. Were the Sarum books which
this community presumably used in constant use from the reign of Elizabeth? Were the
books perhaps revived by a priest in later times who preferred their native ‘Englishness’ the
Roman use? Possibly as a sort of revival, suggested by the words ‘in vogue?’ These
questions are difficult to answer without considering Cox himself and the reliability of his
account of events.

John Charles Cox lived from 1843 to 1919.” The son of a vicar and one himself,
Cox was an attendee but never a graduate of Queen’s College, Oxford. He lived most of
his life at Chevin House in Hazelwood, near Belper in Derbyshire. Despite being active in
Liberal politics, he was a career clergyman in the established church and a confirmed,
enthusiastic antiquarian. Cox was a fellow of the Royal Historical Society from 1873, and
was given the degree of doctor of laws from Lambeth in 1885 for his work on the records
of the dean and chapter of Lichfield. He was elected fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of
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London in 1887, and helped to found the East Riding Antiquarian Society in Yorkshire. He wrote more than thirty articles for the journal of the Derbyshire Archaeological Society, and was its editor from 1885 to 1891. He was asked to edit two national British journals of antiquities, *The Reliquary* (1887–1909) and *The Antiquary* (1888–94). He was passionately interested in the history of his home county, and published the two-volume *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals* in 1890, when he was 47, the same year in which Morris' study of the calendar and rite was published in *Archaeologia*. His specialty in his later career was the history of English parish churches, and was the author of several works on the subject, including *How to Write a History of a Parish* in 1879.

Cox was very experienced writing the history of local and parish churches and communities. He was also something of an Anglican ‘high-churchman,’ and purportedly disliked the Reformation iconoclasm he was surely experienced writing about from his time studying parish churches. He was an Anglican, however, until his later life, when he was received into the Roman Church on 25 April 1917 in the church of St Benedict, Stratton-on-the Fosse, Somerset, by Ethelbert Horne, OSB, of Downside Abbey. The most that can be said of his religious sympathies in 1890 then is that they were typical of the later period of the Oxford movement, and thus his interest in Sarum was perhaps typical of the Anglicans then interested in liturgical history.

His historical method was both admired and criticized in later assessments of his work. His *DNB* entry observes that “He was highly regarded for the breadth of his knowledge and the thoroughness of his historical research. A lucid writer in the nineteenth-century discursive tradition, Cox was so prodigious in his output that some of his works are
rightly criticized for lacking accuracy and finish.” Any historian of course, including one as thorough as Cox, might make a mistake wading through such an enormous amount of minutiae as is involved in a thorough and local study of an entire English county such as Derbyshire. Cox himself gives no particular provenance for his narrative, merely saying that it is found in the contemporary printed accounts. Again, without a thorough study of all of them the story is impossible to confirm.

Such a fact-check of Cox’s story was in fact done in 1896 by a man named Joseph Gillow, who wrote a letter to the editor on the subject to The Tablet which was printed on 4 April of that year. Gillow alleges that Cox’s story is based on “non-Catholic” and thus presumably faulty tradition. “The late Father Morris,” Gillow insists, “[other] than whom we have no better authority, demonstrates... that long before this date the Sarum, York, and other English uses had died a natural death, and not ‘by the strong hand of authority.’” After citing Morris’s noting of the events of 23 April 1577 at Douai, Gillow, clearly a knowledgeable historian, comments that it is “questionable” if Mass was ever said by a French priest at Derby in 1745. He himself had “not met with any confirmation of this assertion, or, indeed, that Prince Charles Edward was accompanied by a French military chaplain.” Though there appears to have been a community of recusants at Derby at the time, not uncommon for the conservative north of England, no evidence that they were attached to the Sarum Use, nor that Sarum was “in vogue” at any time before the Oxford movement is known to exist. Thus, Gillow has significant doubt that Cox’s alleged incident ever took place during the campaign of 1745.

79 Ibid.
80 Cox, Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals, 311.
With these facts in mind, it is difficult to give any credence to Cox’s story, though it could still, strictly speaking, be true. There is nothing precluding its truth in what Gillow presents in his letter, and celebrations of Sarum are theoretically possible, even from two-century old copies of the Marian-era Sarum Missal. Without a thorough examination of the printed sources of the Jacobite rising of 1745, any definitive answer is impossible.

Additional study of the question is needed to determine the truth of Cox’s claim in Derbyshire Annals and the exact latest time at which the Sarum Use can be proven to have been an active tradition among Catholics in England.

The Legacy and True ‘End’ of the Sarum Use

It is a true historical irony that one of the most long-lived legacies of the Sarum Use in English culture in general was its recurring presence as a protestant, anti-Catholic trope. Exploration of the liturgical aspects of anti-Catholicism are something of rarity in the historiography. In her 2011 book, *Fighting the Antichrist: a Cultural History of Anti-Catholicism in Tudor England*, Leticia Álvarez-Recio covers the common aspects of the phenomenon in the Elizabethan and Jacobean reigns – the pope as Antichrist, scurrilous gossip about clerics, the anti-Spanish ‘Black Legend,’ the sly Jesuit, and of course the Inquisition. Other scholars have taken up the narrative to the Georgian era and brought it to British America, where it developed into a robust colonial anti-Catholicism based on the distrust of Catholics and Jesuits, who it was thought could commit sin with impunity
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because of the doctrine of indulgences. Anti-popery had the ability to engender violent hatred and riots even into the mid-nineteenth century. The specter of the medieval, papistical past reaching forward to seize and oppress the present became a common trope of the nineteenth century and was used with great effect to beat both true Catholics and the Tractarians. Catholic doctrine and institutional structure then, as areas of major difference with various groups of protestants, were common targets of anti-Catholic ire. The liturgy has not, however, received sufficient attention as a locus of anti-Catholicism. As one of the central aspects of the English Reformation, and the one which possible gave rise to the most passionate disagreement, the liturgy naturally also became a source of these anti-Catholic images and a focus of the anti-Catholic imagination. Both doctrinally and practically, the Catholic Mass was abhorrent to English protestant sensibilities, and even though there were no public celebrations of the old liturgy after 1559, the images remained in currency long after any English protestants were likely to have ever seen such a liturgy.

Practices like the sacring bell and the liturgical worshipping of the Host were detestable practices which smacked of idolatry, and it was better to not be instructed in the Christian religion at all than to be taught of these things.

By the late seventeenth century, the most recognizable and characteristic ceremonies of the Sarum Use - the Creeping, the Sunday blessing of bread and holy water, the processions of Palm Sunday and Rogationtide, the Easter Sepulcher - were likely only
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84 Hill, *God's Architect*, 448; the anti-popery hysteria of 1850 resulted in the Ecclesiastical Titles Act the following year, which outlawed the use of the diocesan titles of the Church of England by any other body. Thus did the current Roman Catholic sees obtain their names, noticeably different from those of the medieval English Church; cf. 455-68.

85 See the development and enforcement of protestant critiques of the traditional liturgy in *The Stripping of the Altars*, 448-503 passim.

86 Álvarez-Recio, 84-85.
remembered by most in the polemical terms used by protestant preachers to refer to such idolatrous, ‘popish poms.’ The 1688 Prayer Book could well recall that “This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, then declare and set forth Christ’s benefits unto us.”

They were used as exemplars of the obvious idolatrous excesses of the pre-Cranmer liturgy. Most churchgoing Anglicans – that is, all of them as church attendance was still compulsory and would remain so until quite recent times – were given this perspective on the past as absolute truth, and their impression of their medieval history as idolatrous, obscure, sinful, and corrupt was one which would be long-lasting, and would be raised again during the Oxford movement and ritualism crises as the cry of ‘no popery’ was taken up once again, this time specifically in response to liturgical developments.

Descended from such a pedigree, anti-Catholicism – identification of the Catholic Church (or at least the medieval English Church) with medieval obscurantism, corruption, vice, unreason, and violence continues, a fact pointed out by Duffy as a reason for the ignoring or outright rejection of his conclusions. Much of this can be attributed to the legacy of state reinforcement of the religious opinions of the sixteenth century, evolved and culturally digested over four centuries. The cultural pressure against the old religion became increasingly heavy, and the traditional liturgy (or at least their imaginings of it) became increasingly ridiculous to those who had been raised in English protestantism. As a result, when the material aspects of the old Mass began to be attractive to the nineteenth-
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These prejudices continued into the twentieth century as well. The debates on the revisions to the Prayer Book in the 1910s and 20s occasioned denunciations of covert popery within the established church, and angry calls in 1927 from nearly a hundred protestant MPs for the suppression of ritualism within the Church of England. Butler, 79; Alexander Roper Vidler, The Church in an Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present Day (Baltimore: Penguin, 1971), 163ff.

century Tractarians, an entire cultural context – all the conflict and emotion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – seemed to be dredged up along with it.\(^9\)

Among the English Catholics, the loss of much of Sarum’s medieval enculturation ensured that it became a ‘dead letter’ by the time memories of its medieval use faded after a century of unbroken official protestantism. The cleaving to certain of its aspects by those I have called ‘Sarum Catholics’ was probably uneven and inconsistent. While in the same community the Sarum marriage traditions might have been used until the mid-eighteenth century or more, the actual celebration of Mass ad usum Sarum could have disappeared entirely by the end of the sixteenth century. Fasting and feast days, blessings and marriage services, and stray missals and breviaries which may have survived in use by individual clerics and communities seem to how Sarum survived, with all traces probably gone by the period from 1700 to 1750. By that time, English Catholics had abandoned the memory of the medieval world and effectively embraced the ‘Romanization’ of the Counter-Reformation. This in turn ensured the cooling of any lingering affection for Sarum and its eventual fall into desuetude. The recovery of its use by clerics like Wiseman and Rock in the nineteenth century was to a certain extent inorganic, in that it was recovered from texts and historical memory rather than living tradition. It is certainly possible that a hiatus of merely a century and a half to two hundred years separates Sarum’s Romantic recovery and its loss in the seventeenth century. Further, this recovery was done in the spirit not of simple reconstruction or antiquarianism, but a rediscovery of a medieval way of being Catholic which had never been abandoned outright but merely suppressed and later left to atrophy under persecution as the newer Roman books were promoted.

---

\(^9\) This is possibly another reason for the failure of the English Catholics to readopt Sarum, that is, they wished to avoid the entire controversy and sidestep the question of the legacy of the medieval in favor of the more neutral Roman.
The conclusions I draw from this later period of Sarum’s history in the Catholic community are briefly these: first, Sarum’s disuse, its passing as an active tradition, was, as Morris puts it, a “natural death,” and not one which is attributable to any act of authority, episcopal or papal. Though the Jesuits and others imbued with the spirit of the Counter-Reformation encouraged the use of the new Missale and Rituale Romanum, this was never mandated due to the confused and decentralized structure of the English mission, as well as the express permission and indeed encouragement given in Quo primum for the celebration of liturgical traditions older than two hundred years. Secondly, aspects of Sarum closest to the laypeople – feasts and fasts as well as marriage services – were those which survived the longest, indicating that Sarum’s status as the particular English use, i.e. the traditions of the English Church and people, was its most attractive and unique quality. Despite the upheaval and suppression of the Reformation and the pressures of the Counter-Reformation and the Jesuits, some were resolved enough and had enough residual affection for the Sarum Use to keep it alive under persecution in various forms and under great hardships for at least a century and a half following 1549. Sarum’s revival in the nineteenth century then need not be seen as an ‘esoteric whim,’ but a grasping for what is authentically English and Catholic, grasping at a world which, though lost, can be connected with on a liturgical level and can in a sense reunite English Catholics with a lost history.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND CURRENT STATUS OF SARUM

This study has compassed nearly five centuries and vast spans of historical time and setting. The subject is complex and consists in multiple moving parts. Despite this, however, I hope to have illuminated the unique place which Sarum holds both in the history of the English Reformation and in the story of the English Catholic community. I have sought to show the embedded and enculturated nature of Sarum and the violent disruption occasioned by its suppression, all which are constitutive of its collective cultural memory today. Employing a relevant sampling of selected works from the voluminous secondary literature available, I have brought the insights of recent historiography to the study of the medieval liturgy in general and Sarum in particular, emphasizing the deep enculturation of the medieval Sarum Use, the significant social and political impact of its suppression, and the meaning of its revival both in the nineteenth century and in recent years.

In doing so, I wished to show a fresh perspective on the Sarum Use, informed by recent advances in social and cultural history. Not, as most scholars of the liturgy have done in the past, a study purely of the text and publication history of Sarum books, as was thoroughly done recently by Pfaff and before by the Tractarian scholars, nor of the traditional religion writ large as Duffy accomplished in The Stripping of the Altars, but a more specific study of Sarum as a species of the enculturated medieval liturgy, and the
place of that liturgy in the cultural discourse of the Reformation. I have sought to identify
Duffy’s medieval neighborliness and community-reinforcing liturgy as something which
cannot be separated from the Sarum Use itself, and his further description of the violence
of the Reformation changes with the suppression of that same Sarum tradition. I also
argued crucially for a reestablishment of the connection between the medieval Church and
the post-Reformation Catholic Church in England denied by Bossy in 1976. Sarum
liturgical and para-liturgical traditions continued through the Reformation period and
beyond, along with a common Catholic liturgical tradition and doctrinal beliefs. These facts
render Bossy’s separation thesis untenable. At base in all of this, it has been my motivation
to show that the historical legacy of the Sarum Use is essential to understanding English
Catholic and Anglican cultural and religious identity.

With this in mind, I intended ultimately to address Sarum’s significance in the
Roman Catholic Church in England of the present-day, particularly the renewed interest in
it represented by the Oxford Society Candlemas in 1997 and Bishop Conti’s celebration in
2000. This interest, I maintain, must be seen not simply in the short-term of the past two
centuries as symptomatic of neo-Romantic or reactionary revival, but in the context of a
peculiar history. Humanity, as historical subjects ourselves, approaches history in context.
We approach medieval Sarum through this and interpretation, and cannot bypass it, but
must recognize the filter of the nineteenth century through which much of the sources on
Sarum as well as its contemporary memory are usually interpreted. As I provided earlier,
the CDW was likely unaware of the extra dimensions and layers of peculiar historical
context which are bound up with the Sarum liturgy. Their action in halting further
celebrations at Oxford in 1996 was probably a result not of hostility to legitimate
aspirations, but rather a reaction, understandable in the context of the moment, which did
not take into account every aspect of the question in full, particularly the social history of the English Catholics as a people who had had their traditional liturgy taken violently from them – and the place of Sarum in that history. The previous chapters were meant to readdress the place of Sarum in English culture and English Catholic history as a means of providing this context. Historical research is, I contend, the best way to advocate for revival and a readdressing of this question by the CDW. The deep medieval enculturation of Sarum and its significant cultural memory is manifestly apparent. Further, not only is it possible that Sarum may already be protected by the provisions of *Quo primum*, but, by the arguments of Alcuin Reid in *Organic Development*, Sarum’s revival is a legitimate aspiration born of an authentic place in English Catholicism.

Those interested in Sarum today are engaged in a recovery of the tradition, and Sarum itself is a linking together of many various aspirations for continuity and community with the past. The culturally-trumatic loss of Sarum (primarily in the reign of Edward VI and later Elizabeth I) resulted in the devaluing of the entire liturgical use. The differences between Sarum and Roman customs were obscured by the fact that both liturgies were now said by Catholics in secret. Sarum’s loss was at the time likely felt to be no great matter, as its importance had now been changed to triviality by the circumstances of Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Meanwhile, use of the post-Tridentine *Missale Romanum* of St. Pius V was connected naturally with papal obedience and the Counter-Reformation movement itself and thus grew to become the favored use of the English Mission. Very likely, the new missal was viewed as a sort of ‘wave of the future’ and a sign of opposition to protestantism, in addition to being the universal liturgy of the new international missionaries. In this atmosphere, it is not surprising that the Sarum Use, devoid of its communal context and function in its own homeland, gave way to a liturgical reform which
likely seemed much more relevant to the situation and an astute response to the crisis. With the space of several centuries, however, interest in the English Catholic medieval context has returned – and legitimately so, as I have argued.

Sarum’s revival among the Tractarians and Romantic Catholics of the 1840s ended in discredit by its association with both, and as such it was not readopted after the restoration of the hierarchy. Cardinal Wiseman and the restored bishops were not keen to be associated with either Pugin’s idiosyncratic melding of Anglican branch theory with Catholic ecclesiology, nor were they interested in the medieval Gothic ‘revival’ championed by the Earl of Shrewsbury and Fr. Rock. As the nineteenth century continued, Sarum became associated with those peculiar occupations of the early Victorians – the antiquary and liturgiologist.

Certainly the reference of the 1996 CDW letter to “esoteric whims” is partly a consequence of this perception. The association with Sarum is unfortunate, as it has to a great degree obscured the important historical place of the Sarum Use. Whether or not the stereotype of the ‘enthusiast’ actually existed outside of caricature (Pugin was probably a living example), the image seems to have stuck, and unfortunately given it the air of triviality – two antiquaries discussing the shape of a piscina or the cut of a Gothic chasuble are unlikely to inspire much interest in their ideas except among themselves.

The characterization of “esoteric whims” brings to mind not only conventional examples of liturgical experimentation frowned upon by the CDW, but also perhaps a suspicion of the sort of English-izing tendencies which tend to be associated with Sarum, the very things of which Pugin himself was accused. Sarum’s association with Anglo-Catholic indecision on entering the Church, and with what might be now considered eccentric and fussy liturgical antiquarianism is what kept it from reintroduction in 1850,
and may still linger in the background of the controversy. In this vein, it might be objected to both the revival of the nineteenth century and the recent one that this spirit is simply nostalgia and whimsical historical reenactment rather than a true liturgical renewal, and that there is something inauthentic about the revival of a liturgy which was in disuse for nearly two centuries and has not been celebrated in its fullest form for five. In part, the rejoinder to this is the history reviewed in the foregoing chapters, combined with the examples Reid provides of precedents for the authentic revival of liturgical uses. The recovery of medieval traditions is, in short, not unheard of. I return then briefly to the example of Braga, which I mentioned in the introduction.

It might be reasonably objected that the raising of historical context and the call for revival is a symptom of illegitimate antiquarianism. The twentieth century version of liturgical antiquarianism has of course been constantly frowned upon in the Catholic reform of the liturgy since the beginnings of papal action in favor of the liturgical movement, as Alcuin Reid observes in *Organic Development.* The renewal of the Use of Braga (Lat. *Usus Bracarensis*) was accompanied in Benedict XV’s 1919 letter *Sedes huius* by a stern warning against a simplistic antiquarianism done for its own sake. Pius XI acknowledged both the fruits and dangers of liturgical study and renewal in *Inter multiplici*es of 1924. Both of these are forerunners of Pius XII more well-known proscriptions against reductionist antiquarianism in the encyclical *Mediator Dei,* sections 62-64. Since the reforms of the Roman Holy Week in 1955, the introduction of the more participatory ‘Dialogue Mass,’ and the later reforms to the Roman Missal following the Second Vatican Council, conversations on liturgical antiquarianism – the preference of the
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1 Reid, *Organic Development,* 128-32.
supposed original over the more recent - have continued, with some few accusations of antiquarianism levied against these reforms themselves. This is written about extensively in Reid and others concerned with liturgical renewal.²

There is neither the need nor the space here to enter into a discussion of the merits of these accusations, but the objection of antiquarianism and general ‘outmoded-ness’ was also associated with the Sarum Use, confronting it in 1850 and again in 1997. It is my position that English interest in Sarum, far from being antiquarian (in either its nineteenth century English or twentieth century Catholic senses), is a function of the peculiar history of the English nation and so falls under the heading of legitimate liturgical revival and recovery. No other country in Europe during the Reformation had the cause of reform forced upon it by government legislation and enforcement, nor did any other country have the liturgy so at the center of reform. Aspiration for the Sarum Use now is connected to all of these various strains of English history and culture among Catholics, and the desire for continuity with the late medieval world which was suppressed in the sixteenth century. Sarum thus has a much more important place in the historical memory of English Catholics than for which its mistaken antiquarian reputation gives it credit.

As such, its current situation is broadly analogous to the interest in reviving the Bracarian Use discussed by Reid in *Organic Development*. By the renewal of the 1910s, the Use of Braga had also fallen out of celebration. It was only celebrated in isolated instances in that Portuguese diocese, and where it was celebrated various ‘Romanizations’ had crept into the local tradition.³ The decision of the archbishops to bring about a renewal and revival of the Bracarian Use was ratified by Rome, as what Reid calls an affirmation

² Ibid., 35-229 passim.
³ Ibid., 128.
both of “venerable liturgical antiquity” along the lines of *Quo primum*, and “a confirmation of the right of local churches to their truly traditional liturgies.” For Reid, there is a sort of happy middle ground between unhelpful and inorganic antiquarianism for its own sake, and an authentic renewal of ancient and venerable tradition. Like Sarum, the diocese of Braga had let its local use lapse, with ‘Romanizations’ included in the rite and only a few places which even still kept it in practice. With the permission of the Papacy, Braga set about teaching their traditional use to their diocesan clergy and ‘purifying’ it of later customs. This was seen by Rome and others as a restoration of something intrinsically valuable and in the spirit of *Quo primum*, a revival of an ‘antique’ liturgical use which was nevertheless legitimate and non-antiquarian.

In both the case of the nineteenth-century Romantics and the twentieth century enthusiasts, those who advocate celebration of the Sarum Use are interested in recovering the historical and liturgical sense of medieval England. The loss of the Sarum liturgical tradition was a deliberate and enforced decision of the English state under the protestant Tudors, and the suppression of that same liturgy was never acquiesced to or approbated by either any ecclesiastical authority in communion with Rome or any expressed aspiration of the English Catholic faithful. Had the cultural context and practice of Sarum survived (for example, had Queen Mary not fallen ill and died without issue in 1558), Sarum would not have succumbed to desuetude, as *Quo primum* would have ensured its continuing celebration. It was as a result of Jesuit efforts in defense of Rome, itself a response to the crisis of the times, that the Roman Missal was preferred.

The Jesuit response is certainly understandable in the context of the time (their distinctive vow of obedience to the Papacy, for instance, sprang from emphasis on the Petrine primacy), but historical distance from the period has brought into renewed focus
that the lost Sarum liturgy – a representative in some sense of the lost world of a pre-Reformation England which was so intricately connected to the traditional liturgy – is an aspiration of English Catholics today precisely because it and its full medieval context has been lost. Its revival is a symptom of the deep desire of some English Catholics, as a result of the peculiar history of their particular Church as a reduced and persecuted group, to reconnect with something which was violently taken from their predecessors – something which those same predecessors practiced and valued for centuries, and which permeated every aspect of their lives. As such, the impressions created by the association of Sarum with fussy antiquarianism and Anglo-Catholicism may be discarded – Sarum was once the fully realized Catholic life for the whole of Catholic England. The English Church has within it those who would revive Sarum, such that it would be again a living tradition, a means of reconnecting with a history and an identity.

Dom Alcuin Reid’s schema supports such a revival. For Reid, what marks the difference between unhelpful antiquarianism and authentic revival is both a good case for the salutary and venerable continuity of the tradition and the decision of proper authority, i.e. of Rome as evidenced by his example of the Bracarian Use. In the first place, I have made in this study a case for liturgical continuity with the medieval period as well as for Sarum’s unique place in English Catholic history. There is, I maintain, a reasonable desire for reestablishing continuity even if this liturgy ceased to be celebrated for a time. Its recurring historical memory and place in English culture make it a living tradition. The peculiar history of Catholic England supports the claim of Sarum as a living liturgical tradition over a significant period of time. The presence of a significant gap in the tradition – of perhaps two-hundred years – cannot of course be ignored. The Bracarian Use, however, was also lost for a time to Romanization, but later recovered. Sarum has indeed
been lost longer, and, unlike at Braga, was totally lost in that celebrations of it ceased. This is of course a problem – how can an authentic tradition be recovered from just the study of texts? Further, how can the layers of historical interpretation on Sarum be peeled back in order to facilitate its revival as a practical Catholic liturgy while avoiding the missteps of the nineteenth century?

While these questions are fair ones, there is no reason these concerns should preclude Sarum’s revival into an active tradition. There is no firm evidence to prove that Sarum was not celebrated continuously in one place or another among Catholics in the British Isles in this period, though this of course is unlikely as no record exists of it. The possibility is nevertheless intriguing. This aside, however, the short century or two of desuetude between Sarum and its revival might be inconsequential. What is, after all, this time in comparison to the centuries and depth of the English Catholics’ previous experience with Sarum? Provided the liturgical books are properly reviewed and revised and new Catholic editions made, there is no reason Sarum cannot be used once again. The heavy historiographical re-contextualization which Sarum has undergone throughout the last few centuries can be stripped away as a result of continuing historical study of English ritual and history, such as Duffy’s and my own, so that one can approach the Sarum tradition on its own terms as a Catholic liturgical system of sign and symbol with its own internal logic. Sarum Use Catholics recited the same Creed, crept to the same cross, knelt before the same Sepulcher, and worshipped according to the same forms as those who now ask to use the Sarum books would, if allowed. If one admits that the Catholic faith in England has, despite Bossy’s objections, enjoyed a continuity of tradition from the medieval period to the present, it is difficult to deny that, despite the gap of disuse, the Catholic community continued to exist, in belief and many aspects of practice very largely
as it had before the disappearance of Sarum. There is consequently no legitimate objection to its revival, just as there was no serious obstacle to the twentieth-century renewal of the Use of Braga.

What I have sought to show in this study is the historical pedigree of the Sarum Use, its intrinsic Englishness and its intrinsic Catholicity as a liturgical use of the Roman Rite. Given the tumultuous and difficult history of the English Catholics, and the historical continuity - devotional, liturgical, and doctrinal - between the continuing English Catholic community (particularly those interested in Sarum) and the medieval English Church, I have made a case for the legitimacy of the aspiration for a revival and renewal of Sarum. Far from being a symptom of eccentric and ‘esoteric’ liturgical whimsy, a revival of Sarum represents profound historical and ecclesiological trends in the English Catholic Church, ones which are deserving of cultivation, respect, and better understanding. It remains my hope that these considerations may in the future be brought again to the attention of the CDW and permission sought from the Church on these grounds for a renewed and enthusiastic permission for the recovery of the Sarum tradition.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Liturgical and Para-liturgical Sources


*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites of the Church according to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America.* New York: OUP, 1952.

(ML-RB) *The Book of Common-Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church, according to the use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches.* London: Charles Bill & Henry Hills, 1688.


*Secondary Sources*


Morris, John. “The Kalendar and Rite used by the Catholics since the time of Elizabeth.” *Archaeologia* 52 (January 1890): 113-128.


Zall, Paul M. *A Hundred Merry Tales, and other English jestbooks of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.