

LG 1958/5

The Commemoration of Saints
and Heroes of the Faith
in the Anglican Communion

THE REPORT OF A COMMISSION
APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

LONDON
S·P·C·K

1957

*First published in 1957
by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church
Marylebone Road
London N.W. 1*

*Made and printed in Great Britain by
Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd
Aylesbury and London*

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE COMMEMORATION OF SAINTS	5
2. ORIGINS	15
3. THE MIDDLE AGES	20
4. THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES	25
5. THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION SINCE THE REFORMATION: THE BRITISH ISLES	30
INTRODUCTORY NOTE ON LITURGICAL TERMS	
THE BRITISH ISLES	
I. The Prayer Book Kalendar	32
II. Other Forms of Recognition in England	36
III. The Province of Scotland	41
IV. The Church of Ireland	43
6. THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION SINCE THE REFORMATION: OVERSEAS	45
AMERICA	
I. The Church of Canada	46
II. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A.	49

AFRICA	
I. The Province of South Africa	50
II. The Diocese of Southern Rhodesia	53
III. The Dioceses of East Africa	53
IV. Other African Dioceses	58
ASIA	
I. The Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon	59
II. Other Asiatic Dioceses	61
AUSTRALASIA	
I. The Church in Australia	62
II. The Church in New Zealand	64
7. HEROIC SANCTITY AND ITS RECOGNITION	65
8. THE PATH FORWARD	69
APPENDIX I	
Notes on the Origins, Diffusion, and Observance of Saints' Days. By E. C. Ratcliff	74
APPENDIX II	
Glossary of Liturgical Terms	84

The Report

INTRODUCTION

IN December 1937 the Bishop of Nyasaland wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Lang), as his metropolitan, asking for his guidance in a matter which he stated as follows:

I have just received from the priest-in-charge of one of the parishes in this diocese a request, strongly supported by the African Elders of the Church, for permission to bring before the Diocesan Synod to be held at the end of January 1938 the cause of the Beatification of the late Archdeacon William Percival Johnson of this diocese.

The Archbishop replied:

I see no kind of objection to your honouring Archdeacon Johnson by special Commemoration by the authority of your Synod, including the provision of a special Collect, Epistle and Gospel for use, if desired, on the birthday of the Archdeacon. But I must ask you not to use in any formal way the term "Beatification", which is not a word in the vocabulary of the Anglican Church, or therefore the word "Blessed" in any commemorative Collect. I must not in regard to a single diocese sanction an innovation which has not authorization in the Anglican Church and which might be regarded as a precedent elsewhere.

At that time preparations were being made for the Lambeth Conference to be held in 1940, and it occurred to the Bishop of Nyasaland that the question of "commemoration" might very suitably be considered then with a view to ascertaining the mind of the Anglican Communion on it. The Archbishop had no objection to this suggestion, but owing to the outbreak of war the 1940 Lambeth Conference was not held. The matter was, however, discussed with the metropolitans at the Conference of 1948, and the Arch-

bishop of Canterbury (Dr Fisher) undertook to appoint a small commission. This he did in 1950, giving it the following terms of reference:

To consider, in relation to the Church of England, questions concerning the "recognition" or "commemoration" of Anglican Martyrs, Doctors, Confessors, Bishops, Missionaries, or the like in Church calendars diocesan or provincial, with special reference to missionary dioceses; and to report as to whether there should be some recognized procedure and regulation in the matter, and if so, as to what form it should take: (a) for missionary dioceses, (b) for dioceses in England.

Later the Archbishop, in answer to a letter from the chairman, wrote:

There is no doubt at all about the meaning of your terms of reference. There you have to consider in relation to the Church of England the recognition of *Anglican Martyrs*, etc., etc. You are thus forbidden to consider the names of people outside the Anglican Communion.

The members of the Commission are:

The Very Rev. Eric Milner-White, Dean of York (*Chairman*).

The Rt Rev. David Colin Dunlop, Dean of Lincoln.

The Rev. Max Alexander Cunningham Warren, Hon. Canon of Truro and General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.

The Rt Rev. Ronald Ralph Williams, Bishop of Leicester.

The Rev. Eric Waldram Kemp, Canon of Lincoln and Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford (*Secretary*).

The report is unanimous.

The Commission has held twelve meetings. It has received valuable assistance from the Metropolitan Gennadios of Heliopolis, the Archbishop of York (Dr Ramsey), the late Rt Rev. B. C. Roberts (formerly Secretary of the S.P.G.), Prof. E. C. Ratcliff, Dr N. Zernov, and many bishops and other correspondents overseas who have replied to the Commission's inquiries.

In the first chapter of the report the theological problems involved in the recognition and commemoration of saints are considered, and an attempt is made to distinguish between a sound defence of the veneration of saints and the unsound position which is implied in the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome.

It is suggested that the existence of abuses in the past ought not to deter the Church today from paying honour to the heroes of the faith and seeking a deeper understanding of their unity with the members of the Church on earth in the Body of Christ. Chapter 2 describes the honour paid to the saints in the early days of the Church, how the cessation of persecution caused confessors to be added to the martyrs as the heroes of Christendom, and how this development, combined with the growth of superstition and abuse as the Church expanded, gave rise to the need for stricter control by ecclesiastical authority. In Chapter 3 the further stages of this development in the West are traced, and in Chapter 4 the somewhat different story of Eastern Christendom. Chapters 5 and 6 describe the forms, both official and unofficial, of the recognition of saints in the Anglican Communion since the Reformation. The first of these two chapters describes the English reaction against the excessive and often superstitious veneration of the saints during the later Middle Ages, sets out the principles which lie behind the Prayer Book Kalendar, and shows how later generations in this country have felt the need to recover a sense of the unity of the Church militant and triumphant, which had been weakened by the reaction against abuse. The second of the two chapters tells the same story as regards the Church overseas. Chapter 7 is devoted to the subject of Heroic Sanctity and its Recognition, considered in the light of the historical development outlined in the previous chapters. The report ends with some practical comments and suggestions on the present position in the Anglican Communion.

Chapter I

THE THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE COMMEMORATION OF SAINTS

ANY theological inquiry such as that undertaken in this report at once raises the question: "What does the New Testament say about the matter?" This question, even when it permits a clear and decisive answer, raises promptly another: "How is the New Testament teaching to be related to the theological teaching of the Church today?" In other words: By what principles are the deliverances of the New Testament Scriptures to be translated into doctrinal formulations?

The formularies of the Church of England do not take us very far in answering this question, but they do suggest some guiding principles. Article 6 lays down the principle that nothing is "to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation" which is not "read therein, nor may be proved thereby". This lays down a negative principle, but makes no statement as to the bearing of scriptural evidence upon points of doctrine not immediately related to the terms of salvation. Article 20—"Of the authority of the Church"—states that the Church may not "ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another". Modern critical study has made it difficult always to conform to this latter requirement. Apart from apparent contradictions in statements of historical fact, it is clear that the natural interpretation of some passages would involve contradiction of other passages when similarly interpreted. Such contradictions arise often because a different point is being stressed or a different picture used, but the apparent contradictions cannot be denied. A modern interpretation of the article might be that doctrinal implications are not to be pressed to the point where a collision would occur between them and the implications of Scripture as a whole; that in formulating doctrine regard should always be had to the "main drift of Holy

Scripture" (as Hooker calls it) rather than to passages which may present a peculiar or "provincial" view-point.

Article 22—"Of Purgatory"—approaches more closely to our particular concern in this report. It brings together a number of similar but not identical subjects, such as "Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Relics, and also invocation of Saints", and states that the "Romish Doctrine" on all these subjects is "a fond thing vainly invented, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God". This article, therefore, goes somewhat beyond Article 6 in demanding conformity to Scripture in matters not immediately relevant to salvation, but it does so again in a negative way. By implication, customs or teachings which are supported by warranty of Scripture should be taught, and those which are not repugnant to God's Word *may* be taught.

The general implication of all this might seem to be that on any important subject the teaching of the New Testament should be looked at as a whole; that no open clash be allowed between that teaching and the teaching of the Church, but that there might be a penumbra of belief, around the clear outline of the Church's teaching, where some beliefs might be taught even if they lacked the clear warrant of Scripture, so long as they were natural deductions from Scripture or were at least not contrary to its teaching.

This teaching of our Church on the general principles of Biblical interpretation would suggest certain principles which should be observed in the consideration of New Testament teaching on such a subject as the condition of the Departed in Christ. We should, for instance, distinguish between the clear teaching of Scripture, given as such, and incidental references which may reflect the common belief of the times, rather than be intended as expressions of definite Christian dogma. We should also distinguish—and this is a greater problem—between the truth which is to be conveyed and the pictorial imagery which must inevitably be used in any statements about the after-life, where language of scientific accuracy is obviously impossible.

Quite apart from specific statements about the departed, it must be remembered that actual statements have to be seen against a whole background of eschatological hope which had been taking clearer shape in the years immediately preceding the New Testament period. The point has been put with clarity by Dr C. H. Dodd in his chapter "The Communion of Saints" in *New Testament Studies* (Manchester U.P., 1953). He writes:

The end of the age, in Jewish thought, brought consequences also for the generations of the past, who, when the time was fulfilled, should be called out of sleep to inherit the promises. It follows, on the primitive Christian view, that the saints of the past are now at last really alive, and no longer awaiting their redemption. The Israel of God is constituted within the eternal order, and living Christians are incorporated in the Church invisible. They are not only members of the household of faith upon earth: they

"... are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven . . . and to the spirits of just men made perfect."

. . . We have here a profound spiritual intuition, which in its essential significance we must attribute to the influence of Jesus Christ Himself. The Christian soul lives within the family of God, whose home is not of this world alone. The ways between the eternal order and this world of mortality are open, and life is one in the two worlds. The seat of life, absolute in its quality, is the one church of the living God, militant here on earth and triumphant above, which in and through its individual members grows into the stature of perfect humanity.¹

Once this essential "two-worldly" background is understood it is possible to observe the great restraint, even the negative character, of the detailed statements about the state of the departed in the New Testament. To these we may now turn.

The first thing that then strikes us is how little is said at all about the subject. One or two parables or sayings of our Lord, a chapter or two from St Paul's Epistles, certain passages from the Apocalypse, contain most of the relevant material. The fact is that the infant Church was dominated by the hope of the early return of the Lord, and the condition of those no longer alive in this world was not a preoccupying problem for its members. The question did arise, but is not one of the main concerns of the New Testament writings. Secondly, what teaching is given is marked by a noticeable restraint, even by a stress on what is not known, or on what cannot be predicated. This is the main burden of our Lord's teaching in St Mark 12.18-27, the reply to the Sadducees about the woman with seven successive husbands. Jesus says that the one error to be avoided is that of carrying over into the other

¹ Dodd, *op. cit.*, 150, 151.

life the conditions with which we are familiar in this. The answer is concerned, in any case, not with the present state of the departed but with their state "when they rise". Then they neither marry nor are given in marriage. They are "as the angels"—they belong to that other world of which we know so little. But Jesus stresses that this unavoidable ignorance must not undermine our faith in the Resurrection. This rests on sure ground—that of God's Revelation of himself in Scripture as a Living God.

St Paul in 1 Cor. 15.35-49 describes as foolish the man who asks: "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" The only answer he will give to this hypothetical question is: "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him."

Thirdly, it must be clearly stated that the New Testament in so far as it thinks of the departed, thinks almost entirely in terms of their resurrection from sleep at the last day. It passes over, almost in silence, their present condition. Evidence for this can be seen in 1 Thess, 4.13-18; 1 Cor. 15; St John 11.1-46 (where nothing is said about Lazarus' soul during the four days when his body was in the tomb). Some evidence on the other side can be drawn from Heb. 12.1-2, and from Rev. 6.9-11. Even in Revelation the stress is on the fact that the blessed dead "rest from their labours" (Rev. 14.13).

Fourthly, it may be said that where guidance is given about the present state of the resting departed, almost the only clear deduction is that they are "with Christ". This can be supported from St Luke 23.43 (Christ's word to the Penitent Thief) and from Phil. 1.23, where St Paul identifies "departing" with being "with Christ, which is very far better". The question as to whether there is a development in St Paul's thought between, say, the Thessalonian epistles and Philippians has often been discussed, and is the subject of a recent important work by Dom Jacques Dupont, O.S.B.—*L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul* (Bruges, 1952). In this work the author takes the view that in the earlier epistles St Paul moves in the ordinary Jewish apocalyptic world. Those who sleep "in Jesus" await their resurrection at the *Parousia*. By the time Philippians is written, the Apostle thinks of death as the normal step leading to being "with Christ". An important passage in 2 Cor. 5.1-9 seems to provide a link between the two positions. In the earlier verses of this passage St Paul expresses a longing "not to be unclothed" (i.e. not to die), but "to be clothed upon" (i.e. to receive his new status during his lifetime, through the *Parousia*). But in vv. 6-9 he speaks of life in this world as being "absent from the Lord". Death would lead to his being "at home with the Lord". There would seem to be a movement towards a more

"Greek" conception of immortality as against the Jewish conception of resurrection; but it must be remembered that such "Greek" ideas had already been integrated into Judaism through such books as The Wisdom of Solomon ("The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God"), a book which certainly influences St Paul in other of his writings.

The references to the saints gathered round the Throne of God in Revelation are difficult to interpret, as it is hard to say whether the writer is picturing their present state or a state of final bliss after the *Parousia*. Some of his references (e.g. Rev. 6.9-11—the souls "under the altar") certainly seem to refer to their intermediate state.

Fifthly, great care must be used in drawing doctrinal deductions from pictorial language. This problem arises most clearly in the story of Dives and Lazarus (St Luke 16.19-31). This story has to be used with the greatest caution. It is told, not to throw light on the state of the dead but to throw the light of the other world on to the moral decisions of this. Much of its language is clearly figurative. Obviously this applies to "Abraham's bosom"—why should it not apply also to the "great gulf fixed", "the flame", "the scorching tongue"? Arguments based on the dialogue between Abraham and Dives are more than precarious.

In summary, then, we may say that the relation between living and the departed Christians is a problem practically untouched in the New Testament. What is assured is the continued inheritance of the departed in Christ and in his Kingdom. All else is treated with the greatest restraint—they rest, they sleep, they wait, but the waiting is expectant, and in a very real sense they live. Now, it would be wrong to assume that the Church can never go beyond these actual statements of Scripture. The postponement of the *Parousia* gives to the later Church a different perspective from that of the Church of the New Testament. (The Church has gone through the same pilgrimage as St Paul went through in his lifetime.) It asks new questions to which the New Testament gives no precise answer. Do the departed still think of us? Do they pray for us? Should we pray for them? Can we speak to them? On all these things the Bible retains a reverent silence. Answers which we give must rest to some extent on our own deductions—they may even be "inventions", but we must prevent their being "fond inventions" or contrary to God's Word written.

The duty and privilege of thankful remembrance of the dead is clearly stated (Heb. 13.7), as is the value of their example, and possibly of their concern for us (Heb. 12.1-2). All that we conjecture and surmise must be controlled by the one supreme message

of the New Testament on the subject: they are one with us, in Christ. The mode of their existence with us, in him, is hidden from our earthly eyes, but will one day be made manifest, when we shall be fully re-united in him and with him. Reasonable and reverent deductions from this truth are permissible but not obligatory, and the very definite limits of revealed truth must never be forgotten. Legend all too easily creeps in to fill the gaps in revealed truth.²

It has been widely held among Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, that after death there must be a state of purification and of progress. Thus the Lutheran writer Martensen says:

As no soul leaves this present existence in a fully complete and prepared state, we must suppose that there is an intermediate state, a realm of progressive development in which souls are prepared and matured for the final judgment. Though the Romish doctrine of purgatory is repudiated because it is mixed up with so many crude and false positions, it nevertheless contains the truth that the intermediate state must in a purely spiritual sense be a purgatory designed for the purifying of the soul.³

If this be so, it is natural to think that some souls need less purification than others, and that there is some distinction between those who have lived lives of eminent holiness on earth and the ordinary run of Christians. Such an opinion, however, does not imply that the Church on earth can draw this distinction in any precise kind of way or in any particular instance. The Roman Catholic practice of canonization appears to imply that it can. It appears to be bound up with a doctrine; namely, that there is a distinction between the faithful departed in the intermediate state and the saints who have already attained their goal in heaven, and that the Church on earth can through the agency of the Pope pro-

² A note on eschatological words used in the New Testament may be useful. The basic idea, taken over from the Old Testament, is that of *Sheol* or *Hades*, the shadowy abode of departed spirits. Through apocalyptic teaching this had come to be regarded as divided into separate regions (see Enoch 22.1-14), according as to whether the occupants were destined for a joyful or bitter resurrection. *Paradise* was the pleasant, garden-like portion. Our Lord refers to this in Luke 23.43. In 2 Cor. 12.4 St Paul speaks of Paradise as though it were part of Heaven. The "lower" part of Sheol was *Gehenna* (Mark 9.43, etc.), a place of abandonment and destruction, and frequently referred to under the picture of fire, in view of the origin of "Gehenna" in the Valley of Hinnom, Jerusalem's rubbish-heap. *Heaven* is the place where God dwells. As Dr Alan Richardson says in his article on these words in *A Theological Word-book of the Bible*, to which this note owes much, "The final New Testament word concerning our questions about the life of the saints in heaven must surely be 1 Cor. 2.9 or 1 John 3.2".

³ Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, 457.

nounce with certainty that some particular persons belong to the second glorious category.

This doctrine we believe to be repudiated by the Church of England, but its repudiation by no means involves the repudiation of all commemoration of the saints, as the practice of our Church shows, and it is to the positive justification of such commemoration that we must now address ourselves.

In the New Testament the word saint is frequently used of all Christians, but among the departed there are some who are held up for particular honour, such as are the martyrs and the virgins of the Apocalypse (Rev. 6.9; 7.13-17; 14.2-5), or the Old Testament heroes of Heb. 11 and 12. A strong motive for the inclusion of the story of the preaching and martyrdom of St Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles was, no doubt, that he should be an example and inspiration to other Christians. The light of Christ shines through these heroes of the Faith, and in their lives we see distinguished the particular rays which make the wholeness of the Christian Sun. Inevitably in the first days those most conspicuously honoured were the martyrs, and in the Apocalypse we see them regarded not just as dead men of the past but always as living, sometimes as reigning, with Christ.

This is an important point, for Christian belief necessarily involves an attitude to a saint which is something more than reflection upon him as a figure of the past, an attitude to him as one who is alive in the unseen world. Christians are bound together in Christ by bonds of prayer and love, and whatever other form of separation may take place at death that unity is not broken. Bishop Christopher Wordsworth in his commentary on Rev. 8.4 writes:

The Saints who are on earth, and the saints departed, whose souls are in Paradise (see 6.9), pray to God for the deliverance of his Church, and for the manifestation of his power and Justice; and their prayers are presented before the throne of God; and in answer to their prayers, he ordains or permits such penal visitations on the world as are best adapted to those ends.

Here is striking evidence of the power of *united Prayer*. It is a lever which moves the world.

The Russian theologian Khomiakoff writes:

If anyone believes, he is in the communion of faith; if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and everyone who prays asks the whole Church

for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the angels pray for us, the apostles, martyrs, and patriarchs, and above them all, the Mother of our Lord, and this holy unity is the true life of the Church.

Similarly the Saxon Confession of 1551, in repudiating the practice of invoking the saints, declared it to be undoubted that "the blessed pray for the Church".

It is perhaps necessary to emphasize the distinctions between three forms of prayer. The first is properly called *comprecation*, and is properly prayer because it is addressed to God. It asks God to hear the intercession of the saints. Thus St Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century, expounding the course of the Liturgy, says:

Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that at their prayers and intercessions God would receive our petition.

An instance of such *comprecation* is to be found in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1929 in the following prayer:

O God the King of saints, we praise and magnify thy holy Name for all thy servants who have finished their course in thy faith and fear, for the Blessed Virgin Mary, for the holy Patriarch, Prophets and Martyrs, and for all other thy righteous servants; and we beseech thee that, encouraged by their example, strengthened by their fellowship, and aided by their prayers, we may attain unto everlasting life; through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

This form of prayer is not invocation, and therefore not involved in the condemnation of the twenty-second article.

The other two forms of prayer are properly called *invocation*. They are to be distinguished according as they ask simply for the prayers of the saint or for some particular benefit which is properly sought from God alone. An instance of the first is the Hail Mary:

Hail Mary full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus; Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death.

An instance of the second is the following prayer, found in the *Rituale Romanum*:

Mary, Mother of grace, Mother of mercy, do thou protect me from the foe, and receive me in the hour of death.

There can be no doubt that this second form of invocation is condemned by the twenty-second article.⁴ There has been a difference of opinion among Anglican writers as to the first. Dr John Wordsworth and Dr Bicknell, for example, held that the article condemns all forms of invocation. Dr Darwell Stone and Dr Kidd held that its language was deliberately vague, and that liberty was therefore left for the first form of invocation. We should regard it as in the highest degree unfortunate if this difference of opinion, which exists on this commission as among Anglicans generally and is likely to persist, were allowed to hinder the veneration of saints in our Communion. We desire to emphasize again the unity of *all* the faithful—living and departed—in Christ, a unity in which adoration and mutual prayer have their place. This is something which will greatly enlarge our common ideas of the Church, and will do much to provide a truly Christian corrective to the attraction of Spiritualism and other such movements.

The saints are honoured within the one, indivisible, fellowship of Christ's people living and dead. Yet they *are* honoured. Inevitably Christian devotion will tend to think of some holy men and women as being not simply some of the "souls" for whom they pray but as calling for exultation, thanksgiving, specific commemoration, and as those whose prayers we would greatly desire. We live under the discipline of times and places, and there will be those in the history of our own country, province, or diocese for whom we shall wish particularly to give thanks and of whose continued fellowship we shall perhaps be aware. The putting of a name in a kalendar and the provision of a "saint's day" need not postulate a definition of status as between an intermediate state and heaven, still less an inspired and infallible judgement on the matter, but it does give the Church's direction and sanction to a gratitude and devotion which Christians have already felt. Such an honouring has a note of thanksgiving for great holiness, in which the glory of Christ is reflected, a making much of them that fear the Lord,⁵ and is therefore not content to commemorate the saint by a "requiem", such as is provided in the 1928 service for

⁴ It will no doubt be contended that the protection referred to is protection by prayer, but if so why not say "pray for us".

⁵ Psalm 15.4.

All Souls Day; and it has a note of particularity, and is not therefore content to leave the saint to take his chance within the general commemoration on All Saints Day.

We may end this chapter with the concluding words of the Passion of Saint Perpetua and Saint Felicity, who suffered at Carthage in the year 203:

O valiant and blessed martyrs! O truly called and chosen to the glory of Jesus Christ our Lord! He who magnifies, honours, and adores that glory should recite to the edification of the Church these examples also, not less precious at least than those of old; that so new instances of virtue may testify that one and the self-same Spirit is working to this day with the Father, God Almighty, and with his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom belong splendour and power immeasurable for ever and ever. Amen.

Chapter 2

ORIGINS

It is a natural instinct in man to honour the memory of the great heroes of his religion, and the mortal remains of the dead are an obvious focus for such veneration. In the early days of the Church this instinct manifested itself in a special care for the bodies of the martyrs. When St Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was martyred in A.D. 156 the Jews, aware that the relics of executed Christians were liable to become centres of devotion, put forward one Nicetes to plead with the magistrate not to give up Polycarp's body lest the Christians should begin to worship the martyr. It was, therefore, burnt; but the Jews did not succeed in their endeavour, for the Smyranean Christians wrote in a circular letter sent to other Churches:

We afterwards took up his bones which are more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place; where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom for the commemoration of those that have already fought in the contest, and for the training and preparation of those that shall do so hereafter.⁶

This early document indicates that Christians observed the heavenly birthday (by contrast with the pagan custom of observing the natural birthday), and that the observance took the form of a commemorative assembly at the martyr's tomb. In the third century we have evidence that this assembly took the form of a celebration of the Eucharist, and it appears that the tomb was often used as an altar. St Cyprian writes from his exile:

Tertullus . . . acquaints me with the days on which our blessed brethren in prison pass by way of a glorious death to immortality; and oblations and sacrifices in commemoration of them

⁶ *Martyrium Polycarpi*, XVIII.

are here celebrated by us, which the Lord protecting, we shall soon celebrate with you.⁷

The recognition of a martyr was naturally the function of the community in which he suffered, and was so obvious as to need no special procedure. From the moment that a Christian was put in prison or taken before the magistrate, his conduct, fortitude, and punishment were followed with the liveliest interest and affection by his fellows. The martyrdom of St Polycarp and the sufferings of the Christians at Lyons and Vienne a generation later were obviously witnessed by the communities which wrote accounts of them. The judgement of the community appears even to operate automatically in distinguishing between orthodox and heretic among the martyrs. Eusebius tells how a Marcionite presbyter, Metrodorus, suffered with St Pionius. There is definite evidence of the latter being regarded as a martyr, none at all for any veneration of Metrodorus.

It was inevitable, however, that other Churches which received such a document as the *Martyrium Polycarpi* should wish to include the martyr in their own list of commemorations. It was equally inevitable that as the Church grew and became a dominant institution in the ancient world, two other developments should take place. First, that others besides those who actually suffered martyrdom should become the objects of veneration, and second, that it should become necessary for the leaders of the Church to intervene from time to time to check or control this veneration.

As early as A.D. 177 we hear of a class of persons to whom the title "confessor" is applied. There were certain Christians in the Churches of Lyons and Vienne who suffered imprisonment and torture in the persecution, but were not actually put to death. They refused to allow themselves to be called martyrs, for they said: "They are now martyrs whom Christ deemed worthy to be taken up in their confession, setting upon them the seal of martyrdom by their departure; but we are ordinary and lowly confessors."⁸ At the end of the century Clement of Alexandria elaborates his pictures of the true gnostic martyr which corresponds very closely to the later idea of a "confessor". He is the man who has "conducted himself according to the rule of the gospel, in love to the Lord . . . so as to leave his worldly kindred, and wealth, and every possession, in order to lead a life free from passion".⁹ In the middle of the third century, Dionysius of Alexandria writes of those who had died while ministering to the sick

⁷ Cyprian, *Ep.* 12.2.
⁹ *Stromateis*, IV, 4.

⁸ Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, V, 2.3.

during an outbreak of plague, that "this form of death seems in no respect to come behind martyrdom, being the outcome of much piety and strong faith".¹⁰

The fourth century produced a series of great ascetics some of whom became leaders in the Church, and many of them were easily included in this new category of confessors. One of the earliest was St Antony of Egypt, whose life, written by St Athanasius, did much to spread his fame and veneration. Another was St Martin, the famous Bishop of Tours, of whom Sulpitius Severus writes that "although the character of our times could not ensure him the honour of martyrdom yet he will not remain destitute of the glory of a martyr, because both by vow and virtues he was alike able and willing to be a martyr".¹¹

It is in the Church of North Africa in the middle of the fourth century that we find the first attempts to control the cult of the saints. The Donatist schism produced a number of religious aberrations, and in particular induced some people to seek martyrdom by violent means and, indeed, in some cases to take their own lives or to force others to kill them. Eventually the Catholic bishops in North Africa had to make a statement about the veneration of martyrs. At the so-called First Council of Carthage held about the year 348, the Bishop of Carthage, Gratus, said that the dignity of a martyr was being destroyed by the veneration paid to people who had killed themselves and had been given burial merely by the charity of the Church. He proposed that layfolk who were guilty of venerating such people should be put to penance and that clerics after being warned should be degraded. This suggestion was adopted as a canon by the whole Council. At the end of the century further legislation proved necessary on account of the large number of shrines and memorial chapels which had sprung up along the roads and in the fields. Connected with this problem was that of the alleged frequent appearance in dreams of persons who said that they were martyrs and their bodies would be found in some particular place. The Council of Carthage of 401 made a canon¹² to the effect that altars which could not be proved to contain the body or relics of a martyr should be destroyed by the bishop of the place if it were possible, and if this could not be done for fear of a riot he should admonish the people not to frequent the shrines. The canon also decreed that no memorials of martyrs should be observed except where their relics were or when there was good reason to think that a particular place was the site of their birth,

¹⁰ Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 22.8.

¹² Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, lxxxiv, col. 212.

¹¹ Sulpitius Severus, *Ep.* 2.

dwelling, or passion, and the erection of altars as the result of a dream was explicitly condemned.

Three points may be noted about this canon: (1) The authority concerned. The Council was a regional one consisting of bishops of more than one province. The North African Church was perhaps the nearest thing in the Ancient World to a "National Church". Subject to the general directions of the Council, the responsibility in this matter of the cult of the saints rests upon each diocesan bishop. He is to investigate the circumstances of each case and to decide the appropriate course of action. (2) The desire to bring each alleged martyr to the test of history, as seen in the production of relics, local tradition, and documentary evidence. (3) A suspicion of alleged supernatural intervention. In general, however, there was nothing approaching a process of canonization. No doubt in each Church the bishop and presbyters were necessarily involved in the liturgical commemoration of martyrs and confessors, but the primary force is the instinct of the Christian faithful, and authority intervenes rather to check abuse than to give formal approval. The multiplication of saints and of relics in succeeding centuries made official control more and more necessary.

Few scholars would question the statement that in the fourth and fifth centuries many pagan customs found their way into the life of the Church. In spite of occasional protests, such as that of Vigilantius at the beginning of the fifth century, the collapse of Roman society and the expansion of the Church among uncultured and half-converted barbarians led to an exuberance in religion which, as in most eras of enthusiasm, deformed as well as enlivened the faith. The translation and dissection of bodies which, though practised in the East to provide relics for the New Rome, had been frowned upon by both Empire and Papacy in the West, could not be prevented when the inroads of Goths, Magyars, and Northmen caused monks and churchmen to flee for safety, and to take with them or to hide the bones of saints which were among their most treasured possessions. Scarcely had peace begun to be restored when certain persons perceived the financial opportunities of a traffic in relics and, having easy access to the Roman catacombs, exploited their resources to the uttermost.¹³

The decrees of the Councils of Carthage had not, however, been altogether forgotten. From time to time a bishop would intervene to suppress or attempt to suppress a cult which he believed to have no proper foundation; but the abundance of ready forgers and the

¹³ See E. W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (1948), Chapters I and II.

lack of any critical method made it easy to defeat such attempts. Most of the instances of episcopal intervention which we find during the early Middle Ages appear to be for the purpose of giving greater solemnity and importance to the cult of particular saints. It was, however, frequently necessary for the authorities to exercise a critical judgement as to the authenticity of various relics, as different churches and monasteries often claimed possession of the same saint. It is clear that in each diocese the bishop, acting in conjunction with the clergy synodically assembled, was regarded as the proper authority, and that bishops very often referred such matters to the provincial synod for a decision. An attempt on the part of Charlemagne in 813 to provide a place for secular authority in canonization was short-lived, though in some parts of the West the influence of the local nobility was powerful. Local popular cult was the principal factor in canonization, although by the time of the Hildebrandine Reform Movement in the eleventh century it is plain that no saint could hope for very wide recognition unless his cult had been approved by some synodical authority whether diocesan or provincial.

Chapter 3

THE MIDDLE AGES

IN the previous chapter much has been said of the abuses which accompanied the cult of the saints during the early Middle Ages, but it should not be forgotten that there are other, and in some respects more important, parts of the story. Before the time of Gregory VII, it has been said, "men went to Rome not as the centre of ecclesiastical government but as a source of spiritual power. The 'power' was St Peter's". Thus Mr R. W. Southern has written,¹⁴ and he continues:

This power brought many men to Rome who would have no thought of going there when Rome became the centre of the everyday government of the church. Several English kings, for example, made the pilgrimage to Rome before 1066: after 1066, not one. King Canute was the last English king to go to Rome to visit the tomb of the Apostle. "God has granted me", he wrote, "in my lifetime the boon of visiting the blessed apostles Peter and Paul and every sanctuary within and without the city of Rome that I could hear of, to venerate and adore them in their very presence (*praesentialiter*). And I sought this blessing because I heard from wise men that St Peter the apostle has received from the Lord a great power of binding and loosing, and bears the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and therefore I deemed it useful in no ordinary degree to seek his patronage before God." The pope of the day when these words were written (1027) is not generally reckoned one of the more distinguished or reputable occupants of the see, but he satisfied the requirements of the day. He presided with patriarchal dignity in a position where a legislator would have been frustrated and where an administrator would have found nothing to administer.

It seems to have been the dignity and prestige of Rome which first led men to seek her approval for the cult of their saints. Apart

¹⁴ R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 136.

from the approval given by Pope Gelasius I at the end of the fifth century to the translation by the Bishop of Naples of the body of St Severinus, the earliest certain papal canonization is that of St Ulric of Augsburg in 993. Between that date and 1049 we have records of six such canonizations. They all suggest that the reason for consulting the pope was that his approval gave the cult more dignity and splendour.

The Gregorian Reform Movement turned the papal court into a judicial and administrative centre for the whole of Western Christendom, and in the course of the following centuries almost all aspects of the Christian life were brought under its control. From the time of Pope Urban II at the end of the eleventh century papal canonizations become increasingly numerous and the outlines of a regular procedure begin to be discernible. The conciliar nature of these canonizations is very marked. Urban II spoke of the assent of a full synod as one of the requisites for canonization, and forty years later a German chronicler wrote that "it is the custom of the Roman Church to canonize saints of God in a general council".¹⁵ Urban II also required the testimony of eye-witnesses of the saint's miracles, and it is clear that a reliable account of his life was also demanded. This evidence was apparently laid before the cardinals for preliminary examination. It is clear that the initiative lay with the bishop of the diocese in which the saint's body was to be found, and that a translation of the body and authorization of the cult by the diocesan were no obstacles to subsequent papal canonization.

The rule that only the pope can canonize seems to have been generally established by the end of the twelfth century. The development of it is still somewhat obscure, but there can be little doubt that a major part in the process was played by Pope Alexander III (1159-81). Before his time occasional references are to be found which indicate a view that canonization properly belongs to the pope; and Eugenius III in 1146, while paying lip-service to the principle of conciliar action, canonized the Emperor Henry II by the authority of the Holy Roman Church *quae omnium conciliorum firmamentum est*. Alexander III was a great canonist, and he was pope for an unusually long time at a critical period in the development of Church organization. The general impression made by his canonizations is that he was quite certain of his right to control the veneration of any new saints. He gave expression to this view in a letter addressed to the King of Sweden, in the course of which he reproached the Swedes for venerating as a saint a man who had been killed while drunk; and added that, even if signs

¹⁵ *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.*, XII, 642.

and miracles had been performed by him, it would not be lawful to venerate him publicly as a saint without the authority of the Roman Church.

The letters of Alexander III were a quarry for the many canonists who in the latter part of the twelfth century made collections of papal and conciliar enactments for use in the schools and in the courts. The letter to the King of Sweden came to be regarded by them as the *locus classicus* for the papal right of canonization, and thus it passed into that part of the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*¹⁶ known as the Decretals of Gregory IX, which was issued by authority of that pope in 1234.

Under Alexander III and Innocent III the procedure in canonization was still further developed. Alexander was generally very deliberate and even discouraging. Petitioners might find themselves put off on the ground that too many saints were being put forward and the pope could not consider more than one at a time. As a rule, small commissions were appointed to investigate the claims made by petitioners, and to examine the evidence for sanctity and miracles. The emphasis which Innocent III laid generally on the importance of written records of legal processes is apparent in canonization. He required that the report of the commission of inquiry should be accompanied by the depositions of sworn witnesses of the miracles, and even that some of the witnesses should be produced in person at Rome. In canonizing St Homobonus in 1199, Innocent declared that although the grace of final perseverance alone is required for sanctity in the Church triumphant, yet in order that a person may be venerated by the Church militant two things are necessary—the virtue of morals and the virtue of signs; that is, there must be proof of a good and pious life, and this must be confirmed by evidence of miracles wrought after death. The second is of no value without the first, because Satan often transforms himself into an angel of light and works wonders in such wise that men of evil life perform miracles.

Save for the period of the Councils of Constance and Basle, when we find expressions of the view that a general council can canonize, the law and canonical tradition of the later Middle Ages seem to be clear that canonization is reserved to the pope and that the most that any individual bishop or local synod can do is to establish or raise the status of the feast of a saint who has already been canonized. Theory, however, does not always agree with practice, and examples can be found of local canonizations at this time. In some instances the letter of the law was observed by celebrating the feast of the saint with a votive mass of the Holy Trinity or of

¹⁶ C. 1, X, iii, 45.

All Saints, but in some cases an appropriate special office was used. Englishmen who seem to have been thus honoured are Robert Grosseteste, Simon de Montfort, Richard Rolle, and King Henry VI. Abroad, the anniversaries of Dorothy of Mantau and Lydwina of Schiedam were celebrated with annual Masses of the Holy Trinity, and Thomas Hélye, priest of Biville, was commemorated each year on 19 October by a Mass of All Saints.

Although apart from General Councils synodical canonization was apparently unknown in the later Middle Ages, both the English provincial synods were active in the fifteenth century in promoting and regulating the cult of accepted saints. Thus in 1415 the Convocation of Canterbury ordered the feast of St George to be observed as a greater double throughout the province, and the feasts of St David, St Chad, and St Winifred to be kept as feasts of nine lessons.¹⁷ In 1434 Archbishop Chichele, at the petition of the clergy, ordered the observance of the feast of St Frideswide in the same way,¹⁸ and this feast was also included with those of St Osmund and St Etheldreda in an enactment of the Convocation of 1481.¹⁹ In 1421 the Convocation of York ordered the feast of St George to be observed as a greater double throughout the province.²⁰

In the sixteenth century the Council of Trent found it necessary to pass a decree defining the control to be exercised over images and relics; and in the early years of the seventeenth century Popes Clement VIII and Paul V devoted a good deal of attention to the problem. Eventually, however, in 1625 Urban VIII issued two decrees which were published again with special confirmation in the brief *Coelestis Hierusalem Gives*.²¹ In them he forbade in the strictest possible terms any form of public veneration of persons who had not been canonized or beatified by the Holy See, and prohibited the publication of books recording the miracles and revelations of such persons unless they had been examined and approved by the ordinary and sent by him to the apostolic see. An exception, however, was made in the case of those saints who could be proved to have been the object of immemorial cult or veneration before the time of Urban VIII, and that is still a form of canonization or beatification in the Roman Church, being known as *processus per viam casus excepti* or *processus per viam cultus*. The normal procedure of investigation of virtues and miracles is known as *processus per viam non cultus*, and the production of evidence of

¹⁷ *Reg. of H. Chichele* (C. and Y. Society), III, 8 f.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 256.

¹⁹ *Reg. of T. Bourghier* (C. and Y. Society), I, 135.

²⁰ *Records of the Northern Convocation* (Surtees Society, Vol. CXIII), 141.

²¹ *Cocquetines, Bullarum . . . Collectio* (1756), V, Part V, 318 ff.

a public cult unauthorized by the Holy See may have the effect of stopping the whole process in such cases.

It is desirable at this point to refer briefly to the idea of beatification. As far back as the time of Pope Eugenius III (1145-53), we find a rudimentary distinction drawn in the form of veneration allowed. The Bishop of Hildesheim had asked for the canonization of one of his predecessors, Bernward, and received a reply from the papal legate, who was visiting those parts at the time, that he was unable to answer fully at present, but that meanwhile an altar might be erected over Bernward's grave and consecrated *ad honorem Dei et beati confessoris Christi*.²² Some forty years later another legate took the case to Rome, where Bernward was canonized by Pope Celestine III in 1193. During the greater part of the Middle Ages the words *sanctus* and *beatus* are interchangeable, but towards the end of the fifteenth century a distinction begins to be apparent, and a beatified person, a *beatus*, seems to be one whose cult is limited in some way, either by being restricted to a particular district or Order or by being general but of a provisional nature. Thus in 1483 Sixtus IV, in reply to an application for the canonization of John Bonus, allowed that he might be venerated everywhere *et ad eum, ut Beatum, preces porrigi et suffragia ejus implorari, donec aliud per Nos vel Sedem praedictam fuerit solemniter ordinatum*.²³ Roman Catholic theory in beatification does not seem to have become settled until near the end of the seventeenth century, but the constant principle all through its development has been that of a limited cult, limited either in its nature or its locality.

²² *Acta Sanctorum*, October, XI, 992.

²³ Benedict XIV, *De Servorum dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, I, 39, n. 9.

Chapter 4

THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

CANONIZATION in the Eastern Orthodox Churches has received very little study by Western writers, and consequently what we have to say can be no more than a tentative outline of the subject. In the preparation of this, however, we have had the advantage of a memorandum prepared for us by the Metropolitan Gennadios of Heliopolis and of the advice of Dr Nicholas Zernov. In addition, we have made use of the valuable articles by the late Fr P. Peeters on *La Canonisation des saints dans l'Église russe*, published in *Analecta Bollandiana*, Vols. 33 and 38 (1914 and 1920).

The impulse to canonization is regarded by the Eastern Orthodox Churches as coming from the veneration of the faithful for the memory of a particular Christian. In early times this veneration was signalized, above all, by the use of a liturgical office for the commemoration of the saint, so that the primary authority in canonization was the person or persons who controlled the liturgical observances of the particular church or chapel which was the centre of the cult, i.e. the liturgical cult might be begun on the authority of a particular parish priest or the superior of a particular religious house.

With the development of ecclesiastical centralization and closer contact between different parts of the Church, there went a tendency to refer such matters to higher authorities. Thus in 1339 the Metropolitan of All Russia, Theognostos, informed the Oecumenical Patriarch, John Kalekas, that his predecessor Peter was performing wonders after his death, and asked for the authorization of a feast in honour of him. There are records of many such canonizations by the Oecumenical Patriarch with the assistance of the resident synod or of the greater synod.

These actions of the Oecumenical Patriarch have not, however, led, like the corresponding development in the Church of Rome,

to the suppression of local canonizations; and there is abundant evidence that the synods of the autocephalous Churches canonize and have canonized as occasion offers, and also that it is still possible for the cult of a saint to grow up without the intervention of any high ecclesiastical authority. An examination of the history of the Russian Church leads Fr Peeters to write:

In the matter of cult, possession is nine points of the law. A feast celebrated according to the rite and in the liturgical forms is presumed approved by the Church and constitutes in itself a canonization which holds good until the coming of a new dispensation. In others words, the quality of saint can be at once authentic and provisional.

The qualifications contained in the quotation arise from the fact that in the Russian Church at least there have been a number of occasions when the veneration of particular saints has been abrogated. Thus Simon of Jurjevets (*d.* 4 November 1584) was venerated in the monastery of the Epiphany in that place by authority of the patriarch Joachim. Eighty-seven years later the town of Jurjevets having passed into the eparchy of Nizegorod, Bishop Pityrion abrogated the feast, ordered Simon's monument to be destroyed and the approaches to his tomb to be sealed. In the time of the patriarch Joachim (1674-90) the veneration of two saints, Anne of Kasin and Euphrosyn of Pskov, was suppressed, apparently for fear of the support which it might give to the cause of the Old Believers.

Fr Peeters writes that these examples demonstrate that:

in the official theology of the Russian Church, as in the obscure ideas of the faithful, even the most legitimately authorized cult is an external manifestation which implies no definitive judgment as to the heavenly status of the saint (*classant le saint dans sa situation dernière*). It ends as it began by a purely disciplinary decision. It could also be abolished by pure accident as being involved in the sudden ruin of the sanctuary which was its home; or it could fall slowly into desuetude, and in every case the act which had established it disappears without trace. The saint who no longer has a feast has ceased to be a saint. But if it happened that someone takes the initiative, his cult could be instituted anew a second time as if it had never existed. . . . If the term canonization necessarily signifies an irreformable decision promulgated by a solemn and authentic act after a procedure carried out in various stages according to invariable rule before

a special tribunal, it is abundantly clear that the ancient organization of the orthodox Church offers us nothing of the kind.

The Holy Synod, set up by Peter the Great in 1721 to hold the patriarchate of Moscow in commission, acted in a way which more resembles the Roman model. In the course of its history it canonized six persons—Dmitri, Bishop of Rostov, in 1757; Innocent, Bishop of Irkutsk, in 1804; Metrophanes, Bishop of Voroneze, in 1832; Tikhon, Bishop of Voroneze in 1861; Theodosius Uglitsky, Archbishop of Tchernigov, in 1896; and Seraphin, monk of Sarov, in 1903. The decrees concerning the first three of these assume that the persons are saints, and do not contain any formula of recognition of them as such. The decrees concerning the fourth and fifth, however, approach much nearer to the language of a papal bull, and some Orthodox theologians of the nineteenth century saw in them traces of undesirable Latin influence. We have been unable to obtain evidence of the procedure in canonization since the patriarchate was restored after the Russian Revolution.

In spite of this activity of the Holy Synod, it is clear that in Russia the old local canonizations continued, and that only a few cases were taken to the highest authority.

From the information which we have received, it is plain that the Orthodox Churches do not follow a procedure of canonization which at all resembles the elaborate legal process used by the Church of Rome, nor do they have detailed criteria which are applied in every case. Much has been made by some writers of the importance attached at certain stages of Russian history to the fact that the body of the saint has remained incorrupt since burial. This feature, prominent as it has seemed in some cases, should not be over-emphasized. In the last great canonization performed before the Revolution, that of Seraphin of Sarov, the saint's body was not found to be incorrupt, but the canonization proceeded nevertheless. It is true, also, that at times great importance has been attached to the wonder-working powers of certain saints, but again too much should not be made of this. St Vladimir, the ruler of Russia who Christianized his country, is venerated without any such evidence of miracles.

Nectarius of Jerusalem defines three points as constituting testimony of true holiness in men. First a blameless orthodoxy, secondly the attainment of all virtues, among which is included the contending for the faith even to the shedding of blood, and thirdly the showing forth from God of supernatural signs and wonders. This definition has been quoted as a representative Orthodox view. It

is apparent, however, that the decisive factor in Eastern Orthodox canonizations is the common consent of clergy and faithful recognizing and acknowledging a particular person to be a saint. This recognition is given to certain Biblical characters, such as the Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, and the apostles; to martyrs; to men and women who have been outstanding in the Christian history of their people, such as the Emperor Constantine, St Vladimir of Russia, St Nina of Georgia, and to individuals in many different walks of life who have impressed their contemporaries by their eminent holiness or later generations by the wonders which occurred at their place of burial. Although the cult of particular saints varies greatly in its geographical extent, the Orthodox Churches know no such distinction among saints as is made by the Romans between *sancti* and *beati*, nor do they practice the distribution and Roman cult of relics.

The Eastern Orthodox Churches do not make the sharp Roman distinction between praying for and invoking the prayers of particular persons. The decree of canonization of Theodore of Uglitsk in 1896 says: "Since the death of this pious bishop on 5 February 1696 the faithful have not ceased to visit his tomb to pray for the repose of his soul, commending themselves to his intercession before God." In the Liturgy of St Mark we find the following prayer:

Give rest to the souls of our fathers and brethren that have heretofore slept in the faith of Christ, O Lord our God, remembering our ancestors, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, holy and just persons, every spirit that has departed in the faith of Christ, and those whom today we keep in memory.

The Metropolitan Gennadios writes:

The Orthodox Church calls for the prayers and the intercessions of all the saints in accordance with the words of the Lord's Brother "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much". The Church being divided into the Church militant and the Church triumphant there exists a spiritual unity between all the living and the dead, and prayers exchanged between likes on either side according to their confidence and their life.

He quotes from the *Martyrium Polycarpi*:

But him (*sc.* Christ) we worship as the Son of God, but the martyrs we love as disciples and imitators of the Lord; and rightly, because of their unsurpassable affection toward their own King and Teacher.

It seems that the history of the recognition of saints in the Eastern Churches offers more guidance to the Anglican Communion than does the parallel development in the Roman Church. It is more cautious and conservative, and less presumptuous. Two points stand out as significant: first, that the cult of a true saint should be spontaneous, springing from the devotion of the people among whom he lived and worked; second, that a bishop or a synod—provincial, national, or general—is the proper authority to control the cult.

Chapter 5

THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION SINCE THE REFORMATION: THE BRITISH ISLES

INTRODUCTORY NOTE ON LITURGICAL TERMS

BEFORE reviewing Anglican kalendars in detail, it may be useful to explain in what different ways "liturgical observance" of any entry may be made and the technical terms which define them.

It is unnecessary for this purpose to go into liturgical history or into the details of such provision in the Roman liturgies today. The current Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion sufficiently illustrate them.

The fullest observance is that prescribed by all Anglican Prayer Books and Lectionaries for what we know as the "Red-letter days". The "proper", i.e. the special provision for each of these feasts, consists (1) of a "proper" collect, epistle, and gospel relating to its subject, be it a dominical festival, such as Epiphany, or the commemoration of a saint, such as St Peter (in the newer Prayer Books there is a richer supply of variant proper prefaces, that for All Saints being permitted on all other Red-letter Saints' Days); and (2) of "proper" lessons and collect at Matins and at two Evensongs, "First" and "Second" on the eve and on the day itself. The 1928 Book and some others go further and give a list of psalms which may *at discretion* be substituted for those of the daily course on "patronal feasts" and "the eves of holy-days and holy-days".

On a Red-letter Saint's day, therefore, the ferial collects and lections are superseded by the "Propers" of the festival.

For the "Black-letter" days, no liturgical provision has been formally made in any Anglican Prayer Book previous to the present century. The Commemoration on 30 January of the martyrdom of King Charles I "annexed" in 1662, had full "red-letter" rank

and propers. In the last hundred years, however, the deeper appreciation of Church history and of the spiritual power of great Christian lives has brought a new conscience towards them. The Kalendar has come alive for many right reasons. It is widely felt that a kalendrical entry has little meaning if it can find no reflection in the public prayer or thanksgiving of the Church. The commemoration of "black-letter" saints has become usual after more than one pattern.

Take the simplest first. This is by a "memorial". In contradistinction to the full overriding character of red-letter day observance, a memorial is simply a collect of the saint said as a second collect, at the Eucharist and the two Daily Offices, after the collect of the day; said only on the day itself. Except for this addition, the daily course of lections and psalms is undisturbed. The use of this memorial is purely voluntary, by churches or clergy who want to commemorate the saint in question.

But between the fullest observance and the simplest there is a middle way: taken, indeed, by the 1928 Book and by almost all the newer Prayer Books of our Communion. To quote Bishop Frere,²⁴ writing in 1910:

The provision of variants for a celebration of Holy Communion does not introduce any disturbing element into an otherwise regular course, as does the provision of special psalms or lessons for Morning or Evening Prayer. The latter course would be inadvisable in the case of Lesser Feasts; but it is advisable to make some provision for variants at the Eucharist. . . . In fact for many years now such variants have been in use in various places with the sanction of individual bishops . . . where the celebrations of Holy Communion are frequent and the need of such an enrichment is consequently pressing.

The collect only may be used in the two daily Offices; otherwise these are unaffected.

There are thus, speaking generally, three liturgical patterns of commemorating a saint in present Anglican use: (1) by a simple memorial collect, (2) by the full provision of variants in Eucharist and Office familiar to us in the Prayer Book of 1662, and (3) by the *via media* just indicated.

To provide a collect for every "black-letter" saint, to strain Scripture for appropriate Epistles and Gospels, would be undesirable for many obvious reasons. This difficulty has been traditionally overcome in Western Liturgy by the provision of "Commons", for a martyr, a bishop, an abbot, a virgin, to name but

²⁴ *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, 25 (1911).

some of the categories into which the saints fall; for less conspicuous names the same epistle and gospel serve, the same collect also, but with a change of the name commemorated in it. The 1928 Book, those of Scotland and South Africa, and the draft revisions of the Churches of Canada and of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, all provide such Commons; while the American Prayer Book at present goes no further than a single Common "For a Saint's Day".

THE BRITISH ISLES

I. THE PRAYER BOOK KALENDAR

The Kalendar of the English Prayer Book is a document of first importance and authority in the subsequent history of the recognition of saints in the Anglican Communion. It bears, perhaps more than any part of our Prayer Book, the marks of Reformation haste and experiment, yet it stumbled upon principles, however imperfectly expressed, which can guide us still.

Cranmer tackled the revision of the Kalendar with his wonted zeal. Two draft kalendars are extant, which illustrate the movement of his thoughts. The earliest contains the names of Biblical saints—the present ones plus SS. Mary Magdalene, Timothy, Titus, and all four great festivals of B.V.M.; also of twelve chief Doctors of the Church, and twelve other saints from the Sarum Kalendar. He added a few names chosen for no obvious reason—i.e. the patriarch Benjamin, SS. Phileas and Philomorus, St Babilus, St Dorotheus, etc.

The first draft, except for these last insertions, was comprehensible. It jettisoned the multitude of entries casually added by locality, fashion, and the passing of time, and kept a fair, even exact, balance between Holy Scripture, Christian history, and the tradition of the English service books. The second draft was wild to the last degree. For instance, the vacant days in January were filled up with Old Testament names in chronological order—Abel, Noe, Abraham, etc. When these fail, New Testament names continue the list. It was scripturalism run mad.

"The draft kalendars abound in faults and follies," remarks staid "Procter and Frere".²⁵ Their author himself recognized it, and in the First Prayer Book, 1549, while concentrating still upon the scriptural principle, he drastically disciplined his list. The Kalendar contained nothing but twenty-five red-letter days, with full liturgical provision. Twenty-four of these held their place

²⁵ *History of the Book of Common Prayer* (ed. 1905), 336

through all future changes; but St Mary Magdalene reappeared in 1552 only in black letters.

This invention of the black-letter entry may be considered helpful. Only four entries—St George, Lammas, St Lawrence, and St Clement of Rome—were to be kept, with St Mary Magdalene, as commemorations without any change of service. But the Elizabethan Kalendar of 1561/62 took advantage of the new device and increased the list with fifty-seven names and feasts. These reinserted both general Church history and traditional observance, for the list for the most part was drawn, uncritically, from that of Sarum. In 1604 was added St Enurchus, who does not exist, though St Evurtius of Orleans does—and why he should be drawn from oblivion is not sufficiently clear. In 1661 came the excellent additions of St Alban (on the wrong date) and the Venerable Bede. And also King Charles.

Confused as the 1662 list came to be, some principles are discernible behind it:

1. There is a distinction, a "grading" of saints' day observance into "red" and "black letter"; the former only having liturgical provision.

2. The black-letter entries show a respect for the old Sarum Kalendar—a principle which carries decidedly less weight today, when many of the names have become meaningless or of restricted interest. The bishops in 1661, defending the lesser saints' days from the Puritan attack, gave a double motive for their presence, "they are left in the Kalendar not that they should be so (as the Red Letters) kept as holy days, but they are useful for the preservation of their memories, and for other reasons, as for leases, law days, etc." It was ingenuous of the bishops to plead the secular motive; but as Procter points out, their addition of SS. Alban and Bede shows "which of their two reasons they considered most important".

3. Those two additions spell the beginning of a new principle, a larger commemoration of local English saints; but it is not carried very far.

It was to be expected that a new Kalendar should appear (1922) during the work which resulted in the Deposited Book (1927-8). The new list, additions and subtractions alike, was inspired and largely guided by a brilliant chapter in *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform* (1911), by Bishop Walter Frere.

The *exclusions* (with one exception, King Charles, to be dealt with later) need not concern us otherwise than to notice the two principles on which they are based:

1. Lack of historicity.

2. Lack of sufficiently serious claim for liturgical commemoration throughout the Church of England. This, indeed, is the negative of a new but desirable principle that no name, or occasion, should be admitted into the Kalendar, but such as, on one ground or another, is deserving of liturgical provision, for the purposes of gratitude, instruction or devotion, whether that provision be of permission or of precept.

The reasons for *additions* in the 1928 Kalendar, if obvious, are of more importance. St Mary Magdalene and the Transfiguration on plain scriptural grounds become red-letter days. The commemoration of All Souls stands by itself. Otherwise the insertions rest upon four principles:

1. *The saints of universal interest*: Of the great names of the universal Church are added: SS. Antony of Egypt, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, Monnica, Chrysostom, and Leo the Great. Hermit, martyr, doctor, prelate, monk, and matron are thus all represented. The entries of the medieval saints are strengthened by the addition of the names SS. Bernard, Francis, and Catherine of Siena.

2. *The saints of local interest* make a long and various list: SS. Wulfstan, Patrick, Cuthbert, Anselm, Aldhelm, Columba, King Oswald, Aidan, Ninian, Theodore of Tarsus, Hilda, King Alfred and "Saints, Martyrs and Doctors of the Church of England".

3. A third principle, to include in the Anglican Kalendar at least *one great saint of each great country*, accounts for the name, e.g., of Anskar of Sweden. It is a neighbourly and catholic intent, but is it sound? Anskar will never mean much to anybody except the small and specialized group who work for closer relations with the Church of Sweden. St Henry of Upsala, the English missionary to Finland, might have been a happier choice. But the principle has worked further than this one entry; for it has saved others of no great interest from exclusion—e.g. St Vincent, Spanish Deacon and Martyr, of whom we know next to nothing; St Remigius (surely France is sufficiently represented by SS. Hilary of Poitiers, Martin, and Bernard); St Fabian of Rome, who is scarcely wanted while we have both St Lawrence and St Agnes.

4. A fourth principle, *the number of Church dedications* to certain saints, has saved the names of SS. Nicholas and Margaret (of Antioch), and perhaps SS. Leonard and Giles, from exclusion. If some case can be made for the traditional patrons of children, prisoners, and cripples, there seems no reason to keep the legendary

St Margaret in the general Kalendar, now that diocesan provision can be made where it is wanted. Commemoration of a saint of dedication is best left as a matter between the particular parish and its bishop.

Undoubtedly the 1928 Kalendar is a great improvement upon that of 1662. But no single saint of later date than 1380 found a place. This one fact damages its highest usefulness, for it suggests that there have been no saints for whom to give thanks over six centuries, centuries which have been as full of saints as any others. The modern martyr, the modern hero of prayer, deed, and abiding influence, are omitted from the lists of those whom the provinces of Canterbury and York delight to honour.

Of the servants of God entered respectively in the Kalendars of 1662 and 1928, two are exceptional in that they had been canonized neither by tradition nor by Rome. And both are kings. King Charles is a clear example of popular canonization; in which Church, State, and popular feeling concurred, and that with a vehemence surprising to the modern generation. At least four churches bear his name, and one has been thus dedicated in the last few years. The method of "canonization" here was not merely by the insertion in black letters of a name in the Kalendar; but special liturgical services were appointed for the day with proper collect, epistle, and gospel. When, by the statute of 1859 (22 Vict., c. ii, of 25 March), the services for 30 January ceased to be printed in the Prayer Book, the Queen's Printers considered that the authority of the Act extended to the removal of the name also from the Kalendar. The Propers did indeed reflect the deep emotions of their day too vividly for modern use; but their framing and the Kalendar entry was as genuine a canonization—that, too, of a martyr—as the historic Church can show, Convocation, Parliament, and popular acclaim acting in passionate unity.

The 1928 list inserted King Alfred. It is strange how so great a king, man, Christian, and missionary to his people should have escaped kalendrical and liturgical recognition for so many centuries. If the 1928 book were formally authoritative, it could be said that this was a clear case of "canonization" by the two provinces of the Church of England. But 1928 included no Common for a King, which renders liturgical provision for him (as for St Edward the Confessor) unintelligent. King Edmund is served by the Common for a Martyr; but local commemoration of such saints as Edwin and Oswald, not to speak of Queen Margaret of Scotland, Helen, and others, add to the advisability in any future revision of a Common "for a King or Queen".

II. OTHER FORMS OF RECOGNITION IN ENGLAND

In addition to the Prayer Book, in the provinces of Canterbury and York the recognition of departed servants of God has lately taken at least four forms.

(A) The two older universities have for more than a century issued their annual Kalendars, which not unnaturally include the saints' days and feast appropriate to their several colleges, or to endowed sermons. Thus St Frideswide at Oxford and St Benedict at Cambridge appear in their respective Kalendars. Similarly, in both universities, with obvious relevance, stands the entry of Corpus Christi.

(B) The formation and use of a special Kalendar by corporate communities has increased and is increasing; by dioceses, e.g. Salisbury, Oxford, Lincoln; by cathedral chapters, e.g. York, Southwark; by religious communities, e.g. Cowley, Mirfield, Kelham, the Franciscans, etc.; by university colleges, e.g. King's, Cambridge; by theological colleges, e.g. Cuddesdon. Further, some modern parishes are seeking modern dedications.

To give detailed examples:

1. The *Salisbury Diocesan Office Book* provides a series of collects, which may be used "on the day of the Consecration of a Church or to its Title" and "also on the anniversaries of its Consecration and Patronal Festivals", for many of the black-letter saints of the Prayer Book and other saints of local or national interest, such as Aldhelm, Osmund, Edmund Rich; as well as twelve Commons. The *Oxford Diocesan Service Book*, authorized by Bishop Burge and now under revision, likewise enlarges the liturgical provision for black-letter days, and for local saints such as Birinus and Frideswide. Lincoln Diocese, with even greater directness, has appointed full Eucharistic Propers, for voluntary observance, of St Chad, St Hugh, Bishop Robert Grosseteste, and Bishop Edward King. These men of God have meant much to the diocese, and their memory is evergreen there: possibly its action may give a right guidance to the whole Communion.

2. The Kalendar of York Minster, observed with the full Eucharistic Propers, drops many of the names in the Prayer Books of 1662 and 1928, and includes northern and local servants of God, most of them like St John of Beverley and St John of Bridlington officially canonized, but others, such as Caedmon (though his is an "Approved Cult") and Richard Rolle, not. It breaks through to more modern saints by celebrating with collect, epistle, and gospel, Thomas More on 5 July and Edward King, Bishop, on 8 March, the latter on an enthusiastic demand of the Chapter.

Similarly in the southern Province, the Commemorations of Southwark Cathedral are both more modern and more local in outlook, as may well befit a church for centuries in the diocese of Winchester, which includes Lambeth Palace, great hospitals and schools, and a great tradition of writers and poets. Amongst archbishops and bishops, it celebrates, on 29 January, William Giffard (1129); on 30 January, Edward Talbot (1934); on 11 April, Henry Beaufort, Cardinal (1447); on 25 May, Randall Davidson (1930); on 9 June, Peter des Roches (1238); on 25 September, Lancelot Andrewes (1626); on 5 October, Richard Foxe (1528); on 10 November, Justus (627). Hospitals are represented on 4 September under the entry of Thomas Guy (1774); schools and universities by Edward Alleyn (1628, 25 November), and John Harvard (1638, 29 November); the poets and musicians "over the River" by John Gower (1408, 15 October) and John Merbecke (? 1585, 26 October).

3. The circumstances and devotional life of the religious communities would lead us to expect a fuller regard to saints and their liturgical observance. We need say nothing about their fuller provision of acknowledged pre-Reformation saints in their kalendars. But these apart, S.S.J.E. (Cowley) commemorates its founder, Richard Meux Benson (*d.* 14 January 1915) by a special "High Mass of Thanksgiving" on the octave day of St John the Evangelist (3 January) with two memorial collects, one of which prays for his soul, and the other, succeeding it, runs parallel to a normal saint's day collect, praying for profit by the example and teaching of "thy servant Richard".

The Mirfield Kalendar is carefully thought out and balanced. Based on 1928, it adds many English saints of obvious relevance to the religious life, to mention only Gilbert of Sempringham and Stephen Harding; a few more non-English saints of patristic and medieval days; and the following post-Reformation saints canonized by Rome—Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Theresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Francis de Sales, Jane Frances de Chantal. Any consideration of the problem afforded by post-Reformation servants of God outside the Anglican obedience in either direction is beyond our terms of reference; but it would be misleading not to state the facts, for such entries are not only not uncommon, but even usual, in what we have called the non-official kalendars. As we shall see later, they have found some place also in official diocesan kalendars. Mirfield further distinguishes between the black-letter entries by designating with an asterisk those which are to be observed by a memorial collect only.

The Kalendar of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, is

of exceptional value, not only from its choice of observances, but for a preface (extracted from a resolution of the Great Chapter, 1952) stating the principles on which the use of a special kalendar can rightly be based by a community within a communion. The authority of the ecclesiastical province remains always primary; and since the Society is working in different parts of the Church with varying provincial (ecclesiastical) kalendars, complete uniformity within the Society is impossible; nevertheless, "diversity of local practice, if it is not to be disruptive, must be based on a common pattern". Thus the general observance of the Society's houses in, say, the Province of South Africa is founded on that province's Kalendar, while particular observances are as far as possible similar to that of the Society's English province.

At the end of the Kalendar there follows an analysis of the types of kalendrical entries, a directory of the exact liturgical observance which attaches to each, and a table of "concurrence and occurrence". This is of much value, though "Class I" and "Class II", concerning "red-letter" observances, dominical and apostolic, are not relevant to our inquiry. The "black-letter" entries, however, are further distinguished into Classes III, IV, and V, so far as concerns their liturgical Propers. Thus the feasts of Class V have no office, but are memorialized (by a second collect) unless they occur on a Greater Feast which forbids memorials. The only post-Reformation entries (both in Class III) of the English province are *African Missionaries and Martyrs* on 20 February and *All Saints of the English Church* on 8 November. Pre-Reformation names are considerably increased in number, bearing witness to "our special preoccupation with theologians and religious".

By contrast, in the joint Kalendar observed by the Society of St Francis and the Order of St Paul, Alton, the great figures of the Oxford Movement occur in embarrassing numbers. Great men of God they all were, but proportion must be kept. The list, however, does open up the more modern English field of recognition and observance. It further includes Fisher and More; and in the seventeenth century Laud, Cosin, George Herbert, Nicholas Ferrar, Jeremy Taylor, and Ken. In the eighteenth, only William Law.

The Cambridge Oratory of the Good Shepherd, a community of secular priests living under rule, has similarly a less conservative but more carefully balanced Kalendar. It contains the post-Reformation Roman saints, Philip Neri, Francis Xavier, Theresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Francis de Sales, and Vincent de Paul. But the great names of the Oxford Movement are not in disproportion to the Evangelical contingent or such liberal moderns and sons of Cambridge as F. D. Maurice, Bishop Lightfoot, and

Bishop Westcott. Its treatment of modern missionaries is suggestive enough to deserve quotation, since it commemorates the large and devoted missionary work of the nineteenth century by joining a single name to a geographical region:

18 September, John Coleridge Patteson, Bp. and M., 1871 and the Missionaries of the Pacific.

16 October, Henry Martyn, C., 1812, and the Missionaries of Asia.

21 October, James Hannington, Bp. and M., 1885, and the Missionaries of Africa.

4. *University Colleges*: King's, Cambridge, observes with proper collect, epistle, and gospel men of God belonging to its society or history, thus:

4 May, Benjamin Whichcote, Provost, 1683.

13 November, Charles Simeon, Fellow, 1836.

27 July, Brooke Foss Westcott, Fellow, 1901.

8 March, Edward King, Visitor, 1910.

with a memorial collect for Orlando Gibbons, chorister (*d.* 1625).

5. *Theological Colleges*: Cuddesdon makes additions to the Kalendar of 1928 "mainly in commemoration of College worthies and of the history of the Church in these parts". The former include 18 January, Charles Gore, Bp., 1932; 8 March, Edward King, Bp., 1910; 17 March, Henry Scott Holland, D., 1918; 28 March, Arthur Henry Stanton, P., 1913; 29 March, John Keble, P., 1886; 7 May, Charles Alan Smythies, Bp., 1894; 12 May, Edward Francis Willis, founder of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, 1898; 19 July, Samuel Wilberforce, Bp., Founder, 1873; 2 August, Francis Paget, Bp., 1911; 9 September, Henry Parry Liddon, 1890; 15 September, Edward Pusey, C. and D., 1882; 2 December, George Belcher, College Butler, 1929.

Certain definite points emerge from this incomplete sketch.

(i) That, however restricted be the circle even within the Church, kalendrical observance is a living fact and issue, particularly where any kind of community life is involved.

(ii) That apart from names of purely local pertinence, there is a fairly general agreement upon the type of candidates whom churchmen desire to honour, whether national or universal.

(iii) That, most certainly, no ill effects have proceeded from these special kalendars and their observance.

6. The issues, however, step out into general Church life through the dedication of churches to God in the name of his latter-day servants. The instances are not as yet numerous; King Charles excluded, they number in England not less than three and not more, we believe, than six. The three doubtful cases are the

William Temple Church at Manchester, and the two Birmingham churches, known as Bishop Latimer and Bishop Ryder. These were built as memorials to these very different prelates, but in each case the name has stuck, unlike the memorial Church at Grimsby to Bishop King, dedicated to St Luke, and that at Sunderland to Bishop Lightfoot, dedicated to St Hilda.

The other three churches were of set purpose dedicated to a modern servant of God in order to give the parishioners an inspiration nearer their own day. The present Archdeacon of London built the Church of John Keble, Mill Hill, particularly with this devotional object; it caused a controversy sufficient to make Bishop Winnington Ingram first hesitate and then deliberately proceed to consecrate in Keble's name. The vicar had fired his parishioners with his vision, and the pressure of the parish itself deeply influenced the bishop. From the first the patronal festival has been kept with proper collect, epistle, and gospel.

The late Dr C. F. Garbett, when Bishop of Southwark, dedicated with similar deliberate purpose a new church in the name of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop.

Bishop James Hannington suffered a martyr's death; so the present Bishop of Chichester could have no hesitation in dedicating a church in his name in that diocese. This he did at Aldrington, Sussex, in 1939. The words he used were: "In the faith of the Blessed Trinity we dedicate this Church to the Glory of Almighty God and in memory of James Hannington, missionary, bishop, and martyr."

A new church in Cambridge proposes to take Nicholas Ferrar as its patron saint.

(C) The third chapter of modern "canonizations" consists of a single incident. On the fiftieth anniversary of Edward King's consecration to the Bishopric of Lincoln, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lang) celebrated a solemn Eucharist in Lincoln Cathedral, at which, before a large and important congregation, the collect, epistle, and gospel were proper to Edward King. This is a direct "raising to the altar", as overt a case of "canonization" technically as may be; whether the archbishop understood his own act thus is uncertain but probable; the Bishop of Lincoln (Nugent Hicks) realized it clearly, prepared it deliberately, and forthwith issued the propers for use in the diocese on March 8 at the will of incumbents. As we have seen, the commemoration of Bishop King now extends beyond the borders of the diocese.

(D) The fourth chapter concerns the growing "bibliography" of the Propers of saints. We can leave aside the numerous Missals and Day Hours which contain translations, as a rule excessively bad,

from pre-Reformation or Roman service books. The provision of individual collects for the lesser feasts received impetus from two little books of original collects: *Collects for the Black Letter Days* (1917) and *Memorial Collects of Saints and Worthies* (1921), by the Rev. A. Campbell Fraser, then Vicar of Bedlington. They were drawn upon extensively by Bishop Frere in his *Collects, Epistles and Gospels for The Lesser Feasts* (1937). Fraser's collects nearly always contain one splendid and fit phrase which the rest of the prayer cannot usually match; Frere's own collects are not so happy and the rhythm is often faulty. His aim "that every Black Letter Day of the 1928 Kalendar should have its own Proper" was more nearly achieved by *Anglican Altar Services* (1941), prepared by Bishop Monahan of Monmouth, and making provision for all the saints, universal and local, observed or proposed for observance, in the Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. His hope that the book would be adopted for permissive use throughout the Church of Wales has not been fulfilled, so it can claim no other authority for its prayers and lections but that of sheer desert. It is the sole contribution of the Church of Wales to our investigation, and may prove not the least important made by any Church.

III. THE PROVINCE OF SCOTLAND

It is now realized that the deviations of the first Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 from the English Book of 1559-60, especially in the Communion Office, which have won so much praise from liturgical scholars, were not "Laudian", but the work of the Scottish bishops themselves, especially of James Wedderburn, Bishop of Dunblane.

The compilers of the Scottish book took great pains to meet some of the (puritan) objections and a serious attempt was made to incorporate existing Scottish usages or preferences and to conciliate Scottish prejudices.²⁶

But they had to deal with the King himself, who would permit but few changes from the English book. One of the points he insisted upon was the Kalendar in its English form, whereas the observance of saints' days had been since the days of John Knox one of the bitterest of puritan criticisms. The black-letter names were not only kept but increased in number by the insertion of the names of David, King (11 January), Mungo (Kentigern) (13 January), Colman (18 February), Constantine III, King (11 March), Patrick (17 March), Cyril (18 March), Cuthbert

²⁶ Gordon Donaldson: *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637*, 60 (Edinburgh University Press, 1954).

(20 March), Gilbert (1 April), Serf (20 April), Columba (9 June), Palladius (6 July), Ninian (18 September), Adamnan (23 September), Margaret, Queen (16 November), Ode, Virgin (27 November), Drostan (4 December).

But the 1637 book, though the foundation of the present one, never itself came into real use. "It was reprinted in 1712, so discreetly that it even kept the 1637 Royal Names unchanged"; apparently it was not used on a large scale; the English book of 1662 had taken its place with episcopalian congregations.

When Bishop Torry printed his edition of the Prayer Book [Edinburgh, 1849] he had the sixteen additions of 1637 to the Kalendar included. There was a great row, and the book was condemned, but I do not think the Bishop's voucher that the book was in strict conformity with the usage of the Church of Scotland was ever challenged, though, of course, his "usages" were bitterly opposed.²⁷

So it may be said that until the revision of 1912 the Kalendar of the Province followed the English book of 1662. At that date the names of St Kentigern (13 January), St Patrick (17 March), St Columba (9 June), St Ninian (16 September), and Queen Margaret of Scotland (16 November) were added; a single Proper, consisting of collect, epistle, and gospel, was provided for the four men and a particular one for the Queen.

In the further revision of 1929, many additions and some subtractions were made to the list of names, under the inspiration of that in the Deposited Book of 1927-8, but by no means identical with it. The additions included not only Biblical and universal saints, but as many as twenty-eight "local" names, for which liturgical provision of collect, epistle, and gospel was made under Commons for (1) Martyrs; (2) Confessors and Doctors; (3) A Virgin Martyr; (4) A Virgin not a Martyr; (5) (collect only) "Saints' Days in the Kalendar not otherwise provided for", providing thus on certain days a memorial collect only, as in the Mirfield order. A rubric covering all the Commons states: "*This Epistle and these Lessons and Gospels shall not be used on any day for which a Proper Epistle and Gospel are appointed.*"

Obscure as some of these entries may seem to those who know not Scotland, existing churches are named after them, and they do emphasize the early religious history of the country and its Church. Their insertion presents no problem, for all these names have been

²⁷ Provost Douglas of Cumbrae, quoted by the Bishop of Brechin, 27 October 1954.

canonized for centuries either by tradition or process. An important rubric at the end of the Kalendar reads:

Note.—Local Saints not included in the Kalendar may be commemorated with the permission of the Bishop of the diocese.

The provision of Commons in practice has not proved ample enough; and the revising committee is at work on something more adequate. The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, who has the preparation of a draft in hand, writes on the methods of insertion in the past: "As to 'canonization', there is no procedure here. The 1929 Prayer Book came out long before my time, and I imagine they just decided what of recognized canonizations they would put in the Kalendar." In other words, the Scottish Church has hitherto made decisions for commemoration and liturgical observance in the ordinary course of its Provincial Synod.

IV. THE CHURCH OF IRELAND

The Church of Ireland was united with that of England until its disestablishment, and used the 1662 Prayer Book. On separation, it issued its own Prayer Book (1878). That was the age of the ritualistic controversies in England, and of successive, but unsuccessful attempts by some laymen to reform the Prayer Book by parliamentary action.²⁸ Their proposals largely followed the puritan objections to the Prayer Book in the seventeenth century, and one of them, though it aroused less passion than the others, would have abolished black-letter days altogether. The Irish Church, face to face with a Roman Catholic majority, adopted some of these proposals in its 1878 book; among them, the abolition in the Kalendar of all but red-letter days. To the red-letters, however, it added the name of St Patrick on 17 March, with full Proper for Holy Communion, and special Lessons at the Offices.

Of particular interest is the "canonization" of St Richard of Dundalk by the Archbishop of Armagh. George Dowdall was appointed to that see by Henry VIII in 1544. The King was not then in communion with the Pope, who tried in vain to appoint a rival. By one of his first acts, Dowdall summoned a provincial, not a diocesan, Synod to Drogheda, 20 June, 1545. There, after a procession to the High Cross and back, he canonized a predecessor (1347-60) in the see, Richard FitzRalph, as St Richard of Dundalk; his festival was ordered to be observed on 27 June.

It is true that the cult of this good bishop, celebrated not only as a theologian and preacher but for shining personal holiness, had

²⁸ R. C. Jasper, *Prayer Book Revision, 1800-1900*.

been maintained in Dundalk and neighbourhood for more than a century and a half, ever since the archbishop's bones had been brought back from Avignon, where he died in 1360. It is true that, as Roman Catholic historians point out, the feast of St Richard Rowley, Archbishop of Armagh, unconfirmed by the Papacy, occurs on 14 March in the Antiphony of Armagh, and that this is older than Dowdall's Synod of 1545. But in confirming a local cult familiar to all, and in providing for a public celebration of the feast with nine lessons on a definite but new date, Archbishop Dowdall would seem to have explicitly maintained, in separation from the papacy, the older functions of the Episcopate in decreeing the public recognition and veneration of a saint.

Chapter 6

THE RECOGNITION OF SAINTS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION SINCE THE REFORMATION: OVERSEAS

THE Commission addressed through the Secretaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society a questionnaire in the following terms to overseas metropolitans and diocesan bishops:

1. What steps if any have been taken in local practice with regard to the commemoration of particular individuals associated with the Church in your Diocese or Province otherwise than is already provided for in the Book of Common Prayer?
2. Has the lack of provision to this end provoked any demand for further recognition?
3. In the Church of South Africa there has been a revision of its Kalendar. A list of post-Reformation Anglican names was attached in a separate list with date, but with no liturgical provision. Has any such provision been under review in your Diocese or Province?
4. Are there any particular comments which you would wish to make dealing with any particular circumstances in your Diocese or Province which would call for special care in the formulation of such recognition?

Some of the replies, which we shall indicate, are negative in character; the majority, however, especially of the longer established provinces and dioceses, showed a surprising progress both of desire and practice towards making kalendarical recognition more living, both in the selection of names and in the provision of liturgical observance. We make no apology over summarizing these, because no serious consideration of the issue would be possible without taking into account these tentative but widespread developments.

AMERICA

I. THE CHURCH OF CANADA

The contribution of the Anglican Church in Canada is extensive and of outstanding interest. It appears in its new revision, the Draft Prayer Book of 1955. The title "Draft" means this: The book was presented to General Synod in September 1955 by the revising committee. The Synod gave it general approval, and referred it back to the committee for correction and (if advisable) further revision, at the same time directing it to present a final draft in 1958. Then, if it be approved, it can be adopted as the authorized book in 1961.

This report is concerned only with its proposed Kalendar, and with any liturgical provisions consequent upon it. The former is bold, not to say exciting, and must be detailed.

Red-letter days are renamed. 1 January becomes *The Octave Day of Christmas and Circumcision of our Lord, being New Year's Day*. That scarcely affects our subject-matter; but the provision for 29 June does; it adjoins St Paul to St Peter. No one can complain of that, except in so far as St Peter is left without a red-letter day to himself, which *the Conversion of St Paul* effects for the latter. The entry for 1 May becomes triple: *St Philip and St James Apostles. St James the Brother of the Lord*. Similarly, on 28 October to SS. *Simon and Jude* is added *St Jude the Brother of our Lord*. Ingenious this!

The black-letter revision is thorough, but a note states that "new names have been added from the ancient kalendars and from the history of the Anglican Communion, without thereby enrolling or commending such persons as saints of the Church". Of pre-Reformation entries other than those already in our 1662 and 1928 books, these may be singled out for mention:

January	19	Henry, Bishop, Apostle to Finland, 1150.
February	11	Caedmon, first recorded Poet in England, c. 670.
March	19	St Joseph of Nazareth, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin.
May	30	Joan of Arc, 1431.
July	9	Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1228.
	29	Olaf, King of Norway, Martyr, 1030.
August	1	(Lammas Day) The Maccabean Martyrs (<i>sic</i>).
	13	Hippolytus, Bishop and Doctor in Rome, Martyr, 235.
	15	The Repose of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

October	9	Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1253.
	26	Cedd, Missionary Bishop of the East Saxons, 664. Alfred, King of the West Saxons, 901.
November	7	Willibrord, Missionary Bishop of Utrecht, 738.

Interesting as most of these entries are, and that from diverse points of approach, our business here is merely to record. Innovation is not stretched far by them. It is otherwise with the post-Reformation names, which designedly carry history forward through the Anglican centuries to the commemoration of the apostles of Canada.

January	10	William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury and Martyr, 1645.
	12	John Horden, Missionary, Bishop of Moosonee, 1893.
	30	Charles Stuart, King, beheaded 1649.
February	25	Charles Inglis, Nova Scotia, first Anglican Bishop in Canada, 1816.
	27	George Herbert, Pastor and Poet, 1632.
March	2	(in addition to St Chad). John and Charles Wesley, Evangelist and Poet; John, 1791; Charles, 1788.
	19	(in addition to St Joseph). Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Poet, 1711.
	21	Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556.
	29	John Keble of Oxford, Poet and Divine, 1866.
April	30	David Livingstone, Missionary, Africa, 1873.
June	16	Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham, 1752.
July	6	Octave Day of St Peter and St Paul, Thomas More, Chancellor of England, 1535.
	16	John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, Doctor, 1686.
	29	William Wilberforce, Emancipator, 1833.
August	13	(in addition to Hippolytus). Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down, 1667.
September	10	Edward James Peck, Missionary to the Eskimo, 1924.
	16	Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley, Bishops, Martyrs, 1555.
	20	John Patteson, Missionary, Bishop of Melanesia, Martyr, 1871.
	25	Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, Translator, 1626.

- October 6 William Tyndale, Translator of the Scriptures into English, Martyr, 1536.
 21 James Hannington, Missionary, Bishop, Martyr, Africa, 1885.
- November 2 (in addition to All Souls').
 Richard Hooker, Doctor, 1600.
 12 Charles Simeon of Cambridge, Presbyter, 1836.
- December 29 (in addition to Thomas Beckett, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1170).
 John Wycliffe of Oxford, Doctor, Translator of the Bible, 1384.
 31 John West of the Red River, Missionary, 1845.

The old and the new are carefully balanced throughout in this Canadian list, whether by inclusion or exclusion. It is bound to be much discussed, so we venture to underline certain minor details that are novel or inconsistent, in case they be worth further consideration before the final draft is presented to the General Synod.

1. First to be noted is the widening of kalendrical "descriptions". The revisers are not content with the traditional categories, "Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Doctors, Virgins", etc. They have dropped "confessors" altogether, doubtless as unintelligible except to ecclesiastics. They have added Missionaries, Poets, Divines, Translators—and one Emancipator! Such descriptions have teaching and pictorial value, but perhaps it would be better to state what the Emancipator (William Wilberforce) emancipated! "Evangelist" again has hitherto been confined to the four Gospel writers, a different sense than that attached to the Wesleys, who are surely better termed "Missionaries".

2. But these descriptions are applied with no great consistency. Why are Wycliffe, Hooker, and Pearson styled "Doctors", and not Andrewes or Butler? The three "Translators" are thus defined: Wycliffe, *Translator of the Bible*; Tyndale, *Translator of the Scriptures into English*; Andrewes, merely *Translator*. Were not each more simply described, *Translator of the Scriptures*?

3. The revisers have not allowed themselves to transfer commemorations when they collide with others. So Thomas Beckett and John Wycliffe are remembered on the same day, a truly Anglican diversity. For all his merits, Richard Hooker should not be a claimant for separate remembrance on All Souls' Day. If there is on second thoughts to be a separate observance for St Peter, surely the Maccabean Martyrs should be moved from 1 August, traditionally St Peter's Chains.

4. Notice, too, the resolution by Canada of two problems outside

our reference. St Thomas More, great amongst laymen of any age, is included under the title *Chancellor of England*. The name of David Livingstone, admittedly first of modern missionaries, stands against 30 April. The one is a post-Reformation canonization by Rome; the other a Congregationalist by allegiance.

5. In commemorating her own apostles, the Church of Canada has shown marked reserve. Four only. The "birthday into life" of one of them is as recent as 1924.

6. The Liturgical Commemoration available is not of the same range or richness, though adequate. There is a Proper Collect, Epistle and Gospel *For Any Saint*: proper Collects for *the Blessed Virgin Mary, St Joseph of Nazareth, the Visitation, the Holy Name, the Beheading of St John the Baptist, Holy Cross, and All Souls*; and, as Commons, for *A Martyr, A Bishop and Martyr, Archbishops or Bishops, Missionary Saints, Doctors, Holy Men and Women, and Holy Women*. Their literary value is inferior. Permissive epistles and gospels for these occasions are drawn from other epistles and gospels already existing in the Prayer Book—a new scheme, which certainly minimizes printing in a book of 730 pages.

7. Nevertheless, the 1955 Draft Book makes an important contribution to the new kalendrical consciousness of the Anglican Communion. If it displays a blend of caution and recklessness it yet registers a definite movement towards the commemoration of the saints and servants of God in the Church of Canada. There may be a feeling that the balance of names weighs down on the side of Christian history and of Christian doctors as against heroic sanctity in character and pastorate; but that may be right for a Church growing into its full inheritance.

Apart from these official provisions, the Church of Canada provides one of the rare examples in the Anglican Communion of a popular canonization. St Charles Church, Dereham Township, in the Diocese of Huron, is dedicated to Charles James Stewart, Bishop of Quebec (1775–1837), an "outstanding pioneer missionary Bishop", who in his vast diocese of Upper and Lower Canada, "devoted his life, energy, and entire income to the betterment of his flock". The church was built over a century ago, in 1844, and has been called St Charles from the beginning, a designation universally accepted.

II. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE U.S.A.

So far this Church has taken only one official action, and that negative. Its Kalendar contains nothing but the red-letter entries

of the English Prayer Book of 1662, plus the Transfiguration and Independence Day. A proposal for certain additions in the revision of 1928, which, however, did not contain any named later than the Middle Ages, was rejected by the General Convention. But alternative collects, epistle, and gospel were inserted for *A Saint's Day*, leaving it to the priest to fill in whatever name he desired. In practice this provision has not proved popular; some priests never using it, others requiring much more variety.

Additional saints' days have not been hitherto in common use, except in the churches or chapels of the monastic orders. Most parishes, if they use extra saints' days, do so only on their patronal festival or on special anniversary occasions.

More cannot be said at present, except that the whole question is under discussion by the Liturgical Commission. The list which it is considering is understood to be inclusive of all periods of Church history.

That interest in America is not confined to early saints of the Church is shown by the publicity given to the Bishop of West Missouri's proposal to his Diocesan Convention on 9 May 1955, to "canonize" two American bishops, Jackson Kemper (1789-1870), first missionary bishop of the Episcopal Church; and Daniel Tuttle, consecrated in 1867 Bishop of Montana, Idaho, and Utah, an area the size of all the Eastern States from Maine to South Carolina; translated to the See of Missouri in 1886; he died in 1923, after an apostolic episcopate of record length. The Convention passed a resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission to study the matter and report in due time. The Press gave Bishop Welles' proposal a wide publicity, which certainly brought the issues to the notice of the Church as a whole.

AFRICA

I. THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH AFRICA

The late Archbishop of Cape Town answered the Commission's inquiries as follows—and his diocesan bishops strongly support his first sentence:

Our arrangements are provincial. The only commemorations connected with Africa are:

May	13	The Martyrs of Uganda.
June	18	Bernard Mizeki, M.
September	1	Robert Gray, Bishop.
October	29	James Hannington, Bp and M.

Of these, Bernard Mizeki and Robert Gray are the only ones who worked in this Province.

In the Diocese of Lebombo special commemoration is made of some Portuguese saints:

February	4	St Joao de Brito, M.
March	9	St Joao de Deus, C.
June	13	St Antonio de Lisboa, C.
July	4	St Elizabeth of Portugal.
December	3	St Francis Xavier, C.

The archbishop's communication, though answering the questions put to him, does not indicate the importance of the "provincial arrangements". These are embodied in *A Book of Common Prayer . . . Set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of South Africa*, "as being adaptations, abridgements and additions to the Book of Common Prayer (1662) required by the circumstances of the Province, and consistent with the spirit and teachings of that Book". To the Kalendar, based rather on 1928 than 1662, the following additions were made:

January	4	Titus.
	24	Timothy.
February	4	Gilbert of Sempringham, 1189.
	20	African Missionaries and Martyrs.
March	18	Cyril of Jerusalem; Bishop and Confessor, c. 386.
	19	Joseph, Foster-father of our Lord.
April	14	Justin, Martyr and Doctor, c. 165.
	24	Wilfrid of York, Bishop and Confessor, 709.
May	30	Joan of Arc, 1341.
June	2	Martyrs of Lyons, 177.
	10	Margaret of Scotland, Queen, 1093.
	29	St PETER and St PAUL, Apostles and Martyrs.
July	13	Silas.
	16	Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, 1090.
	30	Mary and Martha of Bethany.
August	4	Dominic, Confessor, 1221.
	15	Falling Asleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
October	10	Paulinus, Bishop and Confessor, 644.
	11	Philip the Deacon.
	19	Frideswide, Virgin, c. 735.
	23	James, the Lord's Brother.
November	7	Willibrord, Bishop of Utrecht, 738.
	19	Elizabeth of Hungary, 1231.

- December 3 Birinus, Bishop of Dorchester, *c.* 650.
 29 Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury and Martyr,
 1170.

Amongst the "Tables and Rules" is a Section VI. We quote it in full:

VI. The following Names may be commemorated by one of the following Collects:

O ALMIGHTY GOD, who willest to be glorified in thy Saints, and didst raise up thy servant N to shine as a light in the world: Shine, we pray thee, in our hearts, that we also in our generation may show forth thy praises, who hast called us out of darkness into thy marvellous light; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O GOD, who has brought us near to an immeasurable company of Angels, and to the spirits of just men made perfect: Grant us during our pilgrimage to abide in their fellowship, and in our heavenly country to become partakers of their joy; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

- January 10 William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1645.
 February 27 George Herbert, Presbyter, 1632.
 March 19 Thomas Ken, Bishop, 1711.
 29 John Keble, Presbyter, 1866.
 April 6 William Law, Presbyter, 1761.
 11 George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop, 1878.
 May 13 The Martyrs of Uganda, 1886.
 June 18 Bernard Mizeki, Martyr, 1896.
 July 19 William Wilberforce, 1853.
 September 1 Robert Gray, Bishop, 1872.
 20 John Coleridge Patteson, Bishop and Martyr,
 1871.
 25 Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop, 1626.
 October 16 Henry Martyn, Presbyter, 1812.
 26 Alfred the Great, King, *c.* 899.
 29 James Hannington, Bishop and Martyr, 1885.
 November 12 Charles Simeon, Presbyter, 1836.
 December 1 Nicholas Ferrar, Deacon, 1637.

These all, be it repeated, "may be" commemorated by one of the memorial collects provided. All the names and entries in the Kalendar proper have the fuller liturgical provision, collect, epistle, and gospel, whether by Proper or Common; their use, though this is nowhere stated, is presumably voluntary.

It is interesting to compare this second list of the Church of South Africa with that in the new Book of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon. Together they make kalendrical history in the Anglican Communion. Both have effected recognition, and that liturgical, of modern heroes of the Faith. It is not this Commission's concern to comment on the actual selection of names; inclusions and exclusions are matters for the verdict of time and the decisions of Synods. The care, however, which the South African Synod has taken is evident from the complete disregard of party, or any other consideration than that of personal sanctity, missionary heroism, or the surrender of life. Only Anglican names find place. In the early drafts of the revision, the new table was called "A List of Worthies", and some non-Anglicans appeared on it. The word "Worthy" in this connection is no more in the Anglican vocabulary than "Blessed" or "Canonization"—even less so; and we cannot but be happy that the province rejected it.

II. THE DIOCESE OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The annual observance of the Martyrdom of Bernard Mizeki originated from this, his own diocese. The Bishop writes: "We have in this diocese a Proto-Martyr, Bernard Mizeki, to whose memory we have erected a shrine over the floor of the hut in which he was murdered. His martyrdom took place during the rebellion of 1896; and annually on June 18th, the anniversary of his martyrdom, we have a great gathering of our African people round the shrine, and some Europeans. Normally on the eve of the anniversary, I confirm a vast number of African candidates, who make their first Communion the following day, when I celebrate the Eucharist on the Altar of the shrine".

Since the division of the Diocese in 1952, into those of Mashonaland and of Matabeleland, the Mizeki shrine now lies in the former. As we have seen, the martyr's name has passed into the revised Kalendar of the Church of the Province of South Africa on 18 June; under its Section VI.

III. THE DIOCESES OF EAST AFRICA

The Dioceses of Zanzibar and Masasi express their anxiety to act on a provincial basis when a province is established in East Africa. We have already mentioned how the Bishop of Nyasaland before that diocese became part of the Province of Central Africa in May 1955, raised the whole issue before us. He added to his words already quoted:

I am very anxious that there should be established in our Communion a recognized way of commemorating departed members of it notable for their "heroic sanctity". The fact that at present a gap of hundreds of years separates the saints we commemorate from the life of today certainly does not help, to put it at its mildest, our Christians to realise that sanctity is a permanent possibility of the Christian life in all ages.

The Bishop of Zanzibar contributes important details about the joint practice of his diocese and that of Masasi with a final paragraph advocating the greatest freedom in procedure:

It has been the practice for the Bishop in Synod to provide for the liturgical commemoration of saints not already included in the Prayer Book Kalendar. Since this was first done by Bishop Smythies, some time previous to 1894, until the last provision of the Diocesan Kalendar, carried out by a joint Committee of the Dioceses of Zanzibar and Masasi (one diocese previous to 1925) during the years 1936-43, only those individuals have been added who were already included in some other Provincial or Diocesan Kalendar.

The growth of the Kalendar has been a gradual one, and so far as I can discover, additions were frequently made by the Bishop when issuing the annual Kalendar, such additions being provisional until opportunity occurred for their formal acceptance or rejection by Synod.

So far there has been no demand for the recognition of any particular individual especially associated with the Church in the diocese. In the case of others it would, I think, be true to say that by the above method provision has on the whole anticipated demand.

I very much hope that there may be some recognized procedure and regulation in this matter. I know of no particular circumstances in this Diocese, which would call for special care, but hope that in formulating regulations, the greatest possible freedom will be given to Provinces and even Dioceses as to inclusion in their Kalendars of those whom other Provinces and Dioceses may wish to recognize and commemorate.

He gives a list of saints' days observed in his diocese which are not included in the English Kalendar of 1928. Thirteen entries from that Kalendar are omitted. Here are the new insertions:

January	9	Adrian * (North African Abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury).
	24	Timothy.
	29	Francis de Sales.
February	6	Titus.
	9	Cyril of Alexandria.
	10	Scholastica.*
March	7	Thomas Aquinas.
	9	Gregory of Nyssa.
	18	Cyril of Jerusalem.
	19	Joseph.
	25	Archangel Gabriel.
	27	John Damascene.
April	14	Justin Martyr.
	24	The Penitent Thief.
May	9	Gregory of Nazianzus.
	30	Joan of Arc.*
	31	Angela.*
June	2	Blandina and her companions.
	3	Martyrs of Uganda.*
	10	Margaret of Scotland.*
	13	Anthony of Padua.*
	30	Martyrdom of St Paul.
July	7	Ramon Lull.
	10	African Martyrs.
	14	Bonaventure.
	15	Joseph of Arimathea.
	19	Vincent de Paul.*
	29	Martha.*
August	4	Dominic.*
	9	Jean Vianney, Curé d'Ars.*
	12	Clare.
	16	Joachim.*
	18	Helena.*
	21	Jeanne de Chantal.*
September	23	Thecla.
	28	Wenceslaus.*
October	8	Bridget.*
	11	Philip the Deacon.
	15	Theresa of Avila.
	23	James of Jerusalem.
	24	Archangel Raphael.
November	19	Elizabeth of Hungary.*
	24	John of the Cross.*

- December 3 Francis Xavier.
 7 Ambrose.
 13 Lucy (retained).
 29 Thomas of Canterbury.
 * Added in revision of Kalendar 1936-43. Accepted by the Bishop in Synod, January 1949.

Bishop Stradling writes of the Diocese of Masasi, of which he was Bishop at the time of our inquiry:

We have taken no steps, except to print in our diocesan Kalendar a note as to the date of the anniversary of the death of certain people. On those days no special prayers are said, but at the Holy Communion the priest, at his discretion, generally says a "bidding" with regard to that person.

There is certainly a demand for further recognition. The names of Frank Weston, William Johnson and William Porter have often been mentioned to me in this connection; and similar names from other African dioceses would be welcomed. It is often regretted that there are so few names in the Kalendar which have any connection with Africa.

We have hesitated to take any action because we do not wish to act unilaterally. It is so easy for one diocese to act in an eccentric way in matters of this sort. If the matter is to go forward, I should like to see:

- (a) Some conditions laid down as to what, in Anglican judgment, a "saint" in the Kalendar is: e.g. testimony as to the holiness of his life, length of time since his death, fruits of his work.
- (b) Some form of check by an authority outside the diocese. Where there is a Province I presume that the Provincial Synod would provide this. Perhaps in our case there should be consultation through our informal conference of East African Bishops, which could send on an application to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Bishop of Uganda deals with the Baganda martyrs. The first three boys were burned on 31 January 1885.

One more was killed on 25 May 1886, another on 29 May, nine more on 3 June, and one on 6 June. . . . The first three boys were Anglicans but in the other killings both parties, Roman

Catholics and Anglicans were represented. . . . In 1950 Bishop Stuart changed the commemoration to the Sunday nearest the 1st of March so that a collection could always be taken for Mukono Theological College. I want to alter this back if I can. I hope to write or otherwise obtain Propers and to make the day an occasion of re-dedication. I think occasionally there has been a pilgrimage to the place of martyrdom and a short informal open-air service of witness.²⁹

The Diocese of Mombasa covers the territory of Kenya. The cathedral in the see town is a memorial to Bishop Hannington, martyr, and two other apostles of the land. Bishop Beecher in answer to our questionnaire in 1951 made this valuable statement:

By way of personal comment, it would be salutary if more were done to make and keep the Church in Africa mindful of that great encircling cloud of witnesses amongst whom there are now so many of their own. I would deprecate anything that departed from a catholic into a regional or even national tradition of observance. Let Apolo Kivebulaya rank alongside Krapf, and both alongside their Indian, Chinese, and Japanese counterparts. But at the same time, let us not produce a Kalendar so full that it has lost its special significance. There would be more chance of the idea getting across if we had a quarterly observance (with appropriate liturgical provision) in commemoration of "Saints of the Modern Missionary Age", taken continent by continent, than if we merely added some twenty or thirty (possibly many more, names to the Kalendar without note or comment. I'd like an African village congregation to feel from time to time just what their heritage is in respect of this great cloud of witnesses, and feel from it an urge to lay aside encumbering sins and run their race with eyes set on the Lord. And I take it that's your purpose, not just cluttering up the Kalendar with names!

Apart from the wisdom of the whole comment, the suggestion of a commemoration of "Saints of the Modern Missionary Age", continent by continent, chimes with the invention of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd on p. 38.

He may not have foreseen how soon his diocese would number, through the Mau Mau rising, its own tale of martyrs. The begin-

²⁹ For a Roman Catholic argument that these Anglicans were true martyrs, although the Roman Catholic Church cannot canonize them, see J. P. Thoonen, *Black Martyrs* (London, 1941), 290 f.

ning of its consequences to the African Church may be read in *The Times* for 19 May 1955.

The Archbishop of Canterbury today drove from Nairobi to Fort Hall, in the heart of the Kikuyu reserve, which has seen some of the bitterest fighting and most savage murders of the Mau Mau emergency.

Dr Fisher laid the foundation-stone of a church which will commemorate Kikuyu Christians who have boldly opposed the Mau Mau, many of them losing their lives. By the Archbishop's side was Kenya's first Kikuyu assistant Bishop, the Right Reverend Obadiah Kariuki, who will take charge of the new church, and live in a house built beside it.

The Clergy robed in Fort Hall police station, surmounted by a high watch-tower and surrounded by barbed wire. Then they walked in procession, between lines of armed tribal policemen, to the site of the church. After the service the Archbishop walked slowly round shaking hands, and the 4,000 Kikuyu present broke spontaneously into a Christian song in their own language which has become the anthem of resistance to the Mau Mau.

Dr Fisher paid tribute to the Kikuyu martyrs and to others who had stood firm for Christianity in the face of terrorism. "I have never had to face the kind of decision that some of you have faced, of life and death," he said. "It is very, very humbly that I speak to you, only praying that if such a decision ever came to me I might be as faithful as some of you have been." They had given him far more encouragement than he could ever give them, and although he had been in many parts of the world nothing had so moved him as this gathering.

IV. OTHER AFRICAN DIOCESES

Two other African dioceses report as follows:

Madagascar: "The only local martyrs we commemorate in our Kalendar are Abel and the Malagasy Martyrs, 8 November. In 1931 the Synod added a proper collect, epistle, and gospel to the Malagasy Prayer Book; and the day is now kept as a red-letter day."

On the western extreme of the continent, the Diocese of Gambia and the Rio Pongas commemorates the founders and pioneer missionaries of the Rio Pongas, Hamble James Leacock and John Duport, on 12 December.

ASIA

I. THE CHURCH OF INDIA, PAKISTAN, BURMA, AND CEYLON

In 1951 the Episcopal Synod issued through S.P.C.K. *A Proposed Prayer Book . . . supplementary and alternative to the Book of Common Prayer*. The preface, by the present metropolitan, makes its authority or lack of it clear:

In 1945 the Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, by a resolution, requested the Liturgical Committee "to consider the possibility of preparing a Definitive Prayer Book for the Province . . . and to report to the Synod". The Committee prepared comprehensive proposals for a revised Prayer Book, which was submitted to the Synod for its examination in October 1951. After a certain amount of revision, the Synod authorized its publication, and the result is the PROPOSED PRAYER BOOK, 1951.

The new book will eventually be presented to two consecutive sessions of the General Council for discussion, alterations, modifications and acceptance, before it finally becomes the Prayer Book of the Province. It should be mentioned here that even after the revised book receives the final concurrence of the General Council, the Prayer Book of 1662 in its entirety will still continue to be an authorized alternative for permissive use in the Province.

The *Proposed Prayer Book* contains forms authorized by the Episcopal Synod under Canon VII (a) of Chapter XXI of the C.C.R. The use of these becomes permissible in any Diocese of the Province. It is hoped that the book will be used extensively in our churches, in consultation with the congregation under Canon XIV of Chapter XXI, during the interim period.

The new Prayer Book is of the highest importance in many directions, and not least to our own theme. Its Kalendar adds or varies two red-letter days, that of *Christ the King* on the last Sunday of October and that of *St Peter and St Paul* on 29 June. It may not be necessary to take account of the many omissions in black-letter entries from the English Prayer Books; but the additions are of interest.

January	24	Timothy, Companion of St Paul.
February	6	Titus, Companion of St Paul.
March	8	Thomas Aquinas, Dominican doctor and friar,

- March 18 Cyril of Jerusalem, Bishop, 386.
 19 Joseph, Foster-father of our Lord.
 April 14 Justin, Apologist and Martyr, c. 165.
 June 2 Martyrs of Lyons in France, 177.
 July 29 Martha of Bethany.
 31 Ignatius Loyola, Founder of the Society of Jesus
 1556.
 August 4 Dominic, Founder of the Order of Preachers,
 1221.
 15 The Falling Asleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
 December 3 Francis Xavier, Jesuit Missionary to India and
 Japan, 1552.
 9 Pantaenus, of Alexandria in Egypt, 2nd century.
 Thursday after Trinity Sunday—
 Thanksgiving for Holy Communion.

And this rubric follows:

A Bishop may authorize the observance within his diocese of other Saints' Days, which have some special significance for the diocese.

It will be noticed that the Episcopal Synod has not hesitated to include post-Reformation saints and festivals of the Roman Communion, when these are relevant. At the same time, a large measure of independence is permitted to the individual diocese, perhaps even expected. But this is not all. After the collects, epistles, and gospels proper to the liturgical year and to "the Remaining Greater Feasts", there follows, in a third section, a rich provision of Propers and Commons for "the Lesser Feasts". This again is immediately succeeded by "IV. The Commemoration of Departed Christians", which must be quoted in full.

- January 2 Death of Daniel Wilson, first metropolitan of
 India, 1858.
 February 12 Death of Alexander Duff, 1878.
 13 Death of Christian Frederic Schwartz, 1798.
 March 4 Death of Abdul Masih, 1827.
 11 Consecration of Bishop Robert Caldwell and
 Bishop Edward Sargent, 1876.
 April 3 Death of Reginald Heber, second Bishop of Cal-
 cutta, 1826.
 12 Death of Adoniram Judson, 1850.
 May 11 Martyrdom of Midgley John Jennings, Chimman
 Lal and their companions at Delhi, 1857.

- May 14 Death of Thomas Valpy French, first Bishop of
 Lahore, 1891.
 June 9 Death of William Carey, 1834.
 July 9 Landing of Ziegenbalg and Pleutschau at Tran-
 quebar, 1706.
 August 28 Death of Samuel Wilberforce O'Neill, S.S.J.E.,
 1882.
 October 6 Death of George Edward Lynch Cotton, sixth
 Bishop of Calcutta, 1886.
 9 Death of Nehemiah Goreh, 1895.
 16 Death of Henry Martyn, 1812.
 21 Death of Charles Grant, 1823.

The liturgical provision of collect, epistle, and gospel for these follows under four Commons, viz. For a Martyr or Martyrs, For a Missionary, For a Convert, and For Others.

The interest of these commemorations is clear whether or no they are confirmed by the General Synod; the Synod of Lucknow already has tabled amendments. They mark a step forward in the handling of a kalendar and in the recognition of the local apostolate. If the two lists be taken together, they include both post-Reformation saints of the Roman Communion and also the great non-Anglican Protestant missionaries, such as Carey and Duff—but all with the strictest relevance to the conversion of India. This point is, we repeat, beyond our terms of reference, but it is well to note as a fact that solution by the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon of a problem which must sooner or later be faced by all Anglican provinces and dioceses. We are not told the principles upon which these "departed Christians" were chosen; but expect the simplest answer is the truest, that, so to speak, they chose themselves. Perhaps we may be allowed one serious criticism. To preface each name with "Death of . . ." is unknown in Christian kalendars (if we except the Beheading of John the Baptist): since the day of death has in Catholic tradition always been reckoned as the Christian's birthday into life eternal; the name should stand unprefaced after its date; otherwise the constant repetition of the words "death of" constitutes a melancholy if unintended reflection on the Gospel of Life.

II. OTHER ASIATIC DIOCESES

Of other Asiatic Dioceses, there is nothing to say from China; and Hong Kong's answer is negative, except for the inclusion of St Joseph. The Bishop of Borneo writes: "It is my intention to appoint 13 June as the day of memorial of Lim Siong Teck, priest,

and his Companions. These men were murdered by the Japanese on account of assistance rendered to a crashed Dutch airman."

As for Japan, Bishop Mann answers that no provision, even in a revised Prayer Book now under consideration, has been made for any commemoration of those especially linked with Japanese history, and adds:

If additions are to be made I think N.S.K.K. would do well to make a beginning with commemorating some of those who have served N.S.K.K. so well in the past, rather than follow rigidly the list of "black-letter" saints. In all questions of revision N.S.K.K. is usually conservative in attitude and cautious about any change that is not sanctioned by the use of the Church of England or the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America. Unless, or until, one or other of these Churches begins the commemoration of post-Reformation worthies, N.S.K.K. is likely to hesitate to do so.

Finally, the Bishop of Jerusalem puts a contrary situation (in 1951) altogether:

I am afraid that common honesty demands that I should say that in most of the churches in this bishopric we have not yet been able to persuade them to take any notice of saints' days at all, even the red-letter days of our existing Kalendar, or even when these days are in fact the patronal festivals of their churches. It has been very noticeable that in the last two or three cases, where we have built new churches for Arab congregations, they have refused to have them dedicated in the name of any saint at all, preferring to stick to such dedications as "The Saviour", "The Redeemer", "The Good Shepherd".

AUSTRALASIA

I. THE CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA

The general tenor of the replies we have received from Australian Bishops (the Archbishops of Melbourne and Perth, the Bishops of Adelaide and Tasmania) is that "No steps have been taken here in regard to such commemoration"; that there is no demand but "in some quarters the desire", "a general feeling in the Church", that recognition of this kind ought to be made.

One diocese, however, provides a striking exception which has already had a marked influence on the whole continent. The Bishop of New Guinea, at the request of his Synod, has appointed September 2 as "Martyrs' Day", in which the deaths of three

priests, five lay missionaries, and two Papuan missionaries at the hands of the Japanese invaders should be annually commemorated. The bishop, himself a spectator of the passion of this young Church and a fearless actor in it, has answered by issuing full Propers as for a red-letter day for use in his diocese.

The Archbishop of Brisbane stated in his presidential address to the Provincial Synod of Queensland: "I am mindful of the fact that since our last session the Church in the Province has been enriched by the martyrdom of twelve of its missionaries in New Guinea."

Later, the following resolution was unanimously passed by the Provincial Synod.

That this Synod appreciates the reference in His Grace the President's inaugural address to the Missionary martyrs in the Diocese of New Guinea and Melanesia, and the hope expressed by His Grace that they might find a commemoration in the Church Calendar. The Synod is gratified to learn that the clergy of the Diocese of New Guinea recently assembled in Synod, solemnly requested the Bishop to appoint a day for the annual Diocesan Commemoration of the Martyrs of New Guinea and a Proper with special Collect, Epistle and Gospel for use on the same, and that it is intended that 1 September of each year shall be observed. The Bishops, Clergy and laity of this Provincial Synod, mindful of the enrichment which God has given to His Church in this Province and throughout Australia and the Pacific by a new witness of Martyrs in our generation, commends the extension of the Diocesan observance of this day in New Guinea to the Church in this Province and to the wider Church beyond the Province.

The Archbishop further writes:

2 September is the day finally decided upon. I have little doubt that eventually this day of commemoration of the triumph of the New Guinea martyrs will receive general recognition at least in the Australian Church and probably in the wider Church. . . .

II. THE CHURCH IN NEW ZEALAND

The Archbishop of New Zealand replies thus:

We in the Province of New Zealand thank God for the life of Bishop Selwyn, our first Bishop, and for the martyr Bishop

Patteson of Melanesia. There are others, Europeans, Maoris, and Melanesians, who died for their faith and are commemorated from time to time. In regard to the questionnaire that you enclose, the answer to questions 2, 3, and 4 is "no". The fact is that the Book of Common Prayer, supplemented by the Deposited Book of 1928, meets our needs.

In view of their historic connection with the Church of New Zealand, the Dioceses of the Pacific Islands may be allowed to fall under this heading. The Bishop of Polynesia writes: "We regularly every year remember John Coleridge Patteson, Bishop of Melanesia, on the day of his martyrdom. I have often thought we ought to remember Bishop Alfred Willis of Tonga and Archdeacon William Floyd of Fiji, but no steps have been taken to do this."

Presumably the see of Melanesia also commemorates its great Martyr Bishop; and it would not be strange if England and New Zealand were one day to do so too. During the Second World War the Diocese gave the Church at least two more martyrs, Bernard Moore, Priest, and John Barge, Priest, who suffered in New Britain.

Chapter 7

HEROIC SANCTITY AND ITS RECOGNITION

THE Scriptures speak of all Christians as being "saints", that is as being men and women who have been made members of the holy Body of Christ and set in the way of holiness. They also make it plain, however, how very far many Christians are from true holiness, that there is a goal of character to which we are all called but which in this life we attain in very varying degrees. Sometimes this goal has been set out by later writers in the form of a catalogue of virtues, more or less directly related to passages found in the New Testament. Recently the Methodist divine, Dr W. E. Sangster,³⁰ has attempted to give the picture and path of a saint by elaborating the Pauline catalogue "Love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance".³¹ P. T. Forsyth listed "humility, patience, thankfulness, prayer, duty, love",³² and Baron Von Hügel, in a famous essay, speaks of "courage, purity, unlimited compassion, humility, truthfulness, self-abandonment in the hands of God, spiritual joy".³³ The method more usual with Roman Catholic authors is to enlarge upon the three theological and the four cardinal virtues—"faith, hope, charity, prudence,

³⁰ W. E. Sangster, *The Pure in Heart, A Study in Christian Sanctity* (London, 1954). This book is of great importance for our inquiry.

³¹ Gal. 5.22 f.

³² P. T. Forsyth, *Christian Perfection* (1899), 137 ff.

³³ F. Von Hügel, *Christianity and the Supernatural*, in *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion* (London, 1921). In view of the stress which Von Hügel lays upon joy (here he joins hands with Dr Sangster), the following passage from his second series of addresses (London, 1926), p. 242, is of interest: "I used to wonder, in my intercourse with John Henry Newman, how one so good, and who had made so many sacrifices to God, could be so depressing. And again, twenty years later, I used to marvel contrariwise, in my intercourse with the Abbé Huvelin, how one more melancholy in natural temperament than even Newman himself, and one physically ill in ways and degrees in which Newman never was, could so radiate spiritual joy as, in very truth, the Abbé did. . . . Under the fine rule by which the Roman Church tribunals require for Canonization as distinct from Beatification, that the Servant of God concerned should be proved to have possessed and to have transmitted a deep spiritual joy, Newman, I felt and feel, could indeed be beatified, but only Huvelin could be canonized."

justice, fortitude, temperance"—and the most important stage in the Roman Catholic process of canonization of a confessor consists of a rigorous examination of a man's life by the standard of those seven virtues. It will be obvious how much all these catalogues have in common.

The Roman Catholic Church reserves the title of saint for those who have manifested the virtues to an heroic degree (leaving aside the question of martyrs); and Dr Sangster, although formally following a different standard, seems by his examples to agree with this requirement. The history that we have set out in the early chapters of this report shows that they are both in accord with the best traditions of the Church in so doing. For the most part, it has been the practice of ecclesiastical authority to place in the Kalendar only the names of those who have manifested great heroism, either by laying down their life for the confession of the faith of Christ, or by living a life of such a quality that to quite an exceptional and uncommon degree they manifested to all around them something of the holiness of Christ. There have, of course, been many instances when temporary passion, political or doctrinal, has caused the veneration, even with authority, of men whose lives do not seem to us to have matched this high standard, but in the long view the Church has reserved public veneration only for those whose character was such that it both illuminates and excites to holiness. Without in the least losing sight of the New Testament use of the word saint, we are bound to say that sanctity, in the sense that we have just described, is no ordinary thing. It is an evidence of the supernatural in human life.

From this it would seem to follow that the insertion of a name in the Kalendar as that of a holy man is not to be done lightly or without much consideration. There is no good basis in Scripture, and for some centuries little in tradition, for the requirement that miracles must have been performed at the intercession of the person under examination, and any such requirement would certainly not be in keeping with the Anglican tradition and outlook. Nevertheless, we can learn much from that part of the Roman process which deals with the examination of the virtues, and we commend to the attention of the authorities who have to take decisions in this matter a study of the relevant sections of Benedict XIV's great work, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*.³⁴ There is a danger lest in the desire to fill a gap of

³⁴ Book III, Chapter XI to end. An English translation of part of this work was published in 1850 by Thomas Richardson & Sons, under the title *Heroic Virtue: a portion of the treatise of Benedict XIV on the beatification and canonization of the servants of God*.

three centuries in our calendars we add the names of people who were worthy rather than heroic, and so lower the idea of holiness to a more comfortable level.

The history which we have set out shows also that the impulse to the recognition of holiness has almost always come from the faithful in the first instance, rather than from authority. Calendars have grown over the centuries in response to local demand and what may perhaps seem to us the haphazard distribution of the grace of God. Holiness is the gift of God and ecclesiastical authorities cannot dictate where he shall bestow it. He raises up his saints where and when it pleases him, the faithful recognize his work, and the part of authority is to make sure that that recognition is well founded. When, therefore, kalendrical revision on a large scale is under consideration, it is important to be on one's guard against artificiality. A kalendar of saints should proceed from the life of the Church rather than from the researches of an historian. It is true that the saints have an educative value and that a kalendar may give a conspectus of the life of the Church throughout the centuries, but it is more important that the names in it should live in the devotion of the people, exciting them daily to the service of the Lord of the saints. The insertion of the name of an Edward King or a Bernard Mizeki is more in accord with Christian tradition than that of a Jeremy Taylor or a William Laud.

Here, then, we have two dangers which face those who have to revise or construct calendars today. One is the danger of adding too many names and weakening the example of holiness; the other is the danger of producing a kalendar which breathes the study rather than the church. The chapters in which we have described the calendars of the Anglican communion since the Reformation plainly show examples of these dangers. We are not prepared to say that historical calendars are entirely and always wrong, but we record our opinion that the addition of names to a kalendar should be an occasional and unusual thing. Clearly at such a time as the present, when liturgical revision in general is much to the fore, there may have to be a comprehensive revision of calendars. In that respect we live in an exceptional epoch. We suggest that such revision be in the direction of the reduction of names which are no longer of significance in the life of the Church, rather than in the multiplication of names upon some historical or geographical pattern. It is more important to have in a kalendar the names of a few saints who are significant and who live in the devotion of the people, rather than many who are unknown.

From this point of view it may seem desirable that there should be one kalendar, containing comparatively few names, which is

common to a whole province, a group of provinces, or possibly to the whole Communion, and that to this kalendar there should be provincial and diocesan supplements, with some special provision for more local observance. It is to be expected that in course of time some names will pass from one kalendar to another, as the knowledge and veneration of a saint exceeds the boundaries of his own country. This is what we have seen in the past. It would be an indication that we are proceeding rightly if it were to happen in the future. We must repeat that the veneration and recognition of saints is something which must be controlled but cannot be directed by authority. It must be spontaneous in its origin, the response of God's people to something that he has done, for the saints are God's continual gifts to show us that the vocation to which he calls us is not impossible of fulfilment.

Chapter 8

THE PATH FORWARD

CHAPTERS 5 and 6 reveal a situation of which the Anglican Communion has hardly become aware. Almost everywhere there is a quiet stirring, a movement towards a reform of the Kalendar. A deeper sense of history is moving the older Churches; the younger Churches from gratitude and from the impulse to draw on all possible sources of inspiration wish to commemorate the apostles who brought them to Christ. A reform of the Kalendar may have other aspects with which we are not at this moment concerned; but that is primary which would recognize those servants of God, who in character and the great choices of their calling have shown the light of Christ to their several generations. The movement is the more convincing because it has risen independently in so many provinces, and has everywhere proceeded cautiously and tentatively, as if no province knew exactly what step to take or how to take it. As a matter of fact—and this, too, is impressive—each has acted basically in the same manner; each in this way or that has built upon the English Kalendar of 1552 in its distinction between “red-letter” and “black-letter” entries, and some have introduced a further distinction amongst the latter—between those which are given the fuller provision of collect, epistle, and gospel, whether by Proper or by Common, and those which are limited to a memorial, i.e. a collect to be said second after that for the day.

Thus already a common mind seems to have disclosed itself which without stress or strain can be raised into common principle. And it is accompanied by a growing if not general feeling that names in a kalendar can carry no living inspiration unless it is possible to attach some liturgical provision to each; and further, that the employment of this provision need not be of prescription, “to be observed” as are the red-letter saints' days. The total list of names in any provincial or diocesan kalendar can rightly be more ample than the single parish requires, since it expresses the corporate witness of the whole diocese or province.

The liturgical provision, again, falls into three grades or ranks.

The Prayer Books of all Anglican Communion have accustomed use to the first and fullest on their "red-letter" festivals, as we saw earlier. A second rank appears in many of the newer prayer books or revisions—those "black-letter" saints, who are given, whether by individual proper or by a common, full eucharistic provision, plus the use at Mattins and Evensong of the collect only. Feasts of the third rank receive in practice in some parts only a "second collect" to follow that of the week; a "memorial". These distinctions are widely understood and practised already throughout the Communion, and correspond to common sense. They do not of course introduce or even suggest any differences of merit or sanctity between the men of God commemorated; they simply provide the sort of recognition and remembrance which is convenient to the special conditions and loyalties of each different communion, province, or diocese; without serious disturbance to the duty of preserving the integrity of the daily Office with its regular course of Scripture and Psalm throughout the year.

But if this common mind actually prevails in present practice, hitherto it has never been rubrically defined. We believe that the time has come to define it, and to raise common mind into common principle; and that already the Anglican Communion possesses the foundation on which its component churches may be willing to build. Its primary (though not the only) method of "Recognition" is the placing by province or by diocese of a name in its kalendar. For the moment we are not concerned as to how this is to be effected, i.e. with details of procedure. We suggest only the broad principle, that the Kalendar in each part of the Anglican Communion be given a new life and a more conscious authority for what, after all, has been its intended and traditional purpose through the centuries; as a roll of saints, necessarily selective and representative, which the Church for reasons of gratitude, instruction, and inspiration delights to "recognize" and commemorate.

In the answers to our questions received from many bishops, especially those of South Africa, East Africa, and India, there appears a patent and wholesome reluctance on the part of the diocese to act in any way apart from the province. We suggest that in this issue the functions of the diocesan and provincial synods need not be thought narrowly identical. The duty of the province is to the content and balance of the kalendrical entries as a whole; with the selection of the representative saints of all the centuries in their manifold types and enduring appeal. Naturally, too, a province, e.g. in Africa, would lay definite stress on African saints, whom all its dioceses would profit by observing. But the diocese also will want to recognize and remember its own local heroes of

the faith; indeed, such restricted and local observances may be the most real and intense. To take two examples. The recognition of Abel and the Malagasy martyrs is of profound importance to the Diocese of Madagascar, where the feast has been raised to red-letter rank, but it would not be so primary even in other provinces or dioceses of Africa. In England, similarly, the liturgical observance of Edward King, Bishop, finds its first home in Lincoln Diocese; and only time will show whether it will extend to the whole provinces of Canterbury and York, though here and there locally it may already have overleapt the boundaries of Lincoln. If the recognition of saints is to grow more vivid, if the Kalendar is to record what is most real, *the diocese has a part to play apart from the province*, in no way contrary to the tradition of the Catholic Church. It is a safeguard, not a danger. Often the commemoration of a man of God *must* start from a diocese, from the actual people whom he served, inspired, and illuminated. His appeal may wane as times goes on and disappear—as has happened, indeed, with a majority of canonized saints; or it may wax, and become the inheritance of the province. An example of the latter progress has happened in recent years. Bernard Mizeki, Martyr, belonged, as we have seen, to the Diocese of Southern Rhodesia, where the observance of his "birthday into life", 18 June, is of peculiar vividness: the date and name have now passed into the Kalendar of the Province of South Africa.

There should be no conflict over the respective spheres of province and diocese; the determination of their synods on these issues are complementary, not adversative. Limited diocesan function and authority in the sphere of local observance has, indeed, never been questioned; in England it is in constant exercise, e.g. in the permission by the Ordinary of special collect, epistle, and gospel for the name-saint of a less usual church dedication. We can think of no occasion in modern days when diocesan authority in this region has been abused or come into collision with the province.

But other questions remain. In the case of new entries into a provincial or diocesan kalendar, whether the names be ancient or modern, what or who is the determining authority?

Again, in any proposal to include a post-Reformation name or one (like King Alfred) hitherto uncanonized, how is the standard of the character and achievement which should govern inclusion to be determined?

It is on these two questions that hesitation is most obvious and prevalent. But never yet have they been in this country discussed

at any official level. We believe that they are not so hard to answer as is commonly supposed.

Certainly that is so with the first. The historical sketch in our earlier chapters witnesses to the authority both of province and diocese in the first thousand years of the Church. Indeed, there was no other authority until the papacy had gathered sufficient prestige and strength in the West to engross by gradual development a function hitherto exercised by the episcopate. In the East, neither province nor diocese has lost its authority within due limits; though when the Church or synod was national, as in Russia, its provinces normally acted as one unit for canonizations which it wished to commend widely to the faithful. Similarly, for kalendrical changes, the two English provinces, or the eight in the United States, would doubtless desire to act as one Church, although variations as between provinces and dioceses would be allowed.

The provincial or diocesan Synod, therefore, would be a natural instrument for additions and subtractions within the Kalendar, and for appointing the appropriate liturgical provision. We are, however, convinced that all synodical action of this character should be approached and handled with a new and higher sense of its evangelical importance to a living Church. The Romans are right in making promulgation an event of joy and thanksgiving, and in proclaiming to the whole Church the life of a servant of God which has been grandly achieved. If a prescribed liturgical ceremony of that kind seems alien to ourselves, other ways of publication and celebration may appear. None could be more moving than that which the Diocese of Southern Rhodesia has found in the case of Bernard Mizeki.

The determination of standard would seem at first sight more difficult. The peculiar juridical process of Rome (including the demand for miracles) is but the outward and visible expression of a searching examination into the life and works of the proposed "candidate". But spiritual eminence and the outstanding heroisms of selfless faith in most cases declare themselves, and themselves constitute sufficient miracle. Investigation there must be, if a life is to be singled out for the abiding veneration and gratitude of the Christian family; but that involves no more than a report to synod by a qualified commission.

Similarly, provincial or other commissions can be appointed if it be thought profitable, to prepare regulations over such allied points as the dedication of churches and the general pattern of liturgical provision.

By such quiet and natural procedure, the Anglican Communion

could with a more settled consciousness and by a more clearly defined method, honour its saints and heroes of faith, learn from the light of Christ manifest in their lives and achievements, and deepen its sense of communion and community with the eternal world. The abuses of earlier ages are past and gone, and, we believe, unlikely to revive if our older and younger provinces continue with special care in this sphere to pool their devotion and experience. That "if" is important; the younger communions with their fine enthusiasms can gain nothing but profit from the long disciplines of history in which the older are nursed. Indeed, the deeper sense of the Communion of Saints which could well result from joint thought and action over their kalendars might also contribute to the richer unity *in fide et sacris* of the whole body. The system and observance of the "red-letter" feasts has already become common and distinctive within the pattern of Anglican worship; its extension from the redemptive work of Christ to the fruits of his Spirit in history should reinforce not weaken our treasury of grace.

Appendix I

NOTES ON THE ORIGINS, DIFFUSION, AND OBSERVANCE OF SAINTS' DAYS

by

E. C. RATCLIFF

(Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge)

(This Memorandum covers some but not all the ground of Chapters II and III. It was received after they had been written, and seemed to the Commission to be of such value that it ought to be published by itself rather than incorporated in the appropriate chapters of the report.)

i. Origins

THE origin of the observance of "Saints' Days" may be traced to the practice of commemorating the anniversaries of martyrdoms at the martyrs' tombs. The earliest known reference to the practice occurs in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, which is generally acknowledged to be an authentic and contemporary account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. The date of the martyrdom is agreed to be 22 February 156. Chapter 18 of the *Martyrium* states that the Christians took up the calcined bones of Polycarp and deposited them "where it was fitting".³⁵ The chapter proceeds: "There the Lord will give us opportunity, as it shall be possible for us, to assemble ourselves together in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birthday (*ἡμέρα γενέθλιος*) of his martyrdom, both in memory of those who have competed in contest before, and also for the training and preparation of those who are to fight in the future." Polycarp is stated, in Chapter 19, to be the twelfth martyr in Smyrna, "together with those from Philadelphia"; but he is also said to be "alone particularly remembered by all, so that he is spoken of in every place even by the heathen". It may be, therefore, that the practice of observing "the birthday" was introduced into Smyrnaean usage in connection with Polycarp's commemora-

³⁵ Precise indication of the site is withheld from motives of prudence.

tion. It is perhaps significant that, according to the archaeological evidence, the *Memoria* of St Peter on the Vatican Hill in Rome dates from this time, at which, further, Anicetus, who had received Polycarp at Rome and yielded the celebration of the Eucharist to him, was bishop of the city.³⁶

The *Martyrium* offers valuable evidence concerning the ideas entertained about the martyrs by those who celebrated their "birthdays". Their "nobility and patience and love of their Master" is admired (Chapter 2). "We worship [Christ] as being Son of God: but the martyrs we hold in affection as disciples and imitators of the Lord. . . God grant that we also may have a portion with them, and may be their fellow-disciples" (Chapter 17). Of Polycarp himself it is said that "rejoicing with the apostles and all the just, he is glorifying God and the almighty Father, and is blessing our Lord Jesus Christ" (Chapter 19). The fact of public witness (*μαρτύριον*) to Christ unto death is proof that the witness (*μάρτυς*) has entered heaven there to join with the holy ones in glorifying God. The observance of the martyr's anniversary is consequently, not one of mourning but of rejoicing as being a remembrance of his "birthday" into the life of heaven.

Wherever we meet with reference to the observance of martyrs' days in the period following Polycarp's martyrdom, the pattern followed is that indicated in the *Martyrium*: there is a festal celebration at the martyr's tomb, or grave, on the anniversary of his witness.

In the mid-third century a new element appears in North Africa. In his Epistle 12, Cyprian gives directions concerning those who, dying in prison, are to be reckoned as martyrs. "Take note of the days on which they die, that we may be able to celebrate their commemorations at the chapels '*memoriae*' of the martyrs . . . and that oblations and sacrifices may be celebrated for their commemorations here by us." "Here" is the bishop's own church, in which, therefore, there is an observance additional to that at the chapel.

The evidence of the ante-Nicene period may be summarized thus: (i) the commemorations of martyrs are the only saints' days; (ii) the commemorations are local, celebrated only by the Ecclesia to which the martyr belonged, and at his burial-place; (iii) Cyprian, while not disturbing this tradition, begins to make commemorations partly "diocesan" by introducing them at his own church;³⁷ and (iv) the commemoration includes a celebration of the Eucharist.

³⁶ Eusebius, *H.E.*, v, 24.

³⁷ It seems likely that Cyprian was the initiator of this development.

ii. Post-Nicene Developments up to circa A.D. 600

Pre-Nicene usage continued without interruption, as might be expected, into the post-Nicene age. The more favourable circumstances in which the Church found itself greatly encouraged the cult of the martyrs. Their *memoriae* were made objects of pilgrimage, and in some cases churches were built over them. Evidence for Eastern practice in this regard is found in the *Peregrinatio Etheriae*, written in the late fourth century, and concerns St Thomas the Apostle and St Thecla. The alleged relics of St Thomas were preserved at Edessa. Etheria made a pilgrimage to them, and when prayers had been said, she read "some things about Saint Thomas himself".³⁸ At Seleucia in Isauria, Etheria preferred to stay, not in the city but outside it beside the *memoria* of St Thecla. When she made her visit to the *memoria*, the *Acts of St Thecla* were read.³⁹ Presumably, the *Acts of St Thecla* and some version of the *Acts of Thomas* were read in the course of the commemorations of their "birthdays", not, however, at Mass, but in the Vigil Office with which the commemorations began, and which were designed by the ascetics to occupy themselves, and such devout persons as joined them, in keeping watch up to the Morning Prayer of the festival. The Western mediaeval usage of reading an account of a saint in the Second Nocturn of the Mattins of his day derives from the practice to which Etheria refers.

The early kalendars of saints are lists of martyrs belonging to local churches. The best-known early Western kalendar is the Roman Philocalian List for the year 354. All its entries are Roman, with the exception of two, viz. the African Saints Perpetua and Felicity (7 March) and St Cyprian (celebrated on 14 September in the Catacombs, or cemetery at Callistus, at the *memoria* of the martyred Pope Cornelius⁴⁰). The presence of these African entries is easily explained: a domiciled African Christian group had formed a part of the *Ecclesia Romana* from the second century. The Philocalian List, therefore, provides for the beginnings, albeit in a strictly limited fashion, of a non-local commemoration of martyrs, and of the formation of a kalendar of more than strictly local interest. Other Christian groups domiciled in Rome were to contribute martyrs to the Roman Kalendar at a later date. The Byzantines contributed St Anastasia (25 December) and SS. Cosmas and Damian (28 September), whose names are attached to two churches in the city, and also appear in the Canon at the Mass.

³⁸ H. Pétré, *Ethérie*, Sources Chrétiennes 21 (Paris, 1948), 162.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁴⁰ He was banished to Centumcallae (Civitavecchia) and, dying there, was counted as a martyr.

The Roman Kalendar thus enlarged is still a martyrology. It is not an "historical" kalendar, designed to be representative of the Church Catholic. The foreign martyrs are introduced at the instance of those who have a special devotion to them, and desire to obtain their prayers and aid away from home. The members of the Roman Church naturalize the foreign cults, and become clients of the foreign martyrs, whose anniversaries (*natalia*) they commemorate in the churches dedicated to them.

By the accession of St Gregory the Great to the pontificate in 597, the Roman Kalendar had been enlarged to include the *natale* of St John Baptist (24 June), the *natalia* of SS. Andrew (30 November) and John Evangelist (27 December), and the festival of the Innocents (28 December). Eastern influence is to be discerned in the admission of St John Evangelist. There are two festivals of churches, the Dedication of the Basilica of St Peter (April, n.d.) and that of the Basilica of St Michael Archangel on the Via Salaria (30 September). There is no specific feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary; she is included in the Feasts of Annunciation, Christmas, and "Symeon's Meeting" (Purification).

The official attitude of the Roman Church to the commemorations of the martyrs is expressed in a Leonine collect for SS. Cornelius and Cyprian: ⁴¹ "Almighty everlasting God, who makest us glad with the multiple feast-day of thy saints: Grant that we may be defended by the protection of them whose commemoration we now observe with rejoicing."

iii. Early English Commemorations of Saints

The Anglo-Saxon Church inherited the Roman Kalendar with the Roman liturgical books. English converts to Christianity assisted at the anniversaries of Roman martyrs with as much devotion as the Romans themselves. Changes in and additions to the Roman Kalendar were followed in England, so that the Roman martyrology formed the basis of an English Kalendar, to which the English themselves soon made additions.

An early addition is St Etheldreda of Ely. The circumstances of her promotion are illuminating. She died in 679. Sixteen years later her sister and successor as abbess decided to translate her body from the cemetery into the church. The body of Etheldreda was found to be incorrupt at exhumation. The touch of her clothes healed demoniacs and diseased persons, and contact with her coffin cured sore eyes. It was then remembered that in her lifetime she had possessed a spirit of prophecy. These circumstances were taken as proof that her virginity and sanctity were rewarded by trans-

⁴¹ Feltoe, *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, 103.

lation to heaven at her death.⁴² Bede, who wrote a poem in her honour, numbers her among the women martyrs, and describes her as united with Christ, her Bridegroom, in heaven.⁴³ From Bede's time onward there is a steady increase of English saints to the basic Roman Kalendar. Bede's own account of Benedict Biscop prepared the way for a new category of English saints which was the counterpart of a category coming into existence on the Continent. Benedict Biscop was a monk; he had no prophetic spirit and performed no miracles; yet his continual labours for God, his charity, and his Job-like patience in the physical suffering in which his life closed were indicative of a sanctity which caused Bede to refer to him as a "confessor" of the Lord. Bishops, monks, and nuns form by far the greater part of the "confessor" category of the early mediaeval kalendars, both English⁴⁴ and continental. This fact can be explained by popular readiness to hold in reverence signal examples of the ascetic ideal; and the ascetic life, whether coenobitic or otherwise was regarded as being *par excellence* "religious". Yet not all the bishops, monks, and nuns, and comparatively few anchorets, were admitted to the kalendars. Those who were so admitted were believed by their contemporaries to have been so outstanding as to be, not waiting for heaven but within it, admitted to the Presence of God and united with apostles and martyrs and all other saints in praying to and praising him. Their anniversaries, therefore, are not Obits, i.e. days for Requiem Masses, but Festival Days.

Yet it cannot properly be said that "popular movement made saints" in the era before central ecclesiastical authority intervened to permit or ban the acknowledgment of certain persons as saints. Some sort of popular movement, no doubt, may be taken to account for such commemorations as those of Kenelm and Edward the King; but the circumstances of each were peculiar, both were counted as martyrs, and in the case of Edward the alleged appearance of miracle subsequently justified the popular claim.⁴⁵ It was understood that God alone made saints. The part of men lay in recognizing sanctity. In the nature of things, therefore, recognition of sanctity was at first limited to the persons immediately surrounding the saint. When recognition extended to a wider

⁴² Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, 19.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴⁴ See F. Wormald, *English Kalendars before A.D. 1100*, Henry Bradshaw Society. Vol. 72 (1934). The word *confessor* in the liturgical books of Roman origin means "ascetic".

⁴⁵ Hence the early wide acceptance of "St Edward, K & M" (18 March); Kenelm's recognition was at first more restricted, but he increased in popularity with the passage of time, and his feast (18 July) was admitted to the Sarum Kalendar.

circle, it did so because the statements of the original circle as to the marks of sanctity were accepted as true. Further, the appearance of miracle was taken to be proof, furnished by God, that the person believed, by those who had known him, to be a saint was in fact such.

Even so, it did not follow that English saints were universally commemorated in the English Church during the Anglo-Saxon era. The only universal commemorations were those of the Roman Kalendar. The native English commemorations were regional or scattered. For their acceptance into kalendars, they depended upon the devotional interests of the authorities who drew up and controlled the lists of additions to the Roman Kalendar for observance in the great monastic and cathedral churches.

Both before and after the Norman Conquest, it was the practice of provincial synods and of bishops in their diocesan synods to decree the observance of new feasts throughout the province or in the diocese.⁴⁶ The dissemination of relics was also a factor in the addition of feasts to existing kalendars, the acquisition of a relic leading to the introduction of a commemoration of the saint to whom the relic belonged.⁴⁷ By such means as these, saints' days became excessively numerous, and the local character of kalendars was overlaid, as may be seen from reference to the Sarum Kalendar in its late mediaeval form.

The modern Roman Church, it may be noted, has preserved regional and local observance of feasts in the form of "Diocesan Supplements". The Feast of St John Fisher (4 May), for instance, is wanting from the *Kalendarium Universalis Ecclesiae*, but is prescribed for observance in all English Roman Catholic dioceses; and the Feast of St Edward K & M (18 March) is limited to the Diocese of Plymouth in which Corfe, the scene of his murder, is situated.

iv. Liturgical Observance of Saints' Days

As long as saints' days were the *natalia* of martyrs, few in number

⁴⁶ The Synod of Clovesho (747) prescribed the observance of the days of St Gregory the Great (12 March) and Augustine of Canterbury (26 May): see Canon 17. Circa 1308, Henry de Woodloke, Bishop of Winchester, in his diocesan synod ordered that the feasts of SS. Swithin, Birmus, Demund of Canterbury, and Richard of Chichester "*ubique per nostram diocesim solenniter celebrentur*" (Wilkins, *Concilia*, 2.300).

⁴⁷ Ely history affords an example of this procedure. The Ely Kalendar of circa 1015 contains no feast of St Alban. In 1077, however, the Abbot of St Albans deposited for safe keeping at Ely the alleged relics of St Alban. Thereafter, Ely celebrated as a great feast 15 May, the day on which the relics were believed to have arrived, and also 22 June, the *natale* of the saint observed in St Albans. Incidentally, the Ely monks refused to return the relics, and 15 May was observed until the Dissolution.

and local in observance, liturgical commemoration was simple. It was held at the martyr's burial-place, and from an early time it consisted in a celebration of the Eucharist. This usage, as it was found in continuance at Rome *circa* 400, is noted incidentally by Prudentius in his description of the martyrdom of Hippolytus. Hippolytus was buried in a subterranean tomb, adjacent to which stands an "*ara dicata Deo*". The "*sacramenti donatrix mensa*" of this altar feeds with "*sanctis dapibus*" the Romans who commemorate the martyr.⁴⁸

The Roman Sacramentaries contain some part of the liturgical provision for the commemorations. Each day has its proper set of prayers, i.e. collect, offertory prayer, and post-communion. There were also a proper epistle and gospel, and proper psalmody. The Mass appointed for St Lawrence in the Roman Missal (10 August), with the exception of the Communion anthem,⁴⁹ preserves the authentically ancient provision for the day.

The beginnings of the Office, as distinct from the Mass, of a martyr is bound up with the practice of the vigil. The more pious among the faithful assembled in the night to keep a *pervigilium* before the observance of the day. In course of time, the vigil assumed a liturgical form: appropriate Psalms and Scripture lessons were recited, and the story of the martyrdom was read. The vigil, like the Mass, was observed at the martyr's tomb. When the circumstances of Rome made the traditional cemetery observances difficult or dangerous, and when the martyr's remains were translated to churches within the city, the liturgical observances were translated also. At first the clergy celebrated both the ferial Office and also the martyr's vigil Office. Here we have the origins of the "Double Office". Eventually, the ferial Office was abandoned; the Proper of the saint was extended to the whole series of the Hours; and the Office of the saint became the sole Office of his day. The term "Double" continued as a description of dignity.

With the increase of saints' days, it became necessary to classify them according to importance. In the printed Sarum Breviary of 1531, there are two main classes, viz. "Double" and "Simple". The Double class is subdivided into four grades:

- (a) Principal, e.g. Christmas, Easter, the Assumption of the B.V.M., the Feast of the Patron Saint of a church.
- (b) Greater, e.g. Purification, Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, All Saints.

⁴⁸ Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, XI, 169-74.

⁴⁹ Psalmody *ad communionem* is the last of the Psalmody to be provided for the Mass. That for St Lawrence appears to be a late substitution for an earlier selection.

(c) Lesser, e.g. Stephen, John, Innocents, Peter and Paul.

(d) Inferior, e.g. Andrew, Thomas, Matthias, Mark, Augustine of Canterbury, and the Commemoration of Souls (2 November).

The Simple class has no grades, but contains internal liturgical differentiations: e.g. the Conversion of St Paul (25 January) has nine lessons at Mattins, so has Barnabas (11 June), but *John ante Portam Latinam* (6 May) has three. Some Simple feasts, again, had a triple Invitatory, others a double, others a single.

There is also a subsidiary class of some twenty-five feasts under the title *Memoria tantum*. These had no Office, either proper or common, but were commemorated by a collect at Lauds and Vespers. Some had lessons proper to them introduced into the Second Nocturn.

In a kalendar of these dimensions, the majority of feasts could have no proper Office. Provision was made for them by the expedient of "Commons", which, in origin, were the adaptation of "Propers", i.e. the Roman "Common of Virgins" is an adaptation of the Proper of St Agnes (21 January), and can be used for the feast of any virgin.

Two features of liturgical observance require notice: (i) First Evensong, or Vespers, and (ii) Octaves.

(i) The Roman day, like the modern English day, ran from midnight to midnight. When Pope Leo the Great celebrated the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul (29 June) he did not begin it on 28 June; he confined its observance to 29 June. Later, when St Benedict observed SS. Peter and Paul, he began the feast at "Vigils" (now called "Mattins") about midnight on the day itself, and ended it with Vespers on the same day. The feast therefore had but one Vespers. In the ninth century, a confusion of usage appears in the Frankish Church, as we learn from Amalarius.⁵⁰ In some places the Roman practice was followed. In others, a Jewish day-reckoning prevailed, i.e. from evening to evening (cf. Lev. 23.32), so that, e.g. in Metz *circa* 810, the Vespers of SS. Peter and Paul were sung on the previous evening, and the Vespers of what by Roman reckoning was 29 June were counted as that of 30 June. Either way, the feast had one Vespers and no more; but there was this difference, viz. in Gallican usage the feast began, not with Vigils but with Vespers. By the eleventh century, in monastic circles, these usages coalesced, with the illogical result that the feast of 29 June and other great feasts acquired two Vespers, a "First" and a "Second". Lesser feasts retained one Vespers, and that one was the First. This illogical usage had inevitably an effect

⁵⁰ See *De off. eccl.*, IV, vii, 2, and *De ord. Antiph.*, VI, 16.

upon the practice of the Vigil. If the Vigil was to be regarded as the overture of a feast, it must be removed to a point before First Vespers. In monastic circles, again, this arrangement was adopted. Ultimately, the day preceding a great feast was counted its Vigil; and because Vigil was by then regarded by the pious as a penitential preparation for the feast and consequently to be observed with fasting, the Vigil acquired a penitential Office and Mass. The mediaeval development of the Vigil thus destroyed the pristine festal character of the vigiliary observance.

(ii) An Octave is now the prolongation of a feast for seven days after the anniversary, so that the Office of the feast is recited for eight days. This inconvenient arrangement derives from a misunderstanding of the nature of the Paschal or Easter Octave. Ancient Christian interest in the "first day" and the "eighth day" is well known.⁵¹ Sunday is at once a commemoration of the creation and of the Lord's Resurrection, i.e. of the first and eighth days. But Easter Day has an eighth day of its own (John 20.25, *et post dies octo iterum erant discipuli eius intus*). The original Easter "Octave" was the celebration of the *dies octavus*, or Low Sunday. The intervening days were concerned with the instruction of the newly baptized. The Easter Octave (in the mediaeval sense of the term) was therefore a Baptismal Octave, and the newly baptized wore their white baptismal robes for the last time on Low Sunday. Easter Day itself was unique. In so far as Low Sunday recalls Easter Day, it looks back to the unique day. When the Christmas Octave was introduced it was parallel with that of Easter, and was suggested by Luke 2.21 (*et postquam consummati sunt dies octo ut circumcideretur puer . . .*). Christmas Day in its own way was also unique, and the celebration of its *dies octavus* looked back to it. Three of the intervening days were saints' days, and had Proper Masses including Prefaces. Pentecost had no *dies octavus*, because it was itself the last of the great fifty festal days which began with Easter. In the early mediaeval period, a parallel was drawn between the great Christian feasts and the Jewish eight-day celebrations of Passover, Tabernacles, and the Dedication of the Temple; Easter, Pentecost,⁵² and Christmas received eight-day Octaves, and with them Ascension and Epiphany. Following this pattern, mediaeval liturgists began to attach eight-day Octaves to saints' days. From the eleventh century the number of saints' days Octaves increased considerably. The inconvenience of the arrangement can be seen by referring to the provision of the Sarum Breviary for

29 December; the priest had to recite the Office of St Thomas of Canterbury, and commemorate the Octaves of Christmas, St Stephen, St John, and the Innocents.

The development of dual Evensongs, Vigils, and Octaves had become a nuisance which defeated the ancient and original notion and purpose of celebrating saints' days. Cranmer's treatment of the nuisance deserves to be recalled. Learning from Quinones, he suppressed all First Evensongs, making each feast begin with the Mattins of its day.⁵³ Cranmer also (here going further than Quinones) suppressed all Octaves of saints. He also jettisoned all Vigils. Nevertheless, two Edwardine Acts of Parliament (1549 and 1552) ordained, for the benefit of fishmongers, that certain saints' eves should be observed as days of abstinence from flesh.⁵⁴ Cranmer's simplification of the observance of saints' days was unquestionably "more commodius" for clergy and people together than the mediaeval methods of celebration, and also nearer to "the usages in the Primitive Church".

⁵³ The Restoration Prayer Book of 1663 made a partial and limited return to First Evensongs by prescribing "that the Collect appointed for every Sunday, or for any Holyday that hath a Vigil or Eve, shall be said at the Evening Service next before". Nine saints' days have no eve. The Convocations in 1922 obliterated the distinction and restored the mediaeval First Evensong by appointing the Proper Lessons for the eves of *all* saints' days. Certain eves were statutory holidays, i.e. free from work from noon, and parishioners were required to attend service in their parish churches on such occasions. The usage of 1663 is apparently intended to link the eve with the saint's day following it.

⁵⁴ It will be observed that the Prayer Book Kalendar enters these eves not with the word "Vigil" but with the word "Fast". This procedure was first adopted in Queen Elizabeth I's "New Calendar" of 1561, which thus followed the Edwardine Acts. Similarly the Latin Prayer Books issued after 1561 note an eve, not as "Vigilia" but as "Hic jejunand".

⁵¹ See e.g., *Ep. Barnabas*, XV, and Justin Martyr, *Dial. with Trypho*, 41.

⁵² The Octave of Pentecost was, however, slow in establishing itself. It was not in general use until the eleventh century.

Appendix II

GLOSSARY OF LITURGICAL TERMS

BLACK-LETTER DAY. An entry in the Prayer Book Kalendar printed in black ink, or in small Roman type, in contrast with those entries printed in red ink, or in italic, or large type, and known as red-letter days. Black-letter days were originally introduced into the Prayer Book Kalendar as being of historical interest; and no liturgical observance was appointed for them, until the 1928 Prayer Book made some limited provision for their recognition. The colour of the ink did not imply any judgement as to the degree in which the saint in question displayed the grace of God; red ink or distinctive type being restricted to those days for which proper collect, lessons, etc., were appointed, and which originally were holidays from work, observed by general attendance at divine service. For the methods by which black- and red-letter days are now distinguished in observance, see Chapter V, pp. 30-32.

COMMON. The name given to the liturgical provision for classes or categories of saints, it being difficult to provide a separate and appropriate collect, epistle, and gospel for each saint in the Kalendar. Thus a collect, epistle, and gospel for use on the days of saints who were martyrs is called "The Common of Martyrs", though this would not exclude the provision of a special series for an individual martyr where this was desirable. (See Chapter V, p. 31.)

DEPOSITED BOOK, THE. The name given to the revised Prayer Book in the Measure presented by the Church Assembly of the Church of England to Parliament, both in 1927 and in 1928.

DOUBLE FEAST. The title in the Mediaeval Church for a feast of moderate rank, there being also "greater doubles", double feasts of the first and second class, semi-doubles, and so on. The name originates in the practice of celebrating the liturgy of a saint in

addition to the normal liturgy of the day so that there was a double round of services on a single day. Later, when the normal liturgy of the day was dropped, the classification "double feast" still remained attached to the particular saint's day.

FERIAL means non-festal. A *feria* is an ordinary day without any special commemoration, on which the psalms and lessons of divine service are read in course and are not selected to illustrate any definite mystery or doctrine.

MEMORIAL. A short act of commemoration of some saint or mystery inserted into an Office which is mainly concerned with some other saint or mystery. This act often takes the form of an antiphon followed by versicle, response, and a collect, but in the Anglican rites a simple collect following the collect for the day suffices.

NINE LESSONS, FEAST OF. The ancient office of Mattins consisted of three sections known as Nocturns, each containing a number of psalms, antiphons, absolutions, benedictions, etc., together with lessons from Scripture. On festivals of certain ranks each Nocturn contained three lessons, making a total of nine. On lesser festivals and ferials, only three lessons were read.

OFFICE means first simply duty, then duty to God, then a public act of worship of God. It is now more particularly used of those non-sacramental rites in which the singing of psalms and the reading of Scripture lessons forms the predominant part, e.g. Mattins and Evensong. The Divine Office or the Choir Office is the customary description of this part of the Church's worship, while Liturgy (which has a similar meaning and a similar history) is used more frequently to indicate the Holy Communion.

PROPER. The name given to the liturgical provision for one special feast, e.g. for the series of collect, epistle, and gospel appointed for use on a specific Holy Day. It is the "opposite" of Common (see above) (see Chapter V, p. 30). The Proper of a feast may include, in addition to the above, a preface, and also proper psalms and lessons for Mattins and Evensong.

VOTIVE MASS, A, in the liturgical language of the Latin Church is equivalent to a Eucharist celebrated on a ferial day with some special intercessory intention, expressed in an appropriate series of Propers (collect, epistle, and gospel). E.g. in anxious cir-

cumstances such as war or pestilence; or for the faithful departed, for spouses at their wedding, for missionaries, and the propagation of the Faith; or for the guidance of the Holy Spirit upon a Convocation or Synod of the Church, or over the choice of a bishop for a diocese or priest for a parish. The 1928 Prayer Book sanctions this practice in a limited way by providing a number of Propers which are not ordered to be used on any special day. Of the Proper for the Commemoration of All Souls a rubric says: "Note, that this service may be used on any day when desired, not being a Holy Day, or a day within the Octave of Christmas, Easter, or Whitsunday."