

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Redeemer's steps in rejection and in shame. Let him also be prepared for casting out by priest and scribe. Let his yearning heart, with whatever anguish, inure itself to the thought that the beloved "city of his solemnities" is not the final and enduring Jerusalem. Let his "thoughts to heaven the steadier rise," as he looks, like Abraham before him, to "God's great town in the unknown land," where sits on high the Mediator of the New Covenant, the "Priest upon His throne."



The Report of the Five Bishops on Vestments.

BY THE REV. CANON NUNN, M.A.

III.

THE five Bishops, in concluding that portion of their Report which relates to the Authority of the Advertisements, do not appear to be quite confident as to the success of their arguments, but provide two ways of escape from the result, if it should be judged that the Advertisements were certainly "other order," under the Uniformity Act of 1559.

The first suggestion is that the "other order" thus taken may have been simply for enforcing a "minimum" of decency; the "maximum" being represented by the full employment of the Vestments under the Rubric.

The second suggestion is that the Rubric of the last Revision in 1662, being somewhat changed in form, and omitting all reference to the Act of Uniformity, in fact superseded all previous rubrics and orders, including the Canons of 1604. This Rubric is now become, it is urged, "by itself, with the Ordinal, a sufficient directory for public worship" (the Bishop of Salisbury in Convocation).

These two suggested methods of escaping from the controlling power of the Advertisements and Canons must, therefore, be carefully examined.

I. THAT THE "MINIMUM" ONLY OF RITUAL IS PRESCRIBED IN THE ADVERTISEMENTS (Report, p. 83):

"But even if those of the Advertisements now in question involved a taking of 'other order,' it has been urged that they are not necessarily *prohibitive*, save in the one case where a prohibition is expressed,¹ but that their intention was to enforce a minimum in matters of ornament."

"In favour of this, it is alleged that—

(a) "A comparison of the rubrical directions of the Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI. shows the form they would probably have taken had the intention been to prohibit anything more than a surplice at the celebration of the Holy Communion—'shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope . . . but . . . a surplice only.'"

We may observe two things here: First, that the five Bishops, as so often in the Report, seem to seek to avoid personal responsibility in making suggestions. They say, "It has been urged," "It is alleged."

As to the argument used, it must be replied, Nothing is easier than to suggest what the Advertisement might have said. We have to deal with what it did say. It prescribed "a comely surplice with sleeves to be provided at the charges of the parish." It was quite unnecessary to forbid, as in 1552, the use of the alb and Vestment. They had been removed under the Injunctions. The cope had in some cases been spared. The Advertisements allowed the cope under certain conditions, but when there was no Administration there was to be no cope, "but a surplice only."

The Advertisements prescribed a surplice for the parish churches. It was not necessary to say a "surplice only," for the Vestments being gone, and the use of the cope being limited by the previous Advertisement, there was nothing left but the prescribed surplice.

The Canons afterwards added the use of the hood, or tippet, in parish churches.

¹ "at all other prayers to be said at that Communion table to use no copes but surplices."

But the Report has a second argument to prove that the surplice was only required as a "minimum."

(b) "'A parallel instance of a minimum is found in the direction as to Holy Communion in Cathedral Churches.' The Prayer Book definitely required that in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches the clergy should communicate every Sunday at the least, unless hindered, etc. The Advertisements require the Holy Communion to be ministered once a month at the least, and all the clergy to receive four times a year."

Now in the case thus cited as "parallel" it is expressly stated that the clergy should communicate once a month "at the least." But it is not laid down that a surplice "at the least" should be worn. There is, therefore, no parallel at all. In the one case there is a "minimum" prescribed; in the other, so far from the surplice "at least" being prescribed, it is plain that the surplice only is allowed, for, as shown above, the cope is disallowed, and the Vestments do not so much as come into the question.

But it may be well to look at the matter also from a historical and from a legal point of view.

It may be noted historically that, after 1559, the surplice only was used in parish churches, with occasional instances of the use of the cope. The Vestments were altogether unknown, even in cathedrals, and in such functions as the consecration of Archbishop Parker himself. It would seem, in fact, as if the Ornaments Rubric of 1552 was regarded as still holding its place. It had never been legally repealed.

But what interpretation have the highest Courts put upon this doctrine of a "minimum" of ritual?

In the judgment in the *Purchas* case the following significant passage occurs:

"Their lordships remark, further, that the doctrine of a minimum of ritual, represented by the surplice, with a maximum represented by a return to the mediæval Vestments, is inconsistent with the fact that the Rubric is a positive order under a penal statute, accepted by each clergyman in a remarkably strong expression of 'assent and consent,' and capable of being enforced with severe penalties. . . . If the minister is ordered to wear a surplice at all times of his ministrations, he cannot wear an alb and tunicle when assisting

at the Holy Communion; if he has to celebrate the Holy Communion in a chasuble, he cannot celebrate in a surplice."

In the Ridsdale judgment we read as follows :

"Any interpretation of the Rubric which would leave it optional to the minister to wear or not to wear these Vestments, not only would be opposed to the ordinary principles of construction, but must also go to the extent of leaving it optional to the minister whether he will wear any official vesture whatever."

It thus appears that the argument for the "minimum" interpretation of the rule of the Advertisements has no warrant in logic, or history, or law. It, in fact, seems grotesque to suggest that when the Queen and her Council desired the enactment of the Advertisements, in order that "her loving subjects" should be "knit together in one perfect unity of doctrine, and be conjoined in one uniformity of rites and manners in the ministration of God's Holy Word, in open prayer and ministration of sacraments," they meant that, while one minister might officiate in a "comely surplice with sleeves," others, if they should so please, might wear the Mass Vestments which had long been disused, and might thus follow their own way and break the peace of the Church.

It is interesting to read the account of the visitation of Archbishop Laud, the strictest Churchman of his day, and to see how he regarded the rule of the Advertisements in the matter of the surplice.

In his visitation articles of 1628 we read :

"Whether doth your minister wear the suplice while he is saying the public prayers and administering the sacrament, and a hood according to his degree of the University.

"Whether there be in your parish, who are known or suspected to conceal or keep hid in their homes any Mass books, breviaries, or other books of Popery or superstition, or any chalices, copes, vestments, albs, or other ornaments of superstition, uncanceled, or undefaced, which it is to be conjectured they keep for a day as they call it."

It is plain from these words that Archbishop Laud required the surplice only to be used. He knew nothing of the modern doctrine of the "minimum." The Vestments which are now

described as the permissible "maximum" were by his order to be destroyed as "superstitious."

II. THE REVISED RUBRIC OF 1662.

But if the Advertisements be proved to be "other order" under the Act of 1559, and if the suggestion, that the Advertisements were, after all, only intended to secure a "minimum" of decency, be shown to be untenable, the Report has yet another method of escaping from the conclusion that the Vestments are now illegal. It is this. It is argued that at the revision of the Rubric in the Prayer Book in 1662 it was altered in form, the reference to the Act of Elizabeth was removed, and the Rubric now stands independently by itself, and thus clearly orders the use of all the Ornaments which were in force under the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

In the first place, it is to be noted that the Report does not fully set out the changes that were made at the last revision of the Rubric. It does not fully state the circumstances under which the changes were made, nor does it state, as it should, the interpretation put upon the latest form of the Rubric by those who had a share in framing it, and by those who immediately were affected by it.

We read as follows, Report, p. 87:

"IV. The Revision of the Prayer Book in 1661-2.

"An account of the changes then made, so far as it is material, has been given in the earlier part of this memorandum."

We turn, therefore, to pp. 48 and 49, but we do not find any complete account of the changes made. The two Rubrics are not set forth in any clear manner side by side. The Rubric of 1559 is given; but the present Rubric has to be found under the paragraph beginning, (c) "In Sancroft's fair copy."

If the two Rubrics be set side by side, we can see clearly what changes were made in 1662.

The Rubric of 1559 ran as follows:

"And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such

ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

The Revised Rubric of 1662 ran as follows :

"And here it is to be noticed that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

We observe here three important changes.

1. The words "according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book" are omitted.

2. The words "at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration" give place to "at all times of their ministration."

3. The words "the minister shall use such Ornaments in the Church" give place to "such Ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof . . . shall be retained and be in use."

1. The first change is twice noted in the Report (p. 8) :

"The change in the Ornaments Rubric in 1662 made its wording conform to that of the Act of Parliament of 1559, but deliberately stopped short of, and ignored the limitation of, the proviso."

Again :

"The words of the Rubric were deliberately altered so as to make them correspond with the words of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, stopping short of the reference to the taking of other order."

The reason for the omission of the reference to the Act would seem to be plain.

(a) The "other order" of the proviso has been effectually taken.

(b) The Act itself was made part of the Prayer Book. It now stood first in the Table of Contents.

But the Report has its own explanation of the omission of the reference. It adds :

"This of itself seems to exclude any reference to the Advertisements as authoritative in the future, whatever may have been the case in the past ; for to the contention that, were it thereby intended to abrogate the provisions of the Advertisements, it would have been

necessary to say so in express terms, it may be replied that by the same reasoning it would have been necessary for the Advertisements to abrogate in express terms the requirements of the 25th section of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity."

The idea suggested in the last sentence—*i.e.*, that the Advertisements might have abrogated the requirements of the 25th section of the Act of 1559—is grotesque in the extreme. Nothing could abrogate a section of the Act but a new Act. The Advertisements were the fulfilment of the proviso of the Act. It would seem that there was no other way of "abrogating the Advertisements" than by means of "other order" again taken, by the Sovereign—if, indeed, the power of taking such "other order" belonged to the successors of Queen Elizabeth.

2. But the second change in the Rubric of 1662 is the most significant. It consisted in the removal of the words "at the time of the Communion." So long as these words remained in the Rubric, it might be argued that there was a special reference to the Ornaments mentioned in the Rubric found before the Communion Office in the Prayer Book of 1559. The removal of these words amounted to the removal of such reference. The only Rubric remaining was the general Rubric at the close of the Prayer Book of 1559. This was the Rubric that prescribed the surplice for the minister in parish churches. Several of the best-known writers on the Prayer Book after 1662 evidently regarded this Rubric as the one intended to be followed. So Sharp, Bingham, and others. We may well ask why the important change made by the removal of the words "at the time of the Communion" was left unnoted by the five Bishops. They say that "an account of the changes, so far as it is material, had been given in the earlier part of the Memorandum." Was this not a "material" change?

It is remarkable that this reference to the administration of the Holy Communion appears to have been especially in the mind of the Puritan objectors at the Savoy Conference, when they said the Rubric "seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, etc."

We read as follows in the Ridsdale judgment, p. 720 :

“Baxter seems to treat the objection as having been founded upon the words of the Rubric, ‘at the time of the Communion.’ ‘They excepted,’ he said, ‘against that part of the Rubric which, speaking of the Sacraments to be used in the Church, left room to bring back the cope, alb, and other Vestments.’”

The change made was certainly significant. There was no longer any suggestion made of any distinctive Vestment for the Holy Communion.

The Bishops at the Savoy had said that they thought it right that the Rubric “should remain” as it was. They regarded the objection of the Puritans as really levelled at the surplice.

But, after all, they made the three changes that we have noted. On the other hand, the Puritans still continued to object to the Rubric. We see here an unhappy spirit of contradiction. But it is plain that efforts were made by the Bishops to conciliate their opponents.

3. The third change in the Rubric of 1662 was also important. The Report suggests that it was merely making its words “conform to the Act of 1559.”

But was there no significance in this? The Act contained the word “retain,” which was not found in the Rubric of 1559. To “retain” must mean to keep something already in possession.

It was possible in 1559 to retain the Ornaments of 1549, since they were left in the Churches on the death of Queen Mary. But if these Ornaments were to be used in 1662, they would have had to be restored. They had been gone for more than a hundred years. Only those of King Edward’s Ornaments could be “retained” in 1662 which were at that date in use.

As a matter of fact, only such Ornaments were retained. There was no restoration of disused Vestments or Ornaments. The Revised Rubric authorized no such restoration, and none took place.

Bishop Wren, one of the most eminent of the revisers, had written, in 1662, concerning the Rubric: “But what is now fit to be ordered therein, and to preserve those that are still in use,

it would be set down in express words without these uncertainties, which breed nothing but debate and scorn. The very words, too, of that Act, 2 Edward VI., for the minister's Ornaments would be set down, or to pray to have a new one made, for there is somewhat in that Act that now may not be used."

We see here the mind of a good man considering the task of Revision.

What he ought to have said, according to modern ritualists, was : The Church has been too long content with a "minimum" of ritual, forced upon it by neglect. We must now restore the full ritual, as ordered by the Rubric of 1559.

What he did say was : "There is something," in that Prayer Book of 1549, "which may not now be used." The existence of the Rubric in its present form "breeds scorn" in our enemies. We must "preserve" the Ornaments "we now have in use."

This was what was done. The word "retain" was introduced from the Act. The reference to the Holy Communion was removed. The reference to the proviso was cut off, for its work had been accomplished.

We have thus endeavoured to give a fair account of the changes introduced into the Rubric in 1662. The result arrived at is this—that the Rubric, as finally settled, did not "exclude any reference to the Advertisements as authoritative in the future," but rather confirmed all that had been done in the past.

This conclusion is entirely in agreement with the words of the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. prefixed to the Prayer Book, which confirmed the previous Acts of Uniformity, and so what was done under them.

We must add something upon the manner in which the Revisers themselves, and those who came immediately after them, interpreted what they had done.

Perhaps the clearest exposition of the Rubric, as amended, is found in Sparrow's "Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer." Sparrow had been a Savoy Commissioner, and took part in Convocation at the last revision of the Prayer Book. He

published his "Rationale" in 1655. He republished it in 1664, two years after the Revision, and again in 1672, as Bishop of Exeter, and again, as Bishop of Norwich, in 1684, the year before his death" ("Tomlinson on the Prayer Book," etc.).

The "Rationale," which is scarce in its original form, was republished by Parker in 1839, with a preface by J. H. N. (Newman). We read, p. 311, as follows :

"Ornaments to be used in Divine Service. THE MINISTER IN TIME OF HIS MINISTRATION SHALL USE SUCH ORNAMENTS AS WERE IN USE IN THE Second of Edward VI., viz., a surplice in the ordinary ministration, and a cope in time of ministration of the Holy Communion, in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches : Queen Elizabeth's Articles set forth in the seventh year of her reign" (p. 310).

He adds a commendation of the surplice as most suitable to be used in the service of God. We find here, in the republished editions of Sparrow's "Rationale," no trace of any change of view following upon the Revision of the Rubric. The surplice was enjoined before, and is enjoined still.

One more testimony only must suffice. It is found in the Report of the five Bishops (p. 49) :

"1689. At the attempted revision of the Prayer Book in 1689, the following was proposed, but not agreed to, being left for further consideration. Whereas the surplice is appointed to be used by all ministers in performing Divine Offices, it is hereby declared, That it is continued only as being a decent and ancient habit, etc."

We see clearly from this that the Revised Rubric of 1662 was not regarded as having reversed the practice of the previous hundred years. The interpretation which the five Bishops would put upon it is therefore wholly without foundation.

The clergy of 1662 might not have many copies of the Advertisements in their possession, but they had the Canons ; and they had the tradition of a hundred years to help them. There is no trace whatever of any belief on their part that the last Revision altered the law as to the Vestments.

We have now completed our task. We have endeavoured to examine, in a spirit of candour, the Report of the Five

Bishops, and we find it wanting. It is inaccurate in its statement of facts, and illogical in the conclusions that it draws from them. The immediate result of the Report has been to cause much distress and anxiety to many faithful Churchmen. The hands of those who have set the law, as expounded in the King's Courts, at defiance, and of many who have disregarded the admonitions of their Bishops, have been strengthened. There is reason to believe that the number of persons using the Vestments has been increased. Some may rejoice in this (see the paper read by the Dean of Lichfield at the Church Congress last year), believing that an increase in numbers makes their position more secure, without apparently reflecting upon the certain fate of a "house divided against itself."

What the end of this movement may be we cannot foresee. The duty of loyal Churchmen seems to be plainly this: to examine with all pains and diligence the new proposals to introduce a ceremonial into the Church, which shall divide Churchmen amongst themselves, and in some degree at least tend to undo the work of the Reformation. We can but remember the words of St. Paul, spoken of zealous but misguided Christians: "To whom we gave place, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you."



A Layman's Thoughts on Old Testament Criticism.

By P. J. HEAWOOD, M.A.

IV.

IT remains to look a little more closely at the attitude towards revelation, involved in these views of the history and religion of Israel.¹ Strangely at variance as they seem with those of the Old Testament, it is claimed that (accepting

¹ As stated in Professor G. A. Smith's "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament."