

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

such a royalty, let them address themselves to a life of adoration, and reverence, and awe, deep as that of the holy ones who, close to the throne above, veil their faces and their feet evermore with their wings, not in terror, but in a joy full of wonder and of worship. "Let us have grace," let us take and use the grace which in the covenant is ours,¹ and in it let us live this life. For it is to be a life all the while not of alarm and doubting, but of *grace*. Only it is to be lived as before Him who is (ver. 29) "consuming fire, a jealous God" (Deut. iv. 24), "jealous" against all "forsakers of their own mercy" (Jonah ii. 8), rejectors of His Son, even when they seem to fly for refuge to His law.

Thus the great concatenated passage concludes with one of the most formidable of Scripture utterances. But let us boldly gather peace and hope even from this word of fire. For what is the true message of the verses we have traversed, when we look back and sum them up? It is the glory, the fulness, the living richness, the abundant lovingkindness, the supreme and absolute finality, of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is Himself, the supreme and ultimate revelation of the grace and peace of God. And the fiery jealousy of the close, the warning that we shall lose our souls if we "decline" the blessed Son, what does it mean as to His Father's heart? That He so loves the Son, and so loves us, that He adjures us by all His terrors as well as all His mercies never to turn for refuge for one hour away from the ever-blessed Christ.



The Report of the Five Bishops on Vestments.—II.

BY THE REV. CANON NUNN, M.A.

THE purport or tendency—we must not say the "purpose," as all bias is disclaimed—of the Report of the five Bishops is to overthrow the Ridsdale Judgment.

That Judgment condemned the use of the Vestments as

¹ Cf. Rom. v. 1 : ἔχωμεν εἰρήνην—"Let us use the peace which is ours."

illegal, but the conclusion of the Report is that the Ornaments Rubric "cannot rightly be interpreted" as excluding them.

The Judgment asserts that, apart from the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, "other order" in the matter of the Ornaments was certainly taken by her Advertisements, according to the proviso of the Act of Uniformity, 1559. But the Report would overthrow the authority of the Advertisements, because of alleged defects in their origin or contents. It does not seem absolutely to deny their authority, but throws doubt upon it.

The Report, in the next place, argues that if the Advertisements were authoritative, their purpose was only to secure a "minimum" of ritual order, and that they were "not necessarily prohibitive" of the Vestments.

The Report further argues that, in any case, the Rubric as altered at the final Revision in 1662 seems to "exclude any reference to the Advertisements as authoritative in the future, whatever might have been the case in the past."

Now, these three questions—whether "other order" was taken in the Advertisements in strict accordance with the terms of the proviso, whether the suggestion that a "minimum" only of ritual is intended by the requirements of the Advertisements, and whether the Rubric of 1662 is to be interpreted as setting aside all previous regulations—are questions for the law to decide. The Highest Court has decided them against the use of the Vestments. If the five Bishops regard the Judgment of the Court as wrong, it would appear to be their duty to seek to obtain a new trial. But instead of doing this, they proclaim their private opinions, and, further, take advantage of their commission, which appears to have been simply "to draw up a historical memorandum," to give publicity to their "conclusions" in a manner which must encourage many to disregard the law as at present declared.

It is necessary, then, that we should first inquire carefully into the character and authority of the Advertisements, that we may know whether they constitute "other order" under the proviso of the Uniformity Act of 1559.

The requirements for "other order" are simple—*i.e.*, the authority of the Queen, with the advice of the Commissioners in causes Ecclesiastical or of the Metropolitan. The Advertisements were signed by Archbishop Parker and three other Commissioners. But their authorization by the Queen has been called in question. Many writers of a certain school affirm that the Queen never took "other order" under the Act, and describe the Advertisements as "Parker's Advertisements."

It will be well that we should have before us the Title-Page and the Preface of the Advertisements :

THE TITLE-PAGE.

" Advertisements partly for the due Order in the Public Administration of the Holy Sacraments, and partly for the Apparel of all Persons Ecclesiastical, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's Letters commanding the same, the 25th day of January, in the seventh year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady, Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, etc."

The words of the Preface are still more explicit :

THE PREFACE.

"The Queen's Majesty of her godly zeal calling to remembrance how necessary it is to the advancement of God's glory and to the establishment of Christ's pure Religion for all her loving Subjects, especially the state Ecclesiastical, to knit together in one perfect unity of Doctrine, and to be conjoined in one Uniformity of Rites and manners in the ministration of God's Holy Word, in open prayer and ministration of Sacraments, as also to be of one decent behaviour in their outward apparel, to be known partly by their distinct habits to be of that vocation (who should be revered the rather in their offices as Ministers of the holy things whereto they be called), hath by her Letters directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan, required, enjoined, and straitly charged, that with assistance and conferences had with other Bishops, namely such as be in commission for causes Ecclesiastical, some orders might be taken, whereby all diversities and varieties among them of the Clergy and the people (as breeding nothing but contention, offence, and breach of common charity, and be against the Laws, good Usage, and Ordinances of the Realm) might be reformed, and repressed, and brought to one manner of Uniformity throughout the whole Realm, that the people may thereby quietly honour and serve Almighty God in truth, concord, unity, peace, and quietness, as by her Majesty's said Letters more at large doth appear. Whereupon by diligent conference and communication in the same, and at last by assent and consent of the persons aforesaid,

these Orders and Rules ensuing have been thought meet and convenient to be used and followed; not yet prescribing these Rules as Laws equivalent with the Eternal Word of God, and as of necessity to bind the Consciences of her Subjects in the nature of them considered in themselves; or as they should add any efficiency of more holiness to the virtue of public prayer, and to the Sacraments, but as temporal orders meer Ecclesiastical, without any vain superstition, and as rules in some part of Discipline concerning decency, distinction, and order for the time."

It would appear to be plain that the Queen authorized the document which is thus set forth.

But we must now inquire how the Report treats the Advertisements. It gives (pp. 71-73) a "Chronological sketch of their production. Theories—(a) that they are a taking of 'other order'; (b) that they are the Bishops' orders."

The "sketch" shows how, during more than a year, the publication of the Advertisements was delayed, owing to objections made by the Queen or her Council. Much use has been made by certain writers of the fact that on one draft of them the words were endorsed "these were not authorized nor published."

But the "sketch" omits to notice the most important fact of all—that the Queen, after long delay, approved of them. This is recorded by Strype, "Life of Parker," vol. i., p. 427.

"But now, at last, upon the late address of our Archbishop to the Queen and Secretary, she forthwith issued out her proclamation publishing her will and pleasure in print, peremptorily requiring uniformity by virtue thereof."

This result ought clearly to have been recorded by the five Bishops. But, then, the arguments subsequently given to prove that the Advertisements were merely the "Bishops' orders" must have been omitted.

The Report then proceeds to give in detail proofs that the Advertisements were a taking of "other order." These are eight in number. Any one of them might suffice for the purpose, even if the "Title" and the "Preface" did not furnish argument enough. The Report adds: "These seem to be the

only direct pieces of evidence in favour of the view that the Advertisements are a 'taking of other order.'"

Had the same zeal been displayed in gathering arguments for this purpose that seems to have been shown in the sustaining of the other "theory," the evidence might have been largely increased.

One piece of evidence, at least, we must rescue from the obscurity of a mere reference, page 76 (10). It is taken from the "History of the Reformation," by Peter Heylin, Chaplain to Charles I., and was written in 1661.

"The Queen thought fit to make a further signification of her Royal pleasure not grounded only on the sovereign power and prerogative Royal, by which she published her Injunctions in the first year of her reign, but legally declared by her Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical, according to the Act and statutes made on that behalf . . . and that they might be known to have the stamp of Royal authority a preface was prefixed before them, in which it was expressed that the Queen had required the Metropolitan by her special letters, that upon conference had with such other Bishops as were authorized by her Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical, some order might be took, etc."¹

The fact is that, as stated by Lord Selborne in his "Liturgy of the English Church," p. 13, "No writer of reputation in any work published before the eighteenth century seems to have suggested a doubt that they—the Advertisements—were, as a matter fact, authorized by Queen Elizabeth."

We therefore next examine with some curiosity the pieces of "evidence" adduced by the Report in favour of the theory that the Advertisements were the "Bishop's orders." They turn out to be chiefly objections to the Ridsdale Judgment founded upon the writings of Mr. J. H. Parker, Canon McColl, and Mr. Perry. They relate to such facts as that the Advertisements "as a whole" could not be "other order," to the proper placing of a comma, the name of the Queen's printers, the description given of the Advertisements by the Archbishop, etc. Not one of these old objections is of any substance, though we owe a debt to the five Bishops for gathering together all the

¹ Tomlinson, "The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies," p. 82.

“arguments” by which we have been often told that the Ridsdale Judgment has been “discredited.”

But the Report has some “new light” of its own upon this subject.

The most remarkable piece of evidence against the authority of the Advertisements is that found on p. 80, where it is contended that the Advertisements were intended only for the Province of Canterbury.

The Bishop of Salisbury dwelt upon this point in the Convocation of Canterbury.

“A most important point in the controversy is the fact that they—the Advertisements—are limited in their scope to the Province of Canterbury, both in the mandatory letter of January 25, 1565, and in one of the rules as regards licences for preaching actually issued. Is it conceivable that a document can be supposed to fulfil the requirements of the Act of Uniformity, where the matter is one of enforcing uniformity throughout the realm of England, and yet be limited to one province? I think that, if this fact stood alone, it would be enough to prove that the Advertisements were not a taking of ‘other order’ under the Act. But the whole of the Ridsdale Judgment rests on the supposed proof that they are such ‘other order.’ Are we not therefore justified in concluding that the Ornaments Rubric cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding the use of all vestments for the clergy, other than the surplice in parish Churches, and in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches the surplice, hood, and cope?”

But this important discovery, which was to confute the Ridsdale Judgment and justify the users of Vestments, turns out upon examination to be a mistake.

Whoever copied the Preface to the Advertisements for insertion in p. 80 of the Report omitted certain paragraphs (supplying their places with dots . . .) which, if inserted, show very plainly that the document was intended, not for the province of Canterbury only, but for the whole Church. The omitted passages include the following: (1) “all her loving subjects,” (2) “the realm,” (3) “the whole realm,” (4) “her subjects.” (See the Preface above given.)

How the omission of these expressions, some of which appear in a previous page, escaped the notice of the five Bishops when composing a “historical memorandum,” is at present not known, but should be explained.

The Report proceeds to say that "there is no trace whatever of any publication of the Advertisements for the Province of York."

But this error is corrected on the very same page, for we read that Archbishop Grindal (the Queen having promised that the Advertisements should go to York) "adopts the language of the Advertisements," and we further read that they took effect in the Diocese of Durham.

The only portion of the Advertisements really peculiar to the Province of Canterbury is the fourth Advertisement, touching licences in that province.

If we were fortunate enough to possess a copy of the Advertisements as sent, according to the Queen's promise, to York, we should expect to find in it a similar admonition respecting licences in that province.

It thus appears that the first contention of the Report, that the Advertisements were not "other order" authorized by the Queen, cannot be substantiated.

Whether their second line of defence—*i.e.*, that the Advertisements were only intended to secure a "minimum" of order—can be successfully held, and whether, failing this, their last resort—*i.e.*, the position that all previous orders were superseded by the Rubric of 1662—can be maintained, are matters which seem to require further elucidation.



A Layman's Thoughts on Old Testament Criticism.

By P. J. HEAWOOD, M.A.

III.

WE have now examined several arguments put forward in support of the extreme critical view. We must be excused for saying that we have not found them very convincing. Many of them depend upon inaccurate statements or