

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

Draft Canon 17, the Ornaments Rubric, and the Dean of Winchester

BY RICHARD J. COATES

THE speech of Professor Norman Sykes, as he then was, in the January Convocation of 1958, supporting the proposed Canon 17, has excited much interest and concern. He maintained that the issue involved in the passing or rejection of this Canon was the crux of the whole of Canon Law Revision. If, he said, the Members of the Convocation in the middle of the twentieth century were not prepared in their revision of the Canon Law to maintain and act upon the principle of genuine free comprehensiveness which had been a tradition of the Church of England since the Reformation, the situation would fill him with despair. He argued that under the present Ornaments Rubric the Mass vestments had always been legal, and that, therefore, the new Canon would only express what was actually permissible under the Law. His implication was that the Church had always allowed either the wearing of the surplice only or the wearing of the full vestments. It is important to remember, however, that the comprehensiveness of the Church has never apparently allowed the puritan to go without the surplice.

In support of his contention that the Ornaments Rubric permitted the wearing of vestments, Dr. Sykes maintained that new evidence since the days of the Royal Commission in 1904 had been brought to light, chiefly by Sir John Neale, Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, and Bishop Walter Frere, which had revolutionized our conception of the Elizabethan settlement, and supported the view which he now maintains. The Law as it is at present understood is stated in Halsbury's *Laws of England*, Vol. Eccl. Law (3rd Edition, 1957), as follows :

Ornaments of the Ministers and Others

Construction of the rubric. The rubric as to the ornaments of the minister in the commencement of the Prayer Book prescribes that such ornaments of the minister at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI. This rubric in effect reproduces certain provisions of the Act of Uniformity, 1558, which provided that the ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI should be retained and be in use until the Queen should otherwise order, but the rubric makes no mention of the advertisements which were issued in 1566 under the statutory power above referred to and which limited the vestments which might be worn. The view was, however, accepted by the Privy Council in 1877 that the rubric did not repeal the statutory provisions or change the existing law, and that it must therefore be read together with the advertisements. Accordingly, the Privy Council held, while the general standard of ornaments of the ministers is that established by

authority of Parliament by the directions contained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, that the Act of Uniformity, 1558, and the Advertisements of 1566 thereunder engraft on this standard a qualification that as to the vestures of parish ministers the surplice, and not the alb, vestment, or tunicle, should be used at all times of their public ministrations, and that a cope may not be used except at the ministration of the holy communion in cathedral and collegiate churches (i).

Footnote (i) Ridsdale v. Clifton (1877), 2 P. D. 276, P.C. The Advertisements also provide that the dean and prebendaries shall wear a surplice with a silk hood in the choir, and, when they preach, shall use their hoods. As to the ornaments worn by Bishops, see pp. 80, 81, ante. Since the decision in Ridsdale v. Clifton, supra, further light has been thrown on these points by historical research, and a large amount of evidence was laid before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906 (Cd. 3040, para. 41, p. 10) in support of contentions that the decision is incorrect in substance (1) in holding that the ornaments rubric refers as a standard for ornaments to what was authorized by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (it being alleged that the standard should be the standard in the second year of Edward VI before the first Prayer Book came into force), and (2) in holding that the Advertisements of 1566 ought to be read with this rubric. The commission, without dealing with the question, pointed out that the judgments of the Privy Council are open to reconsideration by the court itself, which will not only look carefully at the fresh light of facts not before it on a previous occasion, but will also examine the reasons upon which the previous decision rests and give effect to its own view of the case (see also pp. 331, 332, ante).

As the footnote makes clear, the Privy Council is always ready to examine again the whole issue in the light of any fresh facts which can be brought before it.

* * * *

Has Dr. Sykes produced any new evidence? We cannot find that he has. Professor J. E. Neale, in his essay on "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity" (*Eng. Hist. Review*, Vol. 65, 1950) introduces his subject by saying: "Let me say at once, that I have failed to find any new evidence to bring to the inquiry. It still remains a task—and how fascinating a task!—for the detective rather than the researcher" (p. 304). Anyone who is at all familiar with the circumstances surrounding the early days of Elizabeth's reign is aware of the great confusion which surrounded, and still surrounds, many of the actions of the Queen. If there is no new evidence on the question of the Ornaments Rubric, which, of course, is involved in the conflicting happenings of the time, then the question of its interpretation and its significance must be determined by certain clear and unshakable intentions which were revealed in both the legislation and actions of Parliament at the time.

It is a common and understandable mistake to seek to interpret the Ornaments Rubric as it stands in our Prayer Book in isolation from

the Act of which it is a part. When read as part of the Act it can be seen at once that it was a proviso with a temporary significance. The clear intention of the Act is stated in the earlier sections, where Parliament decided to restore the Book of 1552 and specifically stated the only alterations from the Book which were permitted. Penalties were imposed upon those who would not use the Book or who should speak against it. The following quotation from the Act will make the intention clear :

Section III. And further be it Enacted by the Queen's Highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral, or Parish Church, or other place within this Realm of England, Wales, and the Marches of the same, or other of the Queen's Dominions, shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and Administration of each of the Sacraments, and all their common and open Prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book, so authorized by Parliament in the said fifth and sixth Years of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth : with one alteration, or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the Year, and the Form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two Sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the Communicants, *and none other, or otherwise.*

The Rubric is taken from section XXV, which reads as follows :

XXV. Provided always, and be it Enacted, That such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in use, as was in the Church of England, by Authority of Parliament, in the second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other Order shall be therein taken by the Authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the Advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England, for Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm.

In the Prayer Book of 1559, the Ornaments Rubric reads :

And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in 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 the VI, according to the act of parliament set in the beginning of this book.

* * * *

Direct reference is made in the Rubric to the Act of Parliament which was published in the Book. Incidentally, Dr. Sykes accuses Bishop Sandys of paraphrasing the Act because he used the expression "were in use" instead of "be in use"; but of course this is not so, as the rubric which he quotes immediately afterwards had the words as above, "were in use" (*Chronicle of Convocation*, Jan. 1958, p. 35). If the intention, which seems undeniable, of the Act was to restore the Book of 1552, then the Ornaments Rubric of 1552 was restored by the Act. That rubric distinctly forbade the wearing of vestments other

than the surplice. It read as follows : " And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope : but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet : and being a priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

Any clergyman in the year 1559 before the actual appearance of the restored Book with the few minor alterations mentioned, could have used, and no doubt many did, his copy of the Book of 1552, noting only the changes mentioned. When, however, the new edition of the Book appeared, the Ornaments Rubric of 1552 had disappeared and its place was taken by the extract from the proviso as quoted above, which has since, with slight variations, been known as The Ornaments Rubric. The problems surrounding the insertion of this unauthorized Rubric are probably beyond solution. Some maintain, as for example, Dr. Gee, that the Rubric was inserted by the Privy Council as the result of the influence of some of its members who disliked Reform. Others incline to the view that it was inserted through the Queen's influence, and in support of this make reference to a letter of Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil in 1571, in which he says :

. . . her Highness talked with me once or twice in that point, and signified that there was one proviso in the act of the uniformity of Common Prayer, that by law is granted unto her, that if there be any contempt or irreverence used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church by the misusing of the orders appointed in the book, the Queen's Majesty may, by the advice of her commissioners, or metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies, or rites, as may be most for the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments, and but for which law her Highness would not have agreed to divers orders of the book. And by virtue of which law she published further order in her injunctions both for the communion-bread, and for the placing of the tables within the quire. They that like not the injunctions force much the statute in the book. I tell them that they do evil to make odious comparison betwixt statute and injunction, and yet I say and hold, that the injunction hath authority by proviso of the statute . . . (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 375).

When we consider the circumstances of the time and the confused state of religion in the country, we may well believe that the Queen herself may have sought, through the insertion of the rubric, liberty to deal with the question of the future use of the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers at more leisure than some were inclined to grant. In the understandable reaction from the Marian persecutions, the people in many places were inclined to take the law into their own hands and quickly rid the churches of all Popish adornments. There can be no doubt that the intention of the House of Commons and the new leaders in the Church who later became its bishops, was to restore fully the Reformed religion as in the latter years of Edward VI, and to remove both the vestments and other ornaments which had come back again in Mary's day. The reforming party believed that the Queen was in full sympathy with their intention, but were often

confused and distressed by her vacillation. Nevertheless, if we take note of the actions which were, with her authority, taken in the country at large, we can see that the rubric could only have a temporary significance, and certainly not any significance contrary to the Act of Uniformity.

Dr. Sykes referred with approval to the conclusion of Dr. Gee, the Evangelical historian, that the rubric made perfectly legal the vestments, but he does not mention that in the same context Dr. Gee writes of the injunctions which were issued by the Queen's authority at the same time, and which he maintains were "further order" as envisaged by the proviso in the Act of Uniformity. He writes: "Under the direction of Cecil, as I think we may take it, the Injunctions of Elizabeth were drawn up. They constituted in some of their provisions a very patent modification of the Ornaments Rubric, indeed a taking of further order, and in their general scope, affected the services of the Church of England for many years to come" (Gee: *Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments*, p. 137, 1902). This is the view taken by Archbishop Parker in his letter to Sir William Cecil quoted above, in which he says that the Queen "published further order in her Injunctions" under the proviso in the Act of Uniformity. (Parker's *Correspondence*, *loc. cit.*)

* * * *

It is maintained by Dr. Sykes that Bishop Sandys was putting a gloss upon the proviso which was not historically true when he wrote in a letter to Parker, later the Archbishop, at the end of April 1559: "The last book of service is gone through with the proviso to retain the Ornaments which were used in the 1st and 2nd year of King Edward, until it pleased the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen." Can Dr. Sykes produce any evidence to show that it was the intention of Parliament to enforce the wearing of vestments? Of course he cannot. When we take into account the actions immediately taken by the Injunctions we can see that there was no endeavour anywhere to enforce the wearing of the vestments under the new Act, but that the contrary action was taken. Sandys was one of the Royal Commissioners appointed who began immediately to implement the new injunctions which specifically forbade the wearing of any other vesture than that of the latter year of Edward VI. The Thirtieth Injunction of 1559 read as follows:

Item, Her Majesty being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, and thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, BOTH IN THE CHURCH and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the SPECIAL MESSENGERS AND MINISTERS OF ALMIGHTY GOD; willett and commandeth, that all Archbishops and Bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministry of the Sacraments, or that be admitted into vocation ecclesiastical, or into any

society of learning in either of the Universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the LATTER YEAR of the reign of King Edward the Sixth; not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth: "Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant" (1 Cor. 14 cap).

In a letter to Peter Martyr, dated April 1, 1560, Sandys describes his activity as a Commissioner in the North of England under the Queen's authority. He mentions that on his return he was appointed by the Queen as Bishop of Worcester. One can hardly imagine that he would have been so honoured if he had been acting illegally, as Dr. Sykes implies, or if he had been acting against the Queen's real intentions. His letter, however, does reveal that there had been some controversy between the Queen and some of the Bishops in recent days concerning ornaments in the church. The following quotation from his letter will convey a picture of the situation:

"When I wrote to you at the beginning of August I was sent by the command of the Queen into the Northern parts of England, as an inspector and visitor, as they call it, for the purpose of removing the abuses of the church, and restoring to it those rites which are consistent with true religion and godliness; . . . I at last returned to London. New labours here awaited me on my arrival . . . for my services were required by the Queen for the government of the see of Worcester; and the episcopal office is at length imposed upon me, though against my inclination. . . . The doctrine of the Eucharist, as yet by God's blessing unimpugned, remains to us, and we hope will continue to remain, pure and inviolate. For both myself and my Episcopal bretheren will maintain it, by God's help, to the utmost of our power, as long as we live. We had not long since a controversy respecting images. The Queen's Majesty considered it not contrary to the word of God, nay, rather to the advantage of the church, that the image of Christ crucified, together with those of the Virgin Mary and St. John, should be placed as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the church where they might more readily be seen by all the people. Some of us Bishops thought far otherwise, and more especially as all images of every kind were at our last visitation not only taken down, but also burned, and that too by public authority; and because the ignorant and superstitious multitude are in the habit of paying adoration to this idol above all others. As to myself, because I was rather vehement in this matter, and could by no means consent that an occasion of stumbling should be afforded to the Church of Christ, I was very near being deposed from my office, and incurring the displeasure of the Queen; but God, in whose hand are the hearts of Kings, gave us tranquility instead of tempest, and delivered the Church of England from stumbling blocks of this kind: only the Popish vestments remain in our church, I mean the copes; which, however, we hope will not last very long (*Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, XXXI).

Bishop Jewel writing a little earlier, on February 4, 1560, to Peter Martyr states that the controversy about the crucifix is still at its height, and mentions that a disputation will take place on the next day on the subject between persons selected by the Council, and feels that he may not write again to Martyr as a bishop unless this controversy is settled in the right way, that is, unless the crosses, etc., which have been broken and banished, shall remain out. Another letter from Cox, Bishop of Ely, about the same time, states :

“Respecting our affairs, what shall I write? By the blessing of God, all those heads of religion are restored to us which we maintained in the time of King Edward. We are only constrained to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and Him who was crucified; the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling block may at length be removed.”

Strype (*Annals*, 1. i, p. 260) records that Cox was greatly disturbed when asked to administer the Sacrament before the Queen (*i.e.*, in her chapel) because of the presence of images, and wrote to her about his conscientious scruples on the matter. It is to this particular situation that the letter of Thomas Sampson, which Dr. Sykes quotes, refers. He does not, however, make it clear in his quotation that Sampson is referring to what is happening at Court and not generally in the country. It will be as well to quote more fully from the paragraph so that its sense may be seen. Sampson writes to Peter Martyr on January 6, 1560 :

Oh! my father, what can I hope for, when the ministry of the word is banished from Court? While the crucifix is allowed, with lights burning before it? The altars indeed are removed and images also throughout the kingdom: the crucifix and candles are retained at Court alone. And the wretched multitude are not only rejoicing at this, but will imitate it of their own accord. What can I hope, when three of our lately appointed Bishops are to officiate at the table of the Lord, one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as sub-deacon, before the image of the crucifix, or at least not far from it, with candles, and habited in the golden vestments of the papacy; and are thus to celebrate the Lord's Supper without any sermon. . . . I will propose this single question for your resolution, for I wish, my father, to employ you as my medium of correspondence with masters Bullinger and Bernardine. It is this: whether the image of the crucifix, placed on the Table of the Lord with lighted candles, is to be regarded as a thing indifferent: and if it is not to be so considered, but as an unlawful and wicked practice, then, I ask, suppose the Queen should enjoin all the Bishops and Clergy, either to admit this image, together with the candles, into their churches, or to retire from the ministry of the word, what should be our conduct in this case? Should we not rather quit the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, than these relics of the Amorites should be admitted?

He proceeds to ask that Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Bernardine should write to the Queen, who he believes is a child of God, and with

whom their letter would have great weight on this subject. Dr. Sykes omits to mention that the complaint is about what is happening at Court and also that the letter bears witness to the fact, as do those of Sandys, Cox, and Jewel, that the same things are not happening throughout the country.

* * * *

When Dr. Sykes faces the difficulty which his interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric leaves, namely, why were the vestments not enforced in the country under the Rubric, he has to maintain that not only was the action of the Commissioners illegal but also that the non-enforcement was due to the fact that there were very few bishops. It is quite clear that the bishops who remained from the former reign were all opposed to the restoration of the Prayer Book and that those who took their place, among whom were Sandys, Parker, Cox, Jewel, etc., were men who interpreted the intentions of the new Prayer Book and the Ornaments Rubric in a sense different from Dr. Sykes.

Bishop Frere in his *Puritan Manifestoes* (1954 Edition, to which Dr. Sykes wrote a Preface) stated :

Parliament might lay down certain requirements for chancels, ornaments, services, etc., but both civil and ecclesiastical authority were powerless to enforce them. The chancels and churches were devastated, the ornaments burnt and disused, the services discontinued. All this had taken place before the new Bishops had had the opportunity of assuming command ; and they never acquired sufficient command to recover a great deal that puritan iconoclasm had already swept away. Many of the Bishops and Ordinaries were themselves not sorry that the full requirement of Rubric and Statute was admittedly unattainable. The famous letter of Sandys of April 30th, 1559, seems to foreshadow a revolt against all the legal ornaments. It was only Court pressure that brought the prelates up to the point of wearing copes ; some of them would gladly have foregone even the surplice ; while the contest raged almost more fiercely about the walking dress of the clergy than about their ministerial dress.

Bishop Frere recognizes that the new bishops were not likely to enforce vestments and also that they did not desire them. He also recognizes that puritan objections were more fierce against the command contained in the Thirtieth Injunction ordering the out-door as well as the church dress of the clergy. *How can it be maintained that the puritan revolt would have been more fierce against the out-door garments if, under the same order, the full mass vestments were to be worn in church?*

Dr. Sykes has ignored the significance of the Injunctions and has treated the actions of the Commissioners as illegal confiscation. There was illegal confiscation going on, the people were acting without authority, and the significance of the proviso from which the Ornaments Rubric is taken, and by which the Injunctions were issued, was to prevent and restrain illegal action. Nevertheless, Bishop Frere's reference to the puritan objection implies that the order taken by the Injunctions was perfectly legal. Strype in his *Annals* describes many of the services conducted in St. Paul's and at St. Paul's

Cross during this period, and mentions that the Bishops wore the Rochet and Chimere.

* * * *

The reason which Dr. Sykes gives for the restoration of the wearing of the vestments in 1559, while we believe it is not true, is very significant, especially in view of the language of the proposed Canon 17. He states that the change took place because there had been a *doctrinal change*—"a definite move towards a higher doctrine of the Sacrament, a doctrine of the REAL PRESENCE, and it was accompanied by the disappearance of the Black Rubric. . . . This shift of emphasis in the doctrine of the sacrament was, he thought, interpretative of the Ornaments Rubric, which by requiring the wearing of the Eucharistic vestments, was designed to convey to the outward eye that there had been a shift of doctrine between 1552 and 1559."

It seems clear, then, that *Dr. Sykes believes that the vestments do signify doctrine and that they are meant to teach doctrine.* Those who are opposed to the Canon in its present form have always maintained this.

But was there any change of doctrine between 1552 and 1559? The Act of Uniformity by its full approval of the Book of 1552 implies complete agreement with its doctrine. The Black Rubric was not part of the Book as it passed through Parliament and was not, therefore, included. But there is plenty of evidence from contemporary sources to show that the doctrine on the Sacrament taught by the Reformers of 1559 was the same as that taught, indeed by many of the same men, in 1552. The speeches of the Roman opponents to the restoration of the Book, *e.g.*, Abbot Feckenham and Bishop Scott, show that they understood that its restoration meant the restoration of the same Eucharistic teaching.

As a Church historian Dr. Sykes must know that the term "real presence" (to allude to another of his arguments) is very ambiguous. Archbishop Cranmer and his associates did not like the term without careful qualifications because in their day it usually implied a substantial presence. By the time of the revision of 1662, however, the term had been used and was being used by many who undoubtedly held the Reformed doctrine of the Sacrament, *e.g.*, it is used in the Westminster Confession. Therefore, to have restored the Black Rubric in 1662 with the denial of the real presence of Christ would have amounted to a contradiction of the doctrine of the Sacrament commonly held in the Reformed Churches. There is much contemporary evidence in the seventeenth century to maintain this change in the use of terminology. It is important to remember that the Black Rubric was inserted not primarily to teach doctrine which was more clearly stated in the formularies of the church, but to justify and safeguard the practice of kneeling at Communion, and its re-insertion in 1662 was the result of a puritan request.

* * * *

The decisions of the Privy Council in cases affecting the legality of vestments in the Church of England since their re-introduction in the

nineteenth century, through the Oxford Movement, have upheld the view that the Advertisements of 1566, which enjoined the surplice only for all services, was a taking of further order under the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Dr. Sykes maintains that the Advertisements were issued on Archbishop Parker's own authority, unsupported by the Royal Sanction, and that therefore the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in affirming that the Royal Sanction must be presumed, had affirmed as a fact what historians knew to be a fiction. Archbishop Parker had, at the command of the Queen, drawn up these Advertisements to enforce uniformity against the puritans. Her letter to the Archbishop (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 233) gives him full authority to proceed according to the Laws and Ordinances provided by Act of Parliament. Both the Queen and the Archbishop were to act under authority of the Act of Parliament and according to the laws, usages, and ordinances of the realm.

There can be no doubt that the Advertisements in the matter of vesture reflected what was then the recognized lawful standard. The reason why the Queen at first refused her signature is unknown, but her later correspondence with the Archbishop does not imply that he had acted contrary to her wishes or contrary to the Law. Thus she writes in 1571: "Where we required you, as the metropolitan of our realm, and as the principal person in our Commission for causes Ecclesiastical, to have good regard that such uniform order in the divine service and rules of the church might be duly kept, as by the Laws on that behalf is provided, and by our Injunctions also declared . . .," etc. (Parker, *Correspondence*, P. 386). It is not unreasonable to conclude, in the light of such a statement, that the Archbishop had the royal authority and consent in issuing the Advertisements.

Dr. Sykes sees a grave internal contradiction in the actions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas* in 1871, in that they considered that with regard to vestments the Advertisements of 1566 had superior authority to the Act of Uniformity of 1559, whereas, in respect of wafer bread, the Judicial Committee refused to allow the Royal Injunction of 1559, which required wafers to be used, to over-ride the Prayer Book Rubric, which said that ordinary bread was sufficient, because that Rubric was in accordance with the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Of course there is no contradiction if it is recognized that the Advertisements were further order taken with Royal sanction under the Act of 1559, and if it is also recognized that the ordering of wafer bread by the Injunctions of 1559 was order taken, but contrary to the clear requirements of the Prayer Book of 1552 incorporated in the Act of 1559. Archbishop Parker, who looked upon the use of wafer bread as a matter not greatly material but used it himself because of the Queen's Injunction, felt that those who refused to do so were wrong to set the Statute against the Injunction, and held that the Injunction had authority by proviso of the Statute (Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 375). It is hardly likely that Parker would have acted unlawfully in the matter of the vestments, he must have believed that they had authority under the proviso of the Statute, and he also believed that all that was in the Injunctions

had the same authority. He was mistaken when he accepted the Queen's authority where it conflicted with the Statute as in the case of the wafer bread. There is no contemporary evidence to show that any Elizabethan Bishop sought to enforce more than the wearing of the surplice as the legal requirement in the interests of uniformity. That was both maximum and minimum for the ordinary parochial clergy, while the wearing of copes was ordered for cathedrals and collegiate churches.

We are not aware of any evidence from Laudian days, either in England or Scotland, that the mass vestments were worn by High Churchmen. The Canon of the Scottish Episcopal Church governing vesture as late as 1839, speaks of the surplice as the sacerdotal vestment for all occasions. The Ornaments Rubric of 1662 was altered to bring it in line more with the proviso in the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity; but of course, the note about taking further order was not included, as indeed it was not in the 1559 Book, and in 1662 it would have had no application because such order had already been taken. The Elizabethan Act was, with the new Act of Uniformity of Charles II, printed in the Restored Book, and it is still to-day to be found in all good copies of the Prayer Book. Its inclusion therefore is significant because it provides the standard of interpretation for the Book, including the Ornaments Rubric, and to adopt any interpretation of the latter which conflicts with the Act and its outcome in the Elizabethan period is inconsistent and unhistorical.

* * * *

In the concluding part of his speech Dr. Sykes referred in very contrary ways to the action of Parliament in the past, and its possible action in the future. He said that "for four hundred years the Church of England had relied on the support and protection of the State, and, because of that support and protection, the Church of England had been able to maintain, amid all the storms of theological controversy, the comprehensiveness which was one of its outstanding traditional characteristics". Later, however, he warned some members of Convocation against the dangers which might ensue if they appealed to Parliament against the decisions of Convocation in favour of the new Canon 17, especially if such an appeal was that Parliament should overthrow the considered opinion of the representative bodies of the Church. Inconsistencies apart, surely there is a danger revealed in Dr. Sykes's words which he does not see, or feel, and that is, that the increase in vestment wearing amongst the clergy in the Church, would increase under such a Canon as that proposed, and so further estrange the laity, including Parliament, from a Church which spends so much time and money on unnecessary frippery.