

"The International Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference will hold its first meeting from May 16 to 20 at Auckland Castle. The Committee, which consists of ten members each from America, the Continent, and Great Britain, will be the guests of the Bishop of Durham."

The Conference met at Edinburgh in a Presbyterian Assembly Hall. It is fitting that the first meeting of its Continuation Committee should receive hospitality in one of the historic centres of the National Church. The great men who have served their generation at Auckland would rejoice to see this day. The Committee has great and far-reaching projects before it. Let us pray.

G.



## Discussions.

### "THE PERMISSIVE USE OF THE VESTMENTS."

(*The Churchman*, March, 1911, p. 169.)

I UNDERSTAND that I am at liberty to make some reply to the courteous critics of my paper on "The Permissive Use of the Vestments." Mr. C. F. Russell goes with me a long way, but he pulls up in the usual place. He assumes that the Vestments in the minds of those who wear them imply disloyalty to Reformation principles, and so he has no difficulty in condemning them. But this assumption is the very thing against which I protested. It is no doubt true that those who use, or wish to use, Vestments take a somewhat different view of Eucharistic doctrine from those who resolutely oppose them. But the differences, whenever they have been examined, have been found to be less and less important than had been thought. They cannot be expressed by saying that the one party regards the Eucharist as a "sacrifice," while the other does not, for almost every view claims that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in some sense. The sense repudiated at the Reformation was that of a "propitiatory" sacrifice, and if Cranmer had held that the Vestments had this signification, as the Roman party asserted, and the counter-Reformation party still asserts, he would not have tolerated them for a moment, for he removed every suggestion of such a power in the English priesthood from his revised Ordinal. It is disappointing, then, to find Mr. Sydney Carter speaking of a "sacrificial" view of the Eucharist as though that expression conveyed an unambiguous and an untenable meaning. The Evangelical party would not, I am sure, wish to maintain that their view, what-

ever it is, is the only view honestly tenable in the Church of England. But this is in effect the plea that Mr. Russell puts forward :

“ Let it once appear that the opposition to them [the vestments] is due, not to a dislike for their witnessing to the continuity of the English Church, but only to a determination to adhere to our *reformed doctrine*, and it must be perceived that this opposition is made in obedience to a higher law than that which authorizes the desire for their revival.”

In other words, the “reformed doctrine” is the exact shade of doctrine at present held by those who oppose the use of Vestments.

The appeal to High Churchmen in Mr. Russell's last paragraph “to give up their demand for a mere external symbol” does not strike me as fair. I am reminded of a demand I once heard made by a child to his brother: “Mother says it is more blessed to give than to receive, so give me your ball.” Obviously the High Churchman might with equal justice appeal to Mr. Russell to surrender his opposition. But when both parties make a conscience of their desires, and neither can see its way to make a concession, it remains for the Church as a whole, after the matter has been fully debated, either to call upon one or other party to make a sacrifice in the cause of peace, or else to allow both uses. I have no doubt that the latter is the more reasonable, and I think it is the more Christian course; but it is new and untried, and I am not surprised that both extremes unite against it.

2. The points raised by my second critic, Mr. Guy Johnson, concern the Ornaments Rubric and its interpretation. I cannot agree with him that there is any distinction in meaning between “the minister shall use . . . such ornaments” (1559) and “such ornaments . . . shall be retained and be in use” (1662), especially as the latter words are taken directly from the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Nor again can I recognize any distinction in meaning between “at the time of the Communion and at all other times in their ministration” (1559) and the more compressed form of words “at all times of their ministration” (1662). It is not disputed that the Caroline rubric was meant at least to legalize the practice enjoined by the Canons, which recognized a difference of vesture in cathedral and collegiate churches between the Holy Communion and other services. Further, I must repeat my conviction that the Revisers went most ambiguously to work, if, when they used the words “such ornaments as *were* in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in 2 Edward VI.,” they meant “such ornaments as came into general use in accordance with the authority which a later Parliament conferred upon Queen Elizabeth.” It is perfectly true, as Mr. Johnson insists, that the Bishops who were responsible for the revision of 1662 inquired in their Visitation Articles about the surplice, and the surplice only. But their question takes the form “Doth [your minister] never omit it?” It was no time to advocate the revival of Vestments when even the surplice had to be inquired about. It is not so absurd, as Mr. Johnson seems to think, to suppose that the Bishops deliberately refused to

stereotype the current usage by altering the Ornaments Rubric, which they clearly ought to have done if the rubric was to be any guide at all to the officiating minister. Nor does it seem irrelevant to point out, that when the Puritans excepted against the rubric that "it seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, etc., and other Vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edward VI.," the Bishops returned no direct re-assurance, but referred them to their general remarks upon Ceremonies, in which there was nothing to the point (Cardwell's "Conferences," pp. 314, 345-351). Why did they not say in plain terms "You are mistaken; by our rubric the Vestments you mention are not brought back"?

I quoted several passages from Cosin, chiefly as evidence that he did not regard the Vestments as implying Roman doctrine, and that at the time when his notes were made "in Charles I.'s reign," he considered them to be obligatory in the Church of England, although neglected. That many of his notes are "collections" and not "original annotations" is not to the point, unless Mr. Johnson means to say that *the passages I quoted* are such collections. For my own part I cannot doubt that they are Cosin's, and express his own opinions, and this is the view of Cosin's "learned editor." I had not overlooked the parenthesis which Mr. Johnson quotes. If he will refer to the passage again he will observe that, as it is printed in Cosin's works, it has no connection with what precedes; but in Andrewes' minor works (p. 146) it is given as a note to a previous observation upon Andrewes' interpretation of the rubric:

"Mention is there made of [cope] surplice, tippet, hood, *pro cujusque gradu*.

"I find not that."—J. C.

"But the Act of Parliament (I see) refers to the Canon, and until such times as other order shall be taken."

In this context it would mean that Cosin had come to understand Andrewes' view, which was that the Canons of 1604 represented the "other order" contemplated by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity. It might mean also that he concurred in that view. It would be interesting to know the date of this final entry, because as late as 1640, in some "particulars to be considered, explained, and corrected in the Book of Common Prayer" (v. 507), he writes:

"But what those ornaments of the Church and of the ministers are is not here specified, and they are so unknown to many, that by most they are neglected. Therefore it were requisite that those ornaments used in the second year of King Edward should be here particularly named and set forth, that there might be no difference about them."

Accordingly we find that in 1662 he proposed that the rubric should specify the Vestments. His note is "that is to say, a surplice, etc." ("Correspondence, Surtees Society," ii. 44). I must confess I had forgotten this passage when I spoke of Cosin as "drafting" the new Ornaments Rubric. It certainly looks as though he had adopted the view of Andrewes; and yet, as the *etcetera* must have included the

cope, which was regularly worn at Durham, it is impossible to say that it did not include the alb also. (There was probably never any question of the chasuble; the first book of Edward, which spoke of "a vestment or cope" was sufficiently obeyed by the use of the latter alternative.) But, for whatever reason, Cosin's advice was not followed, and the ornaments of the minister were not specified. The most intelligible explanation of the action of the Bishops, leaving Cosin's personal view out of account as indeterminable, is that given by Sir C. Chadwyck-Healey in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Discipline (1608, 2). He considers that the Advertisements of 1566, followed by the Canons, represented a legal minimum requirement, which did not abrogate the rubric; and he points out that as late as 1668 Baxter was still asking that "the rubrick for the *old* ornaments which were in use in the second year of Edward VI. be put out."

3. In the April number of the *CHURCHMAN* the discussion is continued by Mr. G. S. Streatfield and Mr. C. Sydney Carter. Mr. Streatfield pleads earnestly that toleration of the use of Vestments in the Church of England would be a new barrier against reunion with other bodies of Evangelical Christians. I cannot myself see why a cope should form such a barrier any more than a surplice. It is inconceivable that Reunion should take any other form than a federation of communions, which would leave each free to arrange its own rites and ceremonies. The terms of Reunion at present before the public are those formulated in the Lambeth Conference "quadrilateral," and they do not contemplate even the common use of the Prayer-Book.

4. In reply to my contention that Cranmer retained the Vestments in 1549 as the vesture appointed for the ministration of Holy Communion, Mr. Carter charges me with not having noticed the fact that Cranmer allowed the cope as an alternative for the chasuble. But surely Cranmer's admitted preference for the cope, which he himself used at St. Paul's, only makes more conspicuous his continued allowance of the "Vestment" as being the historical dress of the clergy at that ministration. He might have substituted the cope. In the second book, being pressed between the lords of the Council and the foreign Reformers,<sup>1</sup> Cranmer abolished the special Vestments altogether. But the fact that the Prayer-Book of 1549 had a real existence and use of some years (which its successor had not) ought to prevent Mr. Carter from saying that to allow the use of the chasuble now would "endorse a view which is absolutely contradictory to the whole Reformation position," and "one also which is consistent only with the Roman theory of the Sacrament."

H. C. BEECHING.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bucer's "Censura," quoted in Dixon's History, iii. 283: "I wish that the vesture appointed for that ministration were taken away, not because it is impious, but because we ought to have nothing in common with Romanensian Antichrists." This is the view which the Puritans more logically extended to the surplice, the ring in marriage, the cross in baptism, the square cap, and most other "ceremonies."

## “HIGHER CRITICISM AND ORTHODOX BELIEF.”

(*The Churchman*, March, p. 193; April, p. 306.)

In Mr. Kimm's criticism of my article, I am credited with three “assumptions”:

1. That “the main results of historical criticism are generally accepted as practically ascertained fact.”
2. That modern critical views imply that “all the great expositors before Wellhausen had failed to show that the Scriptures as they stand record a progressive revelation.”
3. That “man was led from crude beginnings up to the loftiest conceptions.”

As to the first, so much depends on what we are to understand by “main results.” My reference was chiefly to the composite origin of certain books of Scripture (p. 194), a conclusion which is accepted by a steadily increasing majority of the leaders in Biblical science at the present day, and even by Dr. Orr himself (see Professor Peake's criticism of the “Problems of the Old Testament” and Dr. Orr's reply in *The Interpreter* of April and July, 1908). That scholars have not attained to absolute unanimity in matter of detail, or that, here and there, are to be found those who reject the critical hypothesis in its entirety, proves no more than that evidence has different values for different minds.

In regard to the second and third, few, I believe, will be prepared to deny that the modern study of Comparative Religion, and the application of the hypothesis of Evolution to the phenomena of religious development, have enabled us to understand, in a way that was impossible to earlier times, the manner in which God's revelation was “conveyed through human media, which were subject to the limitations of humanity” (see “Pan-Anglican Papers,” S.B. 24, by Dr. C. F. Burney, 1908). Nor can it be doubted that it is to the critical methods of modern times that we are indebted for the more complete demonstration that it has been the peculiar glory of the Israelitish race to have evolved from crude and primitive conceptions, often bearing close affinities to Semitic heathenism, the high monotheistic religion which prepared the way for the true Messiah.

Let us not be seized with that “panicky fear of Biblical Criticism” against which the Rev. F. B. Meyer protested at the Tercentenary Commemoration Meeting in the Albert Hall on March 29. Better to take to heart the wise words of Dr. Eugene Stock, quoted in the April number of the *CHURCHMAN*, and to look facts squarely in the face, even though they may appear to clash with our preconceived ideas. The purpose of my article was to show that there is no cause to fear lest the results of Higher Criticism may affect the hold which men have on

the fundamental principles of the Faith, and that though the *grounds* of belief may stand in need of revision, the belief itself need be none the less firm and true.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

“FRESH LIGHT ON THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.”

(*The Churchman*, April, 1911, p. 265.)

Are not the arguments for the usual chronology stronger than the writer would have us think?

First, there is, above all, the age of the Lord. If He was “about thirty years old” at the Baptism, I do not like to think that He was really thirty-three. Herod died in March A.U.C. 750 or 4 B.C. If the Lord was born before his death, He must have attained thirty before March, A.D. 27. (Note, that as the year 1 B.C. is followed by the year A.D. 1, there are thirty years from 4 B.C. to A.D. 27, and not 31.) Allowing at least a year for the events of Matt. ii. before the death of Herod, we are brought to A.D. 26 for the Baptism.

Of all the data given in Luke iii., the year of Tiberius is the only one that is pertinent, as the others are satisfied by any of the years suggested.

In John ii. we have “Forty and six years has this Temple been in building.” When was the Temple begun? Josephus states in two places that Herod began the Temple in the fifteenth and in the eighteenth year of his reign (“Ant.,” xv. 11. 1; “Wars,” i. 21. 1). He also says that Herod began his reign twice, “Having reigned since he had procured Antigonus to be slain thirty-four years, but since he had been declared king by the Romans thirty-seven.” I regret I cannot go to first sources for these dates, but they are given as 37 and 40 B.C. On these data, Herod began the Temple in 22 B.C. Forty-six years from this time extends to A.D. 25. Shall we be far wrong if we allow enough play in our data to bring this to A.D. 26?


These two periods will then agree, and they will bring us to a date for the commencement of the Saviour’s ministry four years before a date of the Crucifixion which is astronomically possible. There remains Tiberius. I do not feel satisfied that we ought to reject the earlier date for the commencement of his hegemony so lightly as we are invited to do. Suetonius says (Tiberius, xxi.): “Lege per consules lata ut provincias cum Augusto communiter administraret, simulque censum ageret.” I have not the other accounts of this appointment, which may occur in Tacitus and Velleius, but, with this account alone, it hardly seems critical to speak in this connection of “obscure and uncertain titles,” “a complimentary nature,” “date uncertain, the whole business extremely vague,” “supposition that the titles were conferred about the time of,” “such titular honours.” These reiterated

descriptions do not seem to agree with the statement of Suetonius, which is quite precise both as to the power (not the title merely) and the time. Furthermore, this appointment not merely conferred a title, but it definitely designated Tiberius as Augustus' successor, a step Augustus had up to that time been most averse from taking. A common share of the Imperium in the provinces and the appointment to the succession, if not what we should have expected as the occasion of Tiberius' hegemony, are surely not an impossible understanding of St. Luke. And if we admit it, we have all these four data—Tiberius, the Temple, Herod's death, and the astronomical condition—in close agreement. Any mathematician will recognize the enormous chances against such a combination, except on the basis of historical accuracy.

As regards the duration of the Lord's ministry, it is known to all that we have three Passovers carefully specified in St. John; but it is not so generally noticed that we have a fourth in the other Gospels. But I imagine St. John noticed it, and therefore left it out, as he seems to have left out on principle everything that was in the Synoptists. It is to be found in Matt. xii. 1, etc.: "They began to pluck the ears of corn." This, with the saying in John iv. 35, will give us three years or over for the period from John ii. to the end, to which we have to add the time between the Baptism and John ii. 13.

I cannot find that the astronomical table given differs, except in one point, from that given by Salmon, who states his calculation agrees with those of Wurm and Adams. The exception is in the year 29, where Salmon puts the 15th Nisan in April 4, and Dr. Fotheringham puts it a month earlier, both indicating unsuitable days. The Jewish Passover at present always follows the equinox; and if this rule obtained in the Lord's time, it seems that Dr. Fotheringham's date of March 19 is less likely than Dr. Salmon's.

W. BOTHAMLEY.



### Notices of Books.

JOHN THE PRESBYTER AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By Dom Chapman, O.S.B. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. Pp. 108. Price 6s. net.

This book contains what is probably the best discussion of the patristic evidence as to the identity of St. John which is to be found in any language. It is not as extensive as that of Zahn in his "Forschungen," nor are there such displays of recondite erudition. Again, there is not the complete statement of the evidence of Irenæus which is to be found in the admirable work of Dr. Lewis of Chicago. The special value of Dom Chapman's work lies in the exceptional value of his examination of the argument at its cardinal points, and more especially of his study of the evidence of Papias. Perhaps no other examination of the documents shows the same precision of reasoning, penetration of insight, and grasp of the facts.