An Introduction to the

THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles.

By

T. P. BOULTBEE, M.A.
Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Hicksbury;
Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge

London:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1871

Word Processed, 2003
(punctuation reduced and spelling made consistent; footnotes moved to places of citation; Bible citations in modern format)

PREFACE

This work has at least been produced by a natural process. It originated and has gradually assumed shape out of a necessity which has long pressed upon the Author. Having been engaged for some years in teaching theology, he has sought in vain for a manual containing the definitions and terms of that science and distinctly enunciating the received doctrines of the Church of England.

The plan of this work is precisely that which is indicated by its title. It is meant to be an introduction to the Theology of the Church of England. We are so accustomed to magnify our own divisions, and our opponents so habitually mock them, that some may be inclined to doubt whether there is such a theology. The Author would be far from saying that our differences on the doctrine of justification and the nature and efficacy of the sacraments are trivial. But setting aside those extremes which do not really belong to our Church, though they struggle to find foothold within her limits, it is believed that our differences are, to say the least, very manageable so long as they are discussed on the platform of Holy Scripture. No one accustomed to teach the subjects which with considerable uniformity are required by our bishops of the candidates for Holy Orders, can hesitate to acknowledge the solid basis of recognised English Theology. To this it is the object of this work to introduce the Student. It is desired to embarrass him as little as possible with extra subjects or extraneous matter. The time at his disposal is all too little. He is required to read and know many books, sometimes too many. He often fails to trace any unity of teaching or of system throughout his prescribed course. One object of this work is to be a guide to that unity, and to show how each portion of his prescribed reading falls into its place in this great doctrinal code of his Church. For example, the Student as a matter of course reads Pearson's great work on the Creed. There he finds Scripture applied with unexampled copiousness in the text, and abundant patristic learning in the notes. It is most undesirable to confuse his mind with a different arrangement when he comes to the Articles. Accordingly in the first five Articles Pearson's treatment of the subject is epitomized, with the addition of such illustrative and explanatory matter as appeared necessary.

Paley's unrivalled clearness still maintains for him an acknowledged position in the defence of our faith. The student will certainly read at least the first part of his Evidences. It is, therefore, very unwise to disturb the arrangement of the historical proof of the Canon of the New Testament which he has given. And, after all, excepting some matters of detail, that proof remains where Paley left it. Therefore this is taken as the basis of the proof of that portion of the Sixth Article.

In doctrinal subjects for obvious reasons Hooker occupies a foremost place. He has therefore been freely quoted, and his true place in theology is attempted to be defined. These examples will serve to illustrate the nature of the work. Everywhere references are given, sufficient to guide the more thoughtful and studious minds to greater research, and to verify the statements in the text.

Further, remembering that the Articles were written by men who had been trained in the Roman system, it is essential for their proper understanding (to say nothing of our own necessities) that the Roman theology should be fully exhibited. This has always been done from unquestionable authorities and generally from the Council of Trent itself.

It is taken for granted that ecclesiastical history has been carefully read, and that its main outlines and principal details are borne in mind. Early heresies, the papal developments, the schoolmen, the chief characters and controversies of the Reformation, gather around us at every step as we make our way through the Articles. It must be assumed that there is a sufficient knowledge of these before a close study of the Articles is commenced. It has not been deemed necessary to add more than cursory details to the needful historical allusions.

The English text of the Articles is that adopted in Hardwick's *History of the Articles of Religion*, a work distinguished by much careful research. In all matters connected with the history of the text the Author is much indebted to it. The Latin text is taken from Sparrow's collection. The chief preceding

works on the Articles have been consulted but, it is believed, have had but little influence in forming the opinions or moulding the arrangements here adopted. With very rare exceptions it has been thought the wiser as well as the more respectful course not to allude to living writers. It is better to prepare the Student for controversy hereafter, if it must needs be, than to entangle him in it prematurely.

It has been the desire of the Author to retire as far as possible into the background in the composition of this work. He is conscious that his own individual opinions can have little weight. He desires the Student to feel that confidence which is natural when he knows that the exposition of a given doctrine is that of divines of our Church, some of whom have been for centuries its pride and its ornament. He who knows that he is at one with Hooker on Justification, that he follows Pearson in dealing with the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, and has Barrow's masterly hand in traversing the thorny path of the papal Supremacy, must feel those convictions strengthened which, it is hoped, he has already based on the Word of God. In the more original portions the Author has anxiously endeavoured to furnish the Student with such information and explanations as shall at once be fair and sufficient to put him in a position to understand the men and the questions he will have to encounter in practical life. The Author has no desire to conceal or his own convictions, but these are of consequence to but few beside. Whereas the true grounds and reasons and bearings of the great religious questions being once clearly grasped, the Student's own convictions will be maturely formed and will usually be steadfast. In this case there is no more reason to fear what the general result will be than there was in the days of our fathers.

It is hoped that the method here pursued will be distinguished from a mere catena of authorities on the one hand, and from a mere *cram-book* on the other. The object certainly has been to stimulate research and enquiry instead of resting in the mere manual. But this must depend on the earnestness of the student.

The rarity of patristic quotations may strike some as a serious defect. Those who think so will find brief extracts of this kind in Welchman's little work so long used at Oxford; and more copious citations in the well-known Exposition of the present Bishop of Ely. But the Author must further add that he thinks rather lightly of the benefit of such quotations to the ordinary Student. Their use is rather for reference than for 'getting up'. Few indeed are those who can retain them in their memory, and even their time may be generally more usefully spent in other practical matters which are insufficiently mastered.

But besides this, the Author must confess that he agrees with the present Bishop of Ossory in the Preface to his *Sermons upon the Nature and Effects of Faith* when he says, 'the early divines from whom I draw so largely were certainly at home in the Fathers; and they were led to conduct the great contest, so as to furnish any one who desires to make an array of ancient authorities with an ample store of citations, and with great facility for enlarging it. But Romish controversial writers produced counter-authorities from the same sources; and though I am far from believing that upon this, any more than upon the other points which divide the Churches, there is room for reasonable doubt about the opinions or at least the principles of the ancient Fathers, yet to fix with precision the meaning of writers, who confessedly (at least before the Pelagian controversy) wrote somewhat loosely upon this doctrine, would require much reading and thought.' This fully illustrates the Author's conviction as to the practical utility of partial patristic extracts to the tyro in theology. For example, in the course of this work the valuable chapter of Waterland 'On the Eucharist' is referred to in which he treats of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. What would the unassisted Student make of the numerous passages in early writers in which the Eucharist is called *a true sacrifice* if her were not led to understand the real meaning of their phraseology? There must be something fundamentally unsound in the system itself apart from mental unfairness which has led to such opposite results. Jewel, for instance, in his Apology produces a selection of Protestant quotations on the Eucharist from Fathers of the first four

centuries; some modern writers amongst ourselves exhibit extracts from the same Fathers which look, to say the least, very like transubstantiation.

It is impossible without a thoughtful study of their theological phraseology and general system to understand rightly the true position of those ancient writers. Even our own Hooker may be, and has often been, misunderstood on some important points from want of this. Much more must this be the case when mediaeval or modern theological glossaries are used to interpret the meaning of the earliest Christian writers. The Author has no misgivings as to the general result of that meaning. Our great Reformation divines were not mere men of indices and cyclopaedias. They wrought out their systems by painful and laborious study of the Scriptures and the early authors. The mind and intent of primitive writers were familiar to them, and their appeal to antiquity was unwavering and decisive. Modern criticism has produced very little change in the general position as they left it. An excrescence, an inaccuracy, a spurious document may have been lopped off here or there; but, substantially the patristic bearing of the main controversies remains where our Reformers believed it to lie.

On the grounds, then, of the limited nature of this work, as well as of doubt as to their practical utility at this stage of advance, and their somewhat dubious value in themselves, patristic authorities have been scarcely at all referred to.

Some may desiderate a more important matter, a more distinct and copious demonstration of each Article from Holy Scripture. The Author by no means undervalues judicious selections of this kind from Holy Writ. At the same time, if the divine is ultimately to be 'mighty in the Scriptures', it is thought that the Student should be guided rather to the *manner* than to the *details* of thus applying the Bible. Such at least is the course followed in the College of which the Author presides. The Scriptural examination and instruction in the Articles is oral and precedes their more theological interpretation.

More perhaps need not be added in explanation of the objects and principles of this work. To write at greater length would have been in some respects an easier task. To unite compression of style with sufficient fullness of matter and reference, in dealing with subjects which invite discussion and amplification at every turn, requires a self-restraint not always easy to practise. But that compression is absolutely necessary when the object is not to make a display of learning but to provide the theological student with a safe guide through his early difficulties. That some such treatise is greatly needed is very generally confessed. Should this attempt in any measure supply that necessity, it is not doubted that the criticism it may meet with will make considerable improvements possible on a future occasion.

CONTENTS

Historical Introduction
Arrangement of the Articles

PART I.
THE HOLY TRINITY

1. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity
2. Of Christ the Son of God
3. Of his going down into Hell
4. Of his Resurrection
5. Of the Holy Ghost

PART II.
THE RULE OF FAITH

6. Of the Sufficiency of the Scripture
7. Of the Old Testament
8. Of the Three Creeds

PART III.
DOCTRINE

9. Of Original Sin
10. Of Free Will
11. Of Justification
12. Of Good Works
13. Of Works before Justification
14. Of Works of Supererogation
15. Of Christ alone without Sin
16. Of Sin after Baptism
17. Of Predestination and Election
18. Of obtaining Salvation by Christ

PART IV.
THE CHURCH: ITS SACRAMENTS AND MINISTERS

19. Of the Church
20. Of the Authority of the Church
21. Of the Authority of General Councils
22. Of Purgatory
23. Of Ministering in the Congregation
24. Of Speaking in the Congregation
25. Of the Sacraments
26. Of the Unworthiness of Ministers
27. Of Baptism
28. Of the Lord's Supper
29. Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of Christ
30. Of both Kinds
31. Of Christ's One Oblation
32. Of the Marriage of Priests
33. Of Excommunicate Persons
34. Of the Traditions of the Church

PART V.
REGULATIONS AFFECTING THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN PARTICULAR

35. Of Homilies
36. Of Consecration of Ministers
37. Of Civil Magistrates

PART VI.
CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

38. Of Christian Men's Goods
39. Of a Christian Man's Oath

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The code of doctrine known as the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England has experienced several modifications. It has also its roots in yet earlier documents. Of these it appears necessary to give some account.

The earliest doctrinal formulary of a Reformed Church is that known as 'the Confession of Augsburg'. It was the work of Melanchthon, revised by Luther and other divines, and was presented to the Diet at Augsburg in 1530. To a great extent this suggested the several Confessions of Faith published by different Reformed National Churches in that century. But in the case of the English Church it had a more direct influence. Our Articles have borrowed from it some considerable portion of their theological statements. It may be found at length together with other similar documents in the 'Sylloge Confessionum' published at Oxford.

We may notice here the Wurtemberg Confession which belongs to the same school and was consulted in the formation of our Articles. It was intended for presentation to the Council of Trent in 1552 by the ambassadors of Wurtemberg, but the Council refused to hear them.

The first independent attempt of English divines to deal with doctrine after the rejection of the papal supremacy was the publication of the Ten Articles in 1536. These were set forth by royal authority and the approval of the clergy in Convocation. [See *Formularies of Faith during the Reign of Henry VIII.*] In most essential points they contain Roman doctrine, modifying, however, some things and substituting the royal for the papal supremacy. They are of great historical value in tracing the growth of the Reformation but have no authority whatever.

It is well known how Henry's course oscillated in the latter years of his reign under the action of the conflicting influences of foreign and domestic policy.

At certain times the German alliance appeared to attract him. Cranmer's influence was thrown into this scale, and there was more than one negotiation with the German Protestant princes with a view to some agreement on matters of faith. These negotiations assumed the most practical form in 1538 when a Lutheran embassy arrived in England consisting of three members. They held repeated interviews with Cranmer and certain other commissioners appointed by the king. They appear to have taken the Augsburg Confession as the basis of their deliberations. They finally broke off their discussions on the following points on which Henry would not yield: the administration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, private propitiatory masses, and clerical celibacy. After the interruption of these negotiations the reactionary influence of Gardiner prevailed, and the 'Act of Six Articles' made any such plan of union with the German Protestants impossible for the present. There still remains among Archbishop Cranmer's papers a manuscript containing Articles of Religion evidently founded on the Confession of Augsburg. This is believed to contain the result of the conferences between the German and English commissioners. It not only possess historical interest, but it is probable that, in drawing up the Forty-two Articles in Edward's reign, Cranmer had recourse to this document. If so, the Augsburg Confession has influenced our doctrinal code not directly, but *indirectly*, through this revised formula. Hardwick [*History of Arts.* c. iv.] gives as a reason for this opinion that, in matter common to the

Augsburg Confession and our Articles, the divergencies from the former are frequently contained in the document in question. It will be found in *Cranmer's Remains*. [Parker Soc. P. 472.]

The death of Henry in 1547 introduces us to another stage of the Reformation. Cranmer still adhered to his long-cherished plan of a scheme of doctrine which should embrace the whole of the Reformed Church. But from various causes his efforts failed. Perhaps among other reasons the fact that the Archbishop abandoned the idea of the corporal presence, whether under the transubstantiation or consubstantiation theory, proved a serious impediment to union with Lutheran divines in such a formulary. There appears to have been a collection of Articles of Religion drawn up by Cranmer as early as 1549. What this may have been is unknown, but it may probably have served as the basis of the Forty-two Articles. In 1551 the Archbishop was directed by the Privy Council to 'frame a book of Articles of Religion for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in this Church, that being finished they might be set forth by public authority.' [Strype's *Cramner*, ii. 27.] This was done, and the Articles were sent for inspection to some other bishops and to other eminent persons. The Articles, forty-two in number, were finally issued under the authority of a royal mandate in 1553. This document is accordingly referred to by Hardwick as the Articles of 1553. But as they were discussed and completed in the previous year, they are more generally known as the Articles of 1552 and are therefore so styled in this work.

It has been much disputed whether this formulary was ever sanctioned by Convocation or whether it was imposed by royal authority only. It would seem to be a matter of no great consequence since this code has been superseded some centuries ago. But on the score of precedent bearing on ecclesiastical legislation, this question has been deemed by some to possess importance.

There is no record of any action of Convocation on this subject, and there are some other difficulties in the way. But Hardwick is of opinion that Convocation did approve the Articles. He rests on the fact that all extant copies purport in their title to have been ratified 'in the last synod of London'. Statements to the same effect are found in other contemporary documents.

The very year which saw the authoritative publication of the Forty-two Articles witnessed also their abrogation on the accession of Mary.

The first parliament of Elizabeth, 1559, restored the English Liturgy. The Articles of Religion, however, remained in abeyance for some time. In 1563 Convocation took action upon them and ultimately sanctioned a revised copy containing Thirty-eight Articles. But for lack of royal authority subscription could not be enforced. In 1571 Elizabeth [See the Ratification usually appended to the Thirty-nine Articles in the Prayer-book.] finally sanctioned another revision which was subscribed by Convocation in that year. The Articles so ratified and sanctioned, thirty-nine in number, have remained to our time without any alteration.

The Latin and English versions of the Articles have equal authority. We have, therefore, the advantage of a reference from one version to the other in the case of any ambiguity occurring.

The reader who desires further information on this subject will find it fully treated in Hardwick's *History of the Articles of Religion*.

THE PRINCIPAL DIVISIONS AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE ARTICLES

The arrangement of the Articles deserves notice. They may be divided into six parts corresponding to the principal divisions of their subjects.

Part I. (Arts. I–V) treats of the nature of the Deity in this order. The essential attributes of God, and His mode of existence in three Persons. The Deity, incarnation, sufferings, and death of Christ for sin. The descent of Christ into hell; His resurrection, and ascension, and the future judgment. The Deity and Personality of the Holy Ghost.

Part II. (Arts. VI–VIII) treats of the rule of faith thus. The sole authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith is asserted. The relation of the Old Testament to the New and the degree of obligation of the Mosaic law are set forth. The three Creeds are accepted but are denied any authority independent of Holy Scripture.

Part III. (Arts. IX–XVIII). The basis of doctrinal authority having been laid down, the main doctrines of man's salvation are next defined in this order. The lost condition of man by nature is described, and it is denied that he is able to turn to God without preventing grace, or to do what is pleasing to God without cooperating grace. It is then declared that man can only be accounted righteous before God for the merits of Christ, and that faith only is the grace regarded by God in thus justifying the sinner; for which purpose God is pleased to isolate it from other graces present with it simultaneously. Thenceforward the good works of the justified sinner surely follow and are pleasing to God in Christ although themselves imperfect. But works although in themselves good, done before justification are not regarded in Christ and therefore of necessity retain the sinful taint of the nature from which they come.

Further, however pleasing in God's sight the gracious works of His children in Christ may be, none can render to God by the utmost self-sacrifice more than He has invited us to give. No human being, save the Son of God in His human nature, has escaped the universal corruption. The baptized, on falling into sin, have the way to God still open to them through repentance; nor can a sinless state be attained on this side the grave.

Next, the original ground of calling, justifying, and sanctifying sinners is traced in the gracious purpose and predestinating love of God. This ought to call forth in them warm spiritual affections, but the opposite doctrine of reprobation is regarded as one calculated to harden the sinner.

Finally, salvation can be obtained through Christ only. There is no other way to God.

Part IV. (Arts. XIX–XXXIV). We now come to the Church which holds these doctrines. It is defined as consisting of an assembly of faithful men, possessing the pure word of God and the sacraments complete in all essentials. But the most famous individual churches have not been exempt from serious error. The Church may appoint rites and can judge in controversy subject to the supreme authority of Scripture. But even General Councils, being composed of fallible men, have no collective infallibility and are subject to the authority of Scripture. In particular, purgatory, indulgences, saint and image worship, are errors which have prevailed contrary to the Word of God.

The ministers of the Church ought to be lawfully appointed, and the services performed in the vulgar tongue.

The nature and number of the sacraments of Christ are next set forth; the five Romish sacraments are repudiated; and the exhibition, as distinguished from the use, of the sacraments is rejected. Evil ministers cannot annul that grace which Christ bestows on the faithful in the use of His ordinances. Yet such ministers should receive due ecclesiastical discipline.

The efficacy of Baptism follows and the privilege of infants to receive it. The nature of the communion of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper is described; and all participation of Christ by those who have not living faith is denied. To partake of the Cup as well as the Bread is the

right of the laity. Christ cannot be offered again in the Eucharist, for His sacrifice is complete and sufficient. The clergy have full liberty to marry. Excommunicated persons ought to be avoided. Rites and ceremonies may vary according to the convenience of national Churches. But private persons ought not to disobey them.

Part V. (Arts. XXXV–XXXVII). A few special regulations affecting the Church of England in particular come next in order. The two Books of Homilies are approved for general use in churches. The ordinal is sanctioned for setting apart the ministers of the English Church. The royal supremacy is decreed, and the papal authority in England repudiated.

Part VI. (Arts. XXXVII–XXXIX). A few civil rights and duties, at that time called in question by some sectaries, are defined. Capital punishments and military service are lawful Community of goods is not the law of Christianity. Judicial oaths may be taken.

It is hoped that this rapid recital of the substance of the Articles may be deemed fairly accurate. It will at least show their coherence and consecutive arrangement, which is the purpose for which it has been drawn out. That this renowned code possesses scientific order as well as accuracy is too often lost sight of.

PART I.
THE HOLY TRINITY

1. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity
2. Of the Son of God
3. Of His Going Down Into Hell
4. Of His Resurrection
5. Of The Holy Ghost

ARTICLE I.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.	*De fide in sacro-sanctam Trinitatem.*
There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.	Unus est vivus et verus Deus, aeternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensae potentiae, sapientiae ac bonitatis, creator et conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinae naturae tres sunt personae, ejusdem essentiae, potentiae, ac aeternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

Notes on the Text of Article I.

Comparing the Latin with the English text, we may notice the following expressions: –

Without body: Latin, *incorporeus*. *Without parts*: Latin *impartibilis*, i.e. insusceptible of division into parts. *Without passions*: Latin, *impassibilis*, i.e. incapable of suffering. *Infinite*: Latin, *immensae*, immeasurable.

This Article remains as it was in the original formula of 1552.

It has been chiefly derived from Art. I of the Augsburg Confession, as may be seen from the following quotation from that document: –

'There is one divine essence which is called, and is, God, everlasting, without body, without parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things visible and invisible, and yet there are three Persons, of one substance and power, and coeternal: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' The original Latin corresponds in the same exact manner with that of our present Article. As the definitions of so great a divine as Melancthon must be valuable, it may be well to add from the same Article of the Augsburg Confession the definition of the word *Person*: 'The name *Person* is used in the same sense in which ecclesiastical writers have used it in this matter, to signify not a part or quality of something else, but that which has a proper existence of its own' – (*quod proprie subsistit*).

Observations on Article I.

It is assumed that the reader is sufficiently aware of the principal varieties of belief as to the nature of the Deity which have prevailed in different times and countries. It is beyond the limits of this work to give even a sketch of the history of the misbelief of man on this fundamental subject, and a mere catalogue of names is a worthless thing for practical purposes. It may, however, be desirable to name the principal classes under which the varieties of human notions of the Deity are arranged. The dire name of *Atheism* needs no definition: 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.'

Deism is a general expression for the notions of those who believe in One God, the Creator, and in some moral relation to Him, but who reject revelation.

Theism is an ill-defined term, often used as equivalent to deism, but sometimes as including something more, and as the opposite to atheistic ideas.

Polytheism holds that 'there be Gods many', personal existences, sharing among themselves in various degrees the divine power.

Pantheism holds that 'the universe is itself God, or of the divine essence.' All organized matter, all sentient being, it views as appertaining to the Deity, coming from Him, returning to Him, and always in Him. There is, therefore, no personal God distinct from the creature he has made. This was the inner belief of many of the ancient philosophers. It is also that of the Buddhists and lies at the root of Brahminism. It has also been revived in various forms in some schools of modern European philosophy. In further illustration of these portentous aberrations of the human intellect, a passage full of indignant eloquence is subjoined from a charge of the late Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Jeune).

'*Material Atheism*. – In the last and at the beginning of the present century, it was a material and mechanical atheism which attracted the vulgar of scientific men. It was the atheism which denies all existence but the existence of matter – of matter eternal, and containing a divinity called Force in every atom; the atheism which regards thought as a mere secretion of the brain, and vice and virtue simply as products, "like sugar or vitriol"; the atheism which sees order, but not design, in the universe – laws, not Providence, in the course of things.

'*Pantheism*. – To this blank and revolting materialism succeeded pantheism as revived in Germany – the system which confounds the Infinite and the finite and which makes God the sum of all things. God, it teaches, is brutal in brute matter, mighty in the forces of nature, feeling in the animal, thinking and conscious only in man. This system is, in its first aspect, more noble than material atheism, but in truth it is not less fatal to all that is noble and good. It indeed makes man – nay, the beast that perisheth; nay, the very dung on the earth – divine; but it also makes God human, animal, material. It degrades what is high by exalting what is low. Better to deny God after all than to debase Him. Pantheism is, if possible, a worse atheism.

'*Positivism*. – Of both these systems, positivism – the system which at this moment claims exclusive possession of truth; positivism, for such is its barbarous name, to which all thought, we are told by a leading review, in Germany and England as well as in France, its birthplace, is now

converging – speaks with no less contempt, though with less hatred, than it speaks of Christianity. "Daydreams," it says, "are all the assertions, all the negations alike, of philosophers: impotent attempts to compass impossibility." Of God, if there be a God; of the soul, if there be a soul; of revelation, if revelation there be, man can know, man need know, nothing. Away, then, it cries, with mere hypothesis! To the positive, to the material, to the teaching of the senses, to observation of facts, philosophy must limit itself. This system is mean, though supercilious. Perhaps, however, positivism rises in comparison with atheism which itself is less base than pantheism; for it is better to ignore than to deny, as it is better to deny than to degrade God.

'*Suicide of Philosophy*. – Human reason, then, left to itself, leaves us, as to God, a threefold choice: we may deny God, we may degrade God, we may ignore God. A noble result! A godless philosophy ends in suicide! So it will ever be. To quote from the noble close of the Dunciad—

'Philosophy, which leaned on Heaven before,
'Sinks to her second cause, and is no more.

'*Destruction of Morality*. – As is the theology, so is the morality of all these systems. One specimen of their ethical teaching will suffice for all. Here Spinosa, the greatest of pantheists: – "Every act of man, as every fact of nature, is produced by fated laws. Free-will is a chimera, flattering to our pride and founded on our ignorance. Not only has every man the right to seek his pleasure, he cannot do otherwise. He who lives only according to the laws of his appetites is as much in the right as he who regulates his life according to the laws of reason, in the same manner as the ignorant man and the madman has a right to everything that his appetite compels him to take. A compact has only a value proportioned to its utility; when the utility disappears, the compact disappears too. There is folly, then, in pretending to bind a man for ever to his word, unless at least that the man so contrive that the breach of the contract shall entail for him more danger than profit."

'*Practical Results of false Philosophy*. – Utter heartless selfishness, restrained by cowardice, is then to be our sole rule of life! Our final destiny is to perish like the brute; or, like bubbles, to be absorbed when we burst into the ocean of being on which we now float!

'These systems may for a time prevail; but their prevalence cannot be permanent or universal.'

Amongst Christians there are, strictly speaking, only two divisions on this subject, *Trinitarians* and *Unitarians*. The former include the vast majority of the Christian world. The *Unitarians* include persons holding a great variety of opinions verging downwards from Arianism and Socinianism with more or less belief in Holy Scripture as a revelation from God to mere deism.

I. *The Unity of God*.

It is the object of this work to bring into one focus, as far as possible, the somewhat scattered reading of the theological student. Looking also to the scanty time allowed the aspirant to the ministry of the English Church for acquiring the rudiments of theological science, it is most desirable to give him, as far as possible at this stage of his progress, *one* treatise only on each main doctrine. And this *one* treatise ought in each case to be that which has gained the general approval of the Church and is recognised as a textbook for holy orders. In this point of view it seems essential to take the guidance of Bishop Pearson under this and the four following articles. The student in divinity will either have read, or is purposing to read, the great work of that prelate on the Creed. But for the sake of completeness, and at the same time not to take the student over superfluous ground, there is subjoined a sketch of such portions of *Pearson on the Creed* as bear on the present Article.

1. '*There is but one living and true God*,' the passage with which our Article begins, will receive illustration from *Pearson on the Creed* (Art. I. § 2, 'I believe in God'), the substance of which may be thus given: –

The true notion of God is that of a Being, self-existent, independent of any other, on whom all things else depend, and governing all things.

We are assured of His existence, not by a connate idea (for God has never held us responsible on this score), nor as a self-evident truth or axiom; but by the necessity of assigning an origin to things having existence, and from the perfect adaptation of means to ends in creation, or the relation of final causes to the efficient cause.

That God is *One* is deduced first from the primary notion of God, which has been defined as implying *independence*, and there cannot be two independent beings coexistent and acting together. It further follows from the unity of design and of government in creation. Thus God is *One*, and not only *actually* One, but the *only possible* Supreme. He has an intrinsic and essential singularity.

2. '*Everlasting*.' – That God is everlasting will follow from the notion of His self-existence and independence, for He has His existence from none. And it is asserted in numerous passages of Scripture which need not be here specified.

3. '*Without body, parts, of passions*.' – This doctrine is in several places asserted by Pearson (see the Articles 'Which was conceived' and 'Suffered'), but is not separately handled. It follows from the fundamental notion of the self-existence and independence of God. A body is subject to the laws of space and of limitation, it is divisible and local, it can suffer from other bodies; the whole notion is subversive of the true idea of God. There will be no difficulty in quoting sufficient passages of Scripture under this head.

4. '*Of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness*.' – Pearson deals with the almightiness of God in Art. I. § 4, and Art, VI. § 3, and treats it as involving these main particulars: the absolute power of free-will, the absolute right of possession of all things, the absolute right of using and disposing of all things; further, that God is the source of all power in any creature, that there can be no resistance to His will, and no limit to His power, save that which involves a contradiction, physical, rational, or moral. The infinite wisdom and goodness would follow in like manner from a survey of the divine perfections, and all these attributes will be readily confirmed by Holy Scripture.

5. '*The Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible*' – These attributes of the Godhead are arranged by Pearson under Art. I. § 5, 'Maker of heaven and earth', where he shows that *heaven and earth* must be understood as including all things visible and invisible. (Col. 1:16 &c.) Hence follows the definition 'Everything is either made or not made. Whatsoever is not made is God. Whatsoever is made is not God.'

This creation is further to be conceived of as the bringing all things out of that which had no previous existence, in opposition to ancient fallacies about the eternity of matter. Several passages of Scripture imply this. But it follows from the primary notion of God; for to suppose anything existing independent of God and coeval with Him detracts from His independence and self-sufficiency.

In regard to motive we are to believe that nothing but the goodness of God moved Him to create. No necessity lay upon Him, and His own will was sufficient cause for the production of all that He willed to exist.

In respect of time all created things were called into existence at definite times known unto God.

That God is *the Preserver* of all things follows also from the necessary idea of the dependence of all things upon Him.

II. *The Trinity in Unity*.

We have already noticed the definition of the term *person* given in the Augsburg Confession. It may be desirable, before entering on the details of the present section, to pursue that subject somewhat further. Waterland in his *Second Defence of Some Queries* (qu. xv.) thus defines the term: 'A single person is an intelligent agent, having the distinctive characters of I, thou, he; and not divided nor distinguished into more intelligent agents capable of the same characters.' The rationality or intelligence is meant to distinguish a person from an individual of the brute creation to which he allows personality only in a modified analogous sense. The absence of division is intended to exclude a collective intelligent agent as an army or a senate.

In this sense the Trinity is not a person. A man, an angel, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, the separated soul, the God-man, are each of them single persons. 'All other persons, save the three divine Persons, are divided and separate from each other in nature, substance, and existence. They do not mutually include and imply each other. ... But the divine Persons being undivided and not having any separate existence independent of each other, they cannot be looked upon as substances but as one substance distinguished into several *supposita* or intelligent agents.'

There are compound persons also. Man's soul and body together make a compound person and yet only one person.

A man does not say we, but I. The God-man is a compound Person consisting of soul, body, and the Logos. But the result is one Person. 'The same Christ made the world, increased in wisdom, was pierced by a spear.' He is spoken of in Scripture as 'one I, one He, one Thou, whether with respect to what He is as the Logos or as having a soul or a body.'

In our discussion of the great doctrines now before us it will be necessary to anticipate in some measure Articles II and V, for we shall have to take these three separate propositions. The Father is God. The Son is God. And the Holy Ghost is God.

The first of these needs no proof. There is no question about it. We pass, therefore to the second. It must be noted that this is a matter of pure revelation. It is believed as a direct deduction from certain passages; and, if possible, it follows still more certainly from the whole spirit of the New Testament, that the Son is God and a distinct Person in Himself.

This subject is handled by Pearson (Art. II. §§ 3 & 4, 'His only Son our Lord'). Having spoken of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, Pearson proceeds with the following argument: –

1. Jesus Christ had a real existence before His incarnation, as will appear from the following passages: 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?' (John 6:62); 'He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me' (John 1:15); 'Before Abraham was, I am' (John 8:58); 'By the Spirit He went, and preached to the spirits in prison ... in the days of Noah' (1 Pet. 3:18–20); 'By whom also He made the worlds' (Heb. 1:11); &c.

2. The pre-existent nature of the Son was not created but essentially divine as appears from the following arguments.

a. It follows of necessity from the fact of *creation* being ascribed to Him; for this is absolutely a divine attribute.

b. It follows also from the familiar passage Phil. 2:6–7, which being argued out, shows that the Son was in the form of a servant as soon as He was made man, but that before this He was in the form of God. The word *form* (μορφη), being used in both clauses, applies as really to the divine as to the human nature.

c. Jehovah describes Himself thus, 'I am the First, I also am the Last' (Isa. 48:12). The same is said of the Son (Rev. 1:11).

d. That which in Isaiah 6 is spoken of Jehovah is in John 12:41 referred to Christ.

e. In several passages Christ is called God, especially Col. 2:9.

f. In several other places (e.g., Jer. 23:6; Mal. 3:1; Isa. 40:3) the name Jehovah is used, and the same is referred in the New Testament to Christ.

Hence we conclude that the Son of God has an essentially divine nature.

3. Next, he has this divine nature not of Himself but as communicated from the Father.

a. Because of the absolute unity of the divine essence which will not permit the existence of two divine Persons independently existing.

b. The divine nature being indivisible, the whole and not a part of the Deity must be thus communicated. 'I and the Father are one.' This is the ομοούσιον of the Nicene fathers.

4. This communication of the divine essence is of such a nature that it is called in Scripture the generation of the Son (Heb. 1:5).

In the case of human generation man begets a son in his own likeness but with a separate individuality from his own. God *as the Father* has a more perfect relation to God *the Son* in that He communicates the whole nature and properties of the Deity, not by dividing Himself, but by a full communication of Himself.

Hence it is concluded that the Son is God. But that He is not the same Person as God the Father inasmuch as they stand in a peculiar relation in respect of origin, and because in many passages they are plainly distinguished from each other in will and operation (e.g. John 5:30, 37; 16:26, &c.

The third main proposition before us is this: *The Holy Ghost is God*.

We refer again to Pearson (Art. VIII. 'I believe in the Holy Ghost'). The mode of dealing with this subject may be thus exhibited: –

1. The Holy Ghost is a *Person*, and not a mere quality or influence, because –

a. He is contrasted with evil spirits, who are *persons*. See the cases of Saul and Micaiah.

b. He can be grieved, He makes intercession, searches all things, distributes spiritual gifts, spake to Peter and to prophets at Antioch. As the Paraclete, He is sent, teaches, testifies, comes, reproves, guides, speaks. All these are Personal acts.

2. The Holy Ghost is not only a Person, but uncreated and divine.

a. See 1 Cor 2:11.

b. The sin against the Holy Ghost is irremissible. Since all sin against God is not so, sin against a created being cannot be unpardonable.

c. (John 1:3). All created things were made by the Son. But the Spirit of God was in the beginning (Job 26:13), and therefore is not a creature.

d. (Luke 1:35). Jesus is called the Son of God as being conceived by the Holy Ghost who must, therefore, be God.

e. Further proofs are alleged from the following passages: – 2 Cor. 3:15–17. Acts 5:3–4. The lie to the Holy Ghost is a lie to God. 1 Cor. 6:19. The inhabitation by the Spirit makes man a temple of God. Acts 28:25. The Holy Ghost is identified with Jehovah.

f. The divine attributes – Omniscience, Omnipotence, Omnipresence – are attributed to the Holy Ghost.

3. But though a Person and divine, the Holy Ghost is not to be confused with the Father or the Son. For–

a. He proceeds from the Father (John 15:26); therefore He is not the Father.

b. He receives of that which is the Son's, and glorifies the Son. He is sent on condition of the Son's departure (John 14:26, and 16:7, 14); therefore He is not the Son.

c. He is distinguished from both Father and Son (Matt. 3:16; Eph. 2:18, &c.).

The above is a brief sketch of the argument of Pearson in support of the doctrine before us, that *in the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*.

The Trinitarian controversy in the Church of England belonged chiefly to the commencement of the eighteenth century. In 1685 the celebrated work of Bishop Bull appeared, the *Defensio Fidei Niceni*. It is a learned investigation of the opinions of the fathers of the first three centuries on the doctrine of the Trinity. It remains the standard work on that part of the subject. Bishop Bull died in 1709, and the controversy took another form, mainly in consequence of the publications of Dr. Samuel Clarke, which were considered to be a revival of Arian opinions. This led to the valuable treatises of Waterland on the Trinity; they appeared in succession for some years and remain as a copious storehouse of theology on the various points of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

A short treatise entitled *The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity proved from Scripture*, by Jones of Nayland, of which there an edition published by Rivington, will be found a brief and able compendium which may be useful.

ARTICLE II.

Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very Man.	*De Verbo, sive Filio Dei, qui verus homo factus est.*
The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.	Filius, qui est verbum Patris, ab aeterno a Patre genitus, verus et aeternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero beatae virginis, ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duae naturae, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personae fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctae, ex quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus et verus homo, qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

Notes on the Text of Article II.

The Latin text invites no special comment. The substance of this Article is identical with that of Edward excepting that the clause 'begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father' was added in Elizabeth's time from the Wurtemberg Confession, and one or two slight verbal changes were made.

The Article itself is derived from the Third of the Augsburg Confession which runs thus: –

'The Word, that is, the Son of God, took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, so that two natures, the divine and human, were joined together in one person, never to be divided (whereof is), one Christ, very God and very Man, born of the Virgin Mary, (who) truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.'

It is manifest that no code of Christian doctrine could be complete without an explicit confession of faith on this fundamental Article. But the circumstances of the age of the Reformation also made it needful; for, omitting for the present any reference to the more ancient heresies, it is certain that in the confusion created by the great movements of the Reformation every conceivable misbelief about the nature and person of the Lord Jesus Christ found some utterance. For this we may refer to the notice of the Anabaptists, under Art. VII. We may further illustrate it by some lamentable occurrences in the reign of Edward VI. These will show how strong was the hold on men's minds of the persecuting principles of the middle ages. It was perceived to be an intolerable wrong that the Gospel should be resisted. But it was held to be the inviolable duty of the civil ruler to punish blasphemy with death, according to the precepts of the Mosaic law and the example of the Jewish sovereigns. The taunts of Romanists quickened zeal in this matter. The Reformers were anxious to clear themselves of any complicity with those who in any way denied the Saviour. Thus we read of sundry heretics being brought before Cranmer, Latimer, and others, sitting as the King's Commissioners, and being compelled to recant. [Strype's *Cranmer*, book ii. ch. viii.] A more terrible example is the death of Joan Bocher who was burnt by warrant of the Council of Regency. Latimer [*Remains*, p. 114.] gives an account of her, evidently without the slightest misgiving on his own part or that of his hearers that the

slightest wrong had been committed in dealing with her. 'I told you,' says he, 'the last time, of one Joan of Kent, which was in this foolish opinion, that she should say our Saviour was not very Man, and had not received flesh of His mother Mary, and yet she could show no reason why she should believe so. Her opinion was this. The Son of God, said she, penetrated through her, as through a glass, taking no substance of her. But our Creed teacheth us contrariwise.' Two others likewise suffered for a similar reason. And in like manner it is notorious that Servetus was put to death at Geneva, how far with the cooperation of Calvin is disputed. If the Romanists, like ourselves, had been led to repudiate and detest this mode of casting out false doctrine, such instances as these (however few, comparatively speaking) would prevent our reproaching them on this score. Our just ground of indignant rebuke is this, that all the authoritative utterances of their Church down to the encyclical of the present Pope maintain the right of persecution for the sake of religion, and complain of their present state as one of discouragement and oppression because the civil power no longer enforces the ecclesiastical domination.

Observations on Article II.

For reasons already stated, we shall again recur to *Pearson on the Creed* for the exposition of this Article, and as far as possible confine ourselves to his treatment of the several doctrines it contains. We may conveniently break up the Article into these principal sections: –

I. The Deity and Sonship of the Second Person of the Trinity.
II. The Incarnation.
III. The Nature of the Person of the Incarnate Son.
IV. The sufferings of Christ.
V. The purpose of those sufferings.

I. *The Deity and Sonship of the Second Person of the Trinity*.

It has already been needful, in commenting on the first Article, to prove that the Son is very God, and of one substance with the Father. It was also shown that the mode of communicating the divine essence from the Father is such as to make the Second Person of the Trinity properly the Son of God. 'For,' says Pearson, 'the most proper generation which we know is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced.... But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same divine essence by which He is God; and consequently He is of the same nature with Him and thereby the same image and similitude of Him, and therefore His proper Son.'

The Arians of old, though they allowed the ineffable dignity of the Son of God, yet allowed not this communication of the divine essence which makes the Son properly ομοούσιος, of the *same* substance with the Father. They maintained that he is ανόμοιος, *unlike* in substance; while the semi-Arians were willing to go a step further and to acknowledge that He is ομοιούσιος, *similar* in substance to the Father. The Arians also asserted the formula ην πότε ότε ουκ ην, *there was a time when He was not*. We maintain, therefore, the true and proper communication of the divine nature of the Son, and we now further assert that *He was begotten from everlasting of the Father*. Upon this we again quote Pearson (Art. II. § 3): 'In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation or decision of part of the substance of the parent. But this decision includeth imperfection because it supposeth a substance divisible and consequently corporeal. Whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore His nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself. It is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality wholly to be

removed when we speak of Him who inhabiteth eternity; the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate, being always Father, as always God. Animals, when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolifical; in God eternal perfection showeth His eternal fecundity. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man because, though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence: the power of generation depending on the first prolifical benediction, 'Increase and multiply' it must be made by way of multiplication, and thus every son becomes another man. But the divine essence being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is communicated so as not to be multiplied; insomuch that He which proceedeth by that communication hath not only the same nature but is also the same God.'

Nothing need be added to this clear and masterly theological statement of the proper divinity and eternal generation of the Son of God.

II. *The Incarnation.*

This portion of the doctrine before us corresponds to the third Article of the Apostles' Creed: 'Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.' In the second section of that Article Pearson considers the action of the Holy Ghost in the conception and lays down these positions: –

1. The action of the Spirit *excludes* all human agency, even that of the Virgin herself, as the *cause* of the conception. This appears from passages in the gospels describing what took place previously to the birth.

2. What this action of the Spirit *includes* cannot further be defined from the words of Scripture than to say whatever 'was necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother' must be attributed to the Holy Spirit. But this did not involve any communication of the substance of the Holy Ghost which is uncreated. The flesh of Christ was not formed of any substance but that of the Virgin.

Further, under the third section of the same Article, it is shown from the testimony of Scripture that in accordance with prophecy Mary was a virgin at the time of the birth of our Lord and that her maternity involves of necessity these three things:

1. The reality of the conception of the real substance of our Saviour in her womb and of her substance.
2. The reality of the growth from her substance in her womb of that which was so conceived.
3. That what was so conceived and grew was brought forth by her with a true and proper nativity.

III. *The Nature and the Person of the Incarnate Son.*

The consideration of this in Pearson falls chiefly under Art. III. § 1, 'Who was conceived.' In this part of Pearson's treatise we find statements to the following effect: He who was conceived and born partook of the same human nature which is in all men. He is often called man. A parallel is drawn between Him and Adam. He is the seed of Eve, of Abraham, of David. Being thus truly man, His manhood consisted of body and soul. The body was real, for Scripture speaks of its growth, nutrition, and sufferings. The soul was a rational human soul, for He increased in *wisdom* as well as in *stature* which is impossible for the Godhead. Moreover, He experienced the various human affections and sorrows whose seat is in the soul. And He commended this human spirit to His Father at the moment of death.

This opposes the heresy of the Apollinarians who held that though Jesus had a human body and animal soul, yet in Him the divine Logos was a substitute for the spiritual part of man (the νους or ψυχη λογαή). [Neander, *Hist*. Vol. iv. p. 119.]

Next it is maintained that in this incarnation there is no conversion of one nature into the other nor any confusion between them. There is no confusion or mixture of the two natures, for otherwise a third something would result which would be neither God nor man. The affections and infirmities of

our nature could not belong to such a being. Moreover, the Godhead being indivisible in *substance*, a confusion of substance must intermix the Father also.

Further, the divine cannot be converted into the human nature, for the uncreated Godhead cannot be created or made.

Nor can the human nature be converted into the divine as the Eutychians and other Monophysites taught.

Finally, it is concluded that, though different actions and qualities are attributed in Holy Scripture to Christ, some which belong to the divine and some to the human nature, yet they must all be attributed to *one and the same Person*. Otherwise there would be two Christs, two Mediators, contrary to the spirit as well as the language of all Scripture.

Hence we confess in this present Article of our Church (against the Nestorians of old), that the two natures *were joined together in one Person*.

One more topic falls under this head. The Article further asserts that the two natures in Christ are 'never to be divided.' In the first place, Pearson [*Creed*, Art. IV. § 4.] argues that they were not divided when the Lord Jesus died because God 'doth never subtract His grace from any without their abuse of it and a sinful demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.' And further [Ibid. Art. VI. § 2.], while it is granted from 1 Cor. 15:24, 28, that the mediatorial kingdom shall cease when its work shall be finally completed, 'yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a king or lose any of the power and honour which before He had.... The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever' (Rev. 11:15); not only to the modificated eternity of His mediatorship, so long as there shall be need of regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect, *but also to the complete eternity of the duration of His humanity, which for the future is coeternal with His divinity*.'

IV. *The Sufferings of Christ*.

These we find summed up by our Article in these words of the Creed, '*Who truly suffered*, was crucified, dead, and buried.' A slight abstract of some portions of the fourth Article of *Pearson on the Creed* will bring out the principal theological points belonging to this section. The Person who suffered is distinctly *one*, the Son of God. But *the nature in which* He suffered is as distinctly the human and not the divine. For the two natures are united 'not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.' The nature of the Deity is in itself '*impassibilis*' (Art. I.), incapable of suffering. It follows, therefore, that the union of the divine nature with the human nature in Christ does not modify the divine nature so as to make it capable of suffering.

The intimate conjunction of the two natures in Christ has led divines to the use of language which attributes to that *one Person* the attributes which properly belong to *one only* of the *two unified natures*. Such a transfer of language is called in theological language '*communicatio idiomatum*'. Thus it is said that the Son of God suffered. Yet He suffered in that He was man, not in that He was God. Or, *vice versa*, we may say that Christ is omnipresent. Yet he is so as God, not as man. Still, properly speaking, the *one Person*, the Son of God, is omnipresent. But if we permit this mode of speech to confuse our thoughts, we shall fall into some shape of Monophysite error. Some such error pervades all systems of consubstantiation and transubstantiation. For they not only claim that *the Person*, the Son of God, is present, but that His human nature has acquired (in some sense) the omnipresence of the divine nature.

The sufferings of the human nature of Christ consist in the bodily suffering before the crucifixion which are spoken of in so many parts of the gospels; and in the anguish of soul, including emotions of fear, sorrow, and other pains, endured during His whole life, and more especially in Gethsemane; and, finally in the acerbity and ignominy of the cross itself.

With regard to the *death* of Christ, the chief theological points are its certainty and the description of that wherein it consisted.

That Jesus did '*truly* die' is asserted from the testimony of His worst enemies, of nature itself, and of the water and blood which flowed from His wounded side.

Death in Him consisted in the same fact as in other men – the separation of the soul from the body. This appears from the expressions of the Evangelists who describe His death. For this there was an adequate cause in the anguish, bodily and spiritual, which He endured.

It must further be understood that His death was *voluntary* (John 10:18), in the sense that of His own will He submitted Himself to that which would cause death. It was *involuntary* in the sense that without divine interposition the human frame subjected to such anguish must suffer dissolution; and also that He did not anticipate the natural moment of death. Otherwise the actual death itself would not have been the deed of His enemies, but His own.

The fact of the *burial* of our Lord, omitting the circumstances relating to it recorded in Scripture, may here be chiefly noticed as sealing the truth of His death.

V. *The Purpose of the Sufferings of Christ.*

'To reconcile His Father to us and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of man.'

It will be noticed that the doctrine here set forth is the more abstract one of the *general* nature and purport of Christ's sufferings; not the particular and individual one of the application of the merit of those sufferings to a sinful soul. This latter will find its place further on under the Articles on sin, justification, &c.

And it is also this more general view of the subject that Pearson chiefly treats [*Creed*, Art. X.] when commenting on the clause 'The forgiveness of sins.' Pearson there deduces from the consideration of many passages of Scripture that the forgiveness of sins promised to us 'containeth in it a reconciliation of an offended God, and a satisfaction to a just God: it containeth a reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.' There are the two particulars of the present section of or Article.

On the first of these two points, 'The reconciliation of His Father to us,' Pearson proceeds thus: 'Christ by His death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that He hath done so we are assured because He, which before was angry with us, on the consideration of Christ's death becomes propitious to us and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. For we "are justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood" (Rom.3:24–25). "We have an Advocate with the Father, and He is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:1). For God "loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10). It is evident, therefore, that Christ did render God propitious unto us by His blood (that is, His sufferings unto death), who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before He determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God, who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in Him upon the lapse of man is wrath and indignation. God, therefore, was most certainly offended before He gave a Redeemer; and though it be most true that He "so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" (John 3:16), yet there is no incongruity in this, that a father should be offended with that son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding, therefore, that God loved men whom He created, yet He was offended with them when they sinned, and gave His Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them. This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; for "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 5:18), and that by virtue of His death, for "when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10).'

This doctrine needs close attention in the present day when much is made of what Pearson calls 'the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God, but God is never said to be reconciled unto us.' He shows from the language of Scripture in many instances (e.g. 1 Cor. 7:11), that to be reconciled to a person implies that person becoming favourable to the other. We turn to the second part of the present section – the death of Christ viewed as a sacrifice for all sin.

The definition of sin based on 1 John 3:4 given in Pearson is this: 'Whatsoever is done by man or is in man, having any contrariety to the law of God, is sin.' And after including in this definition all acts of omission or commission contrary to God's law, and 'every evil habit contracted in the soul', he says that 'any corruption or inclination in the soul to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever much corruption and inclination came into the soul, whether by an act of his own will *or by an act of the will of another* is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the law of God.'

Sin thus regarded manifestly comprehends under one term the double expression of our present Article, 'original guilt' and 'actual sins or men'. For sin in this comprehensive sense, Christ's death was a sacrifice. In proof of this Pearson alleges many passages of Scripture such as these which may be easily multiplied: 'Once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself' (Heb. 9:26); 'He was delivered for our offences' (Rom. 4:25); 'He died for our sins according to the Scriptures' (1 Cor 15:3). Pearson further shows how the life of Christ was laid down as a price: 'Ye are bought with a price' (1 Cor. 6:20); 'We are not redeemed with corruptible things ... but with the precious blood of Christ' (1 Pet. 1:18–19). 'Now, as it was the blood of Christ, so it was a price given by way of compensation: and as that blood was precious, so it was a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented and increaseth according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price, and dignity of that which is given by way of compensation is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite majesty, against whom we have sinned; and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave His life a ransom for sinners; for God "hath purchased *His Church* with His own blood" (Acts 20:28). Although, therefore, God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet He is never said to remit the price without which we had never been redeemed; neither can He be said to have remitted it because He did require it and receive it.'

Before we dismiss this important Article, which deals with the very foundation of the Christian hope, a few words of caution may be needful. That side of the atonement which looks towards God rather than towards man is confessedly mysterious. In other words, any doctrinal statement is so which seeks to answer the question, 'Why God required and accepts the atonement on man's behalf' rather than the practical question, 'How man may obtain the benefit of that atonement.'

On that mysterious side, the analogy of revelation will not permit us to expect more information than may satisfy us that God's attributes are really united in the mode of salvation He has provided. The origin of evil, its permitted existence, the extent to which it has permeated the whole of human nature, and, as Scripture intimates, spiritual regions of unknown amplitude besides, are appalling, and to us unintelligible subjects. They render it absolutely impossible for us to attempt to account for the present immense scope and sway of evil in the universe of God. We may further consider that to prevent its grosser and more ruinous manifestations in human society is the very utmost which the effort of man has attained, and scarcely attained; and that the absolute conquest of evil in a single human heart has never yet been accomplished. Hence we may well hesitate in presuming to judge of the means by which it has pleased God to deal with this gigantic enemy initially for the present, and completely, as He has intimated to us, in the future. The dealing of God with sin, whether through His attribute of Love or of Justice is therefore beyond human criticism. The past and the future are alike beyond our ken. The subjection or destruction of evil in the establishment of the great kingdom of God that is to be will be accomplished, but we cannot judge of the necessary means. Meanwhile we

are able to say that Christianity, of which the atonement is the animating principle, has in point of fact proved itself the most powerful agent yet known in overcoming sin.

But if all this is undeniable, it is manifest that great caution is needed in stating the doctrine of the atonement. It is in theology as a science, as it is in other sciences. In astronomy the results of multitudinous observations give certain facts which must be all accounted for and included in any theory of the science which claims acceptance. In theology each passage of Scripture is a fact; and the undoubtedly ascertained qualities of man's nature are other facts. Any doctrinal theory, in order to be true, must unite in itself, and take account of, all these facts. If it fails to unite them (within those limits which are possible to man), it is not a true doctrine. If the results of our induction, carefully conducted, lead to two apparently conflicting doctrines, it does not follow of necessity that either is false. For example, the free will of man, to such an extent at least as to make him responsible, is an unquestionable fact of Scripture and experience. The foreknowledge of God and his universal sovereignty are necessary deductions of reason and clear assertions of Scripture. Perfectly to reconcile these with man's free will may be impossible. This need not distress us when we have carefully followed our facts to the verge of the infinite or the unknown. There we must leave them, and we need have little difficulty in feeling assured that the missing facts which would reconcile the apparent contradictions in our deductions lie within, and probably not many steps within, the dark margin in which we pause.

Turning again to the doctrine of the atonement, the greatest care is needed in so stating it that the justice of the Father shall not seem in stern opposition to the love of the Son. The popular opposition to the doctrine of the present Article is mainly fostered either by the incaution of the orthodox divine in so apparently stating it, or else by the misapprehension of disingenuousness of the opponent so invidiously expressing it. We need not particularize names. With varying degrees of refinement or of coarseness, the great doctrine of the atonement is travestied. It is profanely represented as a tyrannical wrath seeking satisfaction with a blind fury, and mitigated at length by exhausting itself even on an innocent victim. If divines of some considerable reputation can be found to make such misrepresentations as this, it behoves us to be very careful in our statements. And the point of all others to be wary upon is that which Pearson (above, p. 19) presses, that God infinitely loved the Son whom He gave, and man for whom He gave the Son. His justice was offended, and yet He did not cease to love. Let us gather together briefly the facts from which we are to make our induction. If any fact of experience be manifest, this is. There are marks of divine wrath and punishment visible everywhere throughout the whole history of man. [See Butler, part i. chaps. ii. iii.] There are also visible in the world everywhere signs of divine love and care for God's creatures. So also in Scripture there are unquestionable declarations of divine wrath against all unrighteousness of man. There are also most gracious declarations of divine love and care for man. These are our facts, equally unquestionable in nature and in revelation. Any theory which fails to embrace both the wrath and the love must be false. Any theory which either ignores one of these, or so deals with both as to rend them apart, is untrue to the unity and perfection of God, and must be false. The great doctrine of the atonement, truly stated, embraces and harmonises both, so far as we are competent to follow it. It is not that coarse idea of God's justice rent away from his love, seeking a victim and finding it in Christ. God is *One*. He is not made up of conflicting and contending attributes. But His perfection can only be described to us under different names varying with the action of the divine Will. Towards sin it has the nature of Justice, and can only be described by that name. And yet this is only another phase of that infinite perfection which, looked at another way, is Love, verily such in name and in nature. Thus the atonement may be truly described as God's justice receiving satisfaction according the full measure of the demands of an infinite wrong. It may also be as truly and more fully described as the last inconceivable effort of Infinite Love. Sin had produced an apparently irretrievable breach between God and man. There was not put forth a destructive vengeful effort of Infinite Power. At least not yet. But instead, Infinite Love, with Infinite Self-Sacrifice, gave *itself*. He who thinks that he is competent to gage and define

all the results in the spiritual world of such a transaction as this is confident indeed. We are content to believe that it will take eternity to unfold them.

We may observe, finally, that Pearson's mode of stating this doctrine has something of an antique hardness. The present Archbishop of York, therefore, warns us [*Aids to Faith*, VIII. ii. 10.] that in this mode of treatment 'there is the danger lest the atonement degenerate into a transaction between a righteous Father on the one side, and a loving Saviour on the other, because in the human transaction from which the analogy is drawn two distinct parties are concerned; whereas in the plan of salvation one Will operates, and in the Father and the Son alike Justice and Love are reconciled.' The student who desires to meet some modern phases of this doctrine may read with instruction the essay of the archbishop above referred to. And it is scarcely necessary to remind him, that in Butler's *Analogy* [Part ii. ch. v.] he will find the *a priori* objections against the appointment of a Mediator and the satisfaction wrought by Christ effectually parried, and the right place which human reason may occupy in relation to the divine action accurately defined. The Thirty-first Article returns to the subject of Christ's death as the sacrifice for sin, and the subject will there receive some further notice.

ARTICLE III.

Of the going down of Christ into Hell.	*De descensu Christi ad Inferos.*
As Christ died for us, and was buried: so also it is to be believed that he went down into Hell.	Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad Inferos descendisse.

Notes on the Text of Article III.

The present Article consists of the first clause only of the original Article of 1552. In that formula these words followed: 'For the body lay in the sepulcher until the resurrection; but His Ghost, departing from Him (*ab illo emissus*), was with the ghosts that were in prison or in hell (*in carcere sive in inferno*), and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.' It must be confessed that we are happily freed from the obligation of maintaining such a comment on that passage.

It appears that controversy had been very busy with this Article. Hence the necessity was felt for stating it in more general terms. Foreign controversies in the time of Edward VI are spoken of in a letter of Micronius to Bullinger, 1550. [*Original Letters*, p. 561: Parker Society.] 'The Churches of Bremen and the rest are strengthening themselves; but ... they are disputing about the descent of Christ into hell, and about the allowance or prohibition of things indifferent. Marvellous is the subtlety of antichrist in weakening the Churches of Christ!' The diocese of Exeter also was harassed with controversy on this subject, as appears from a paper presented to Convocation in 1562 by the bishop of that diocese: [Strype's *Annals*, ch. xxxi.] 'There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers, one against the other, and also partakers with them; some holding that the going down of Christ His soul to hell was nothing else but the virtue and strength of Christ His death, to be made manifest and known to them that were dead before. Others say ... Thus your wisdoms may perceive what tragedies and dissensions may arise from consenting to or dissenting from this Article.' That this was not limited to the West or soon appeased is gathered also from a letter of Secretary Cecil to Archbishop Parker, 1567: [Strype's *Parker*, book iii. ch. xviii.]

'It may please your grace to receive my humble thanks for your care taken in the discreet advice given to me concerning the appeasing of the unprofitable rash controversy newly raised upon the Article of the Descent of Christ into Hell.'

Observations on Article III.

If the space or subject of this work allowed the discussion, it is manifest from what has been so far said that there is abundant scope for investigation into some of the darker passages of Scripture, and for statements of conflicting opinions. But we may well dismiss the greater part of these with the verdict above quoted from the great Cecil, 'unprofitable and rash.' We shall be content as before to give an account of Bishop Pearson's discussion of this Article of the Creed.

Three passages, says Pearson, are usually quoted as the basis of this doctrine. First, Eph. 4:9. There are such conflicting interpretations of the expression in that text, '*the lower parts of the earth*' (τα κατώτερα μερη της γης), that it cannot be relied upon as a proof.

2. 1 Pet. 3:19 has been interpreted of a local descent of the soul of Christ to preach to the souls in hell. Pearson rejects this as encompassed with difficulties. He takes the meaning to be that Christ by His Spirit spoke to the disobedient in Noah's days, as in all other times of the world.

3. It remains that Acts 2:26–27 be accepted as the basis of this Article. For if His soul was not left in hell (Hades), and was not there before His death, it must have descended there after His death. The question, therefore, resolves itself into the interpretation of this passage. We shall have to ask what that hell (Hades) was, and how He descended thither.

Pearson then proceeds to give some account of the principal varieties of opinion which have been advanced on this subject and which may be thus condensed: –

1. Durandus (an early schoolman) held that it was not a local descent, but one of efficacy and influence.

2. Calvin, Beza, and others maintained that Christ actually suffered the torments of the damned to save men from them. This is denied on the sufficient ground that remorse, despair, alienation from God were far from Him.

3. Some have taken it as an expression simply equivalent to *buried*.

4. Others have varied the last by making it signify a *continuance* in the *state* of the dead.

5. The usual opinion is that this Article means that the body having been buried, the soul (as distinguished from the body) was carried into those parts where the souls of men before departed were. In this opinion nearly all the fathers agree. They therefore used this Article of the Creed against the Apollinarians, urging that as the Deity did not descend into hell, Christ must have had a human soul capable of such a descent.

As to the purpose of Christ's descent, the fathers widely differed. But the leading varieties of their opinions may be displayed thus: –

1. He descended to the faithful dead and removed them to a better place.

2. He descended to them, but did not so remove them.

3. He descended to hell in its proper sense and preached the gospel to the souls detained there. It was generally thought heretical to believe (as some did) that He delivered them all. But it was widely held that He delivered some.

Finally, in the middle ages the first of these three prevailed and was stated as an article of faith by the schoolmen with most marvellous elaboration of locality and other particulars. The solid earth was described as the bars of the infernal dungeon; volcanoes, its vent, and their roarings the cries of the damned.

Keeping aloof from profitless speculation about that which has been (not without Divine purpose) concealed from us, we may thus state the end of the descent. Christ bore the condition of a dead man, as He had done that of a living one. His body was laid in the grave. His soul was conveyed to the same receptacles as the souls of other men. He has thus assured His people of His power and presence in death as well as in life.

Finally, we may thus represent the usual simple mode of presenting this subject. We may combine the words of our Lord to the dying thief with the quotation of St. Peter from the Psalms. If the thief

was to be with Him that day in Paradise, and yet He descended into Hades, that part of Hades to which He descended must be the place where the souls of the just await the resurrection.

The Roman Doctrine on the Descent into Hell.

That audacity of assertion which is so marked a character of Roman theology, and which is one of the chief weapons with which it maintains its ground, is well exemplified in its treatment of this doctrine. The Catechism of the Council of Trent (P. I. c. 6) contains the authorized doctrine on this subject.

Q. 2 defines *Hell* as 'those hidden abodes in which are detained the souls that have not obtained heavenly bliss.'

Q. 3 states that this region contains three different receptacles: 1st. 'the most loathsome and dark prison in which the souls of the damned, together with the unclean spirits, are tortured in eternal and inextinguishable fire;' 2nd. 'the fire of purgatory in which the souls of the just are purified by punishment for a stated time;' 3rd. the 'receptacle (commonly called *Limbus patrum*) in which were received the souls of the saints who died before the coming of Christ our Lord; and where, without any sense of pain, sustained by the blessed hope of redemption, they enjoyed a tranquil abode. The souls, then, of those pious men who in the bosom of Abraham were expecting the Saviour, Christ the Lord liberated, descending into hell.'

Q. 5, scarcely in consistency with the preceding, asserts that Christ 'liberated from the *miserable wearisomness* of that captivity the holy and the just.'

Q. 6 further dilates upon the same subject, 'Christ descended into hell in order that, having seized the spoils of the devil, he might conduct into heaven those holy fathers and the other just souls liberated from prison.... His august presence at once brought a glorious luster upon the captives and filled their souls with boundless joy and gladness. Unto them He also imparted that supreme happiness which consists in the vision of God.'

ARTICLE IV.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.	*De resurrectione Christi.*
Christ did truly arise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature, wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day.	Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanae naturae pertinentibus, recepit: cum quibus in coelum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

Notes on the Text of Article IV.

The Latin text presents no points of sufficient consequence to be noted. No special sources are suggested for this Article. It is possible that some doctrinal follies of Anabaptists may have been in the view of its writers; but the obvious necessity of enunciating a complete faith in Christ would in any case have required the statement now before us.

Observations on Article IV.

This Article is so manifestly a recapitulation of a portion of the Creed that nothing need be added to a sketch of the treatment by Bishop Pearson of this portion of the Christian faith. [*Creed* Art. V. § 2.] He first shows from prophecy that the Messiah was to rise again, and enumerates varied testimonies

from Scripture to the *fact* of Christ's resurrection. Then follows the definition of a resurrection thus stated – 'A substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again.' For a resurrection must be distinguished from a creation or a mere alteration of state. A resurrection can only be predicated of a rational being who can retain personal identity. The reunion of the same soul to the same body, in all that is requisite to secure that personal identity, is a perfect and proper resurrection. It must be noted that Pearson in the above definition does not forget that Christ's body 'saw no corruption' (Acts 2:31). For he further defines 'the separation of the rational soul from its body to be the corruption of a man.'

In the sense above stated Christ did properly rise. He had a *real* body; for He said, 'Handle me and see.' He had the *same* body; for He offered His wounds to be examined. The *animal* soul was present; for He ate before the disciples. The *sensitive* part was there: He conversed, he saw, He heard. The *rational* soul was present: he reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. It was the *same* soul; for the Deity was united to human nature in one man only. And the conjunction of the Godhead with the risen body of Jesus is manifest from His display of divine power after the resurrection. It thus appears that Christ did truly rise again from the dead with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature and with His own body.

The ascension which follows next in the Article will in like manner refer us to Pearson. [*Creed*, Art. VI. § 1.] Having shown from type and prophecy that the Messiah was to ascend, he asserts that Christ ascended into heaven neither metaphorically nor figuratively by virtue of the hypostatic union, but actually by a local transfer of the human nature (body and soul), which was upon earth, into heaven. In testimony of this it was necessary that the ascension should be *visible*, because the ascended body disappeared. Accordingly we have the testimony of the apostles (Acts 1:9–10), and of angels (Acts 1:10–11). Further it is asserted that He ascended into that which in the most eminent sense is called *heaven*, as appears from many passages (e.g. Heb. 4:14; Eph. 4:10).

The session 'at the right hand of God' is the next doctrine contained in this Article. This is treated by Pearson in the following manner [*Creed*, Art. V. § 2.]:

The *fact* that Christ was thus enthroned at the right hand of God is asserted frequently in Scripture (e.g. Mark 16:19; Eph. 1:20). This was convenanted to none but the Messiah (Heb. 1:13). The session itself is shown not to refer necessarily to a corporeal posture; but chiefly to imply rest, dominion, majesty, and judicial power. It, therefore, imports the entry of the Messiah into His full dominion. The place, *the right hand of God*, is not named in our Article but is necessarily implied. It is interpreted as conveying no corporeal position since God is a Spirit, but as signifying power, honour, and the place of highest felicity.

That this session shall continue until the judgment day is asserted by the word *until*. This appears from many passages of Scripture (e.g. 1 Cor. 15:25, 28; Acts 3:21; 1 Thess. 4:16).

Lastly, the return to judgment is the subject of the Seventh Article of Pearson *On the Creed*. The principal points of doctrine there elaborated are these: – That Christ shall return is declared frequently in the New Testament (e.g. Acts 1:11), as it is also stated that His purpose then shall be judgment.

The propriety of the judgment being committed to Him appears from these considerations: – It is a part of His exaltation, the reward of His sufferings and obedience (John 5:22–23). The Judge will thus be *visible*. He will know human infirmities by His own experience.

The judicial action itself is sparingly described. But it involves the eternal disposal of the souls and bodies of all persons. As to the *manner*, we can only say that it is represented to us under judicial terms. A judgment seat is spoken of (2 Cor. 5:10). A personal appearance of all before the tribunal (Rev. 20:12); the manifestation of all thoughts and actions (1 Cor. 4:5); a definitive sentence (Matt. 25:34, 41); execution of the sentence (Matt. 25:46) are among the judicial particulars set forth in Scripture.

That this judgment shall take place *at the last day*, the very closing hour of this dispensation, is manifest from every consideration of its nature and purpose; and further is clearly declared – 2 Pet. 3:7 – which predicts the destruction of the existing frame of heaven and earth at the time of the judgment.

ARTICLE V.

Of the Holy Ghost.	*De Spiritu Sancto.*
The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.	Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiae, majestatis, et gloriae, verus ac aeternus Deus.

Notes on the Text of Article V.

The Latin text is closely coincident with the English. No verbal comment is required on either.

This Article is not found amongst those of 1552; it was added in the time of Elizabeth. It is said by Hardwick to have been borrowed from the Wurtemberg Confession presented to the Council of Trent in 1552.

The observation made under other Articles may be repeated. It is obviously essential to such a code of doctrine as this that the truth about the nature of the Holy Ghost should be declared. But it is also certain (omitting mention of the ancient Macedonians) that in the age of the Reformation there were some Anabaptists, also the elder Socinus and others, [Mosheim, *Cent. XVI.* iii. part ii. ch. iv. § 3.] who denied the personality of the Holy Ghost.

Observations on Article V.

This Article defines the nature and Person of the Holy Spirit; it does not speak of His office in dealing with the Church or individuals. It may be divided into two principal sections – the procession of the Holy Ghost, and His divine nature. We were compelled to anticipate the latter of these in commenting on the First Article. The procession of the Holy Ghost now remains for consideration.

The history of this doctrine may be briefly recapitulated. The original form of the Nicene, or rather the Constantinopolitan, Creed declared that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father (εκ του Πατρος εκπορευόμενον). At the close of the sixth century the words *and from the Son* were added by the Provincial Council of Toledo in Spain. Thence the clause appears to have gradually found its way into Gaul, in portions of which kindred Gothic races were settled. Nearly two hundred years afterwards, this dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, as well as from the Father, found a strenuous supporter in Charlemagne. He called a council of his own bishops at Frankfort in which this doctrine was affirmed, and the Pope was afterwards addressed on the subject of the defect of the Creed on this important matter. The Pope declined to make any change in the Creed. Nor, so far as can be clearly ascertained, was the alteration ever made officially and authoritatively. Gradually and stealthily the change spread. About the year 1014 it had established itself in Rome and was adopted in the Pontifical services.

The opposition called forth in the Eastern Church is well known. The presumption of the Western portion of the Church in venturing to alter the Creed confirmed by all the great General Councils, added to the assumptions of the Pope, made the great schism between the East and the West which has never been closed. It has perhaps been a divine mercy that in the midst of so general a corruption of Christian doctrine the Papal tyranny should have thus received a check; and that a perpetual protest should have been made against it by a Church scarcely purer than itself in point of doctrine.

Nothing could well be more unsatisfactory than the mode in which this additional clause found its way into the Creed. Nevertheless we see that it is distinctly affirmed by the Church of England; and the fact of its truth, or otherwise, is quite distinct from any particular time or mode of its promulgation.

We turn, therefore, as before to Pearson's treatment of this doctrine. [*Creed*, Art. VIII.] The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father is confessed by both parties and is commonly taken to be expressly declared in John 15:26 (ο παρα του Πατρος εκπορεύεται). This is also said to be evident on this ground. 'Since the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from Him.'

The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son is said to be 'virtually contained' in the Scripture. 'Because those very expressions, which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because He proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason *presupposed* in reference to the Son which is *expressed* in reference to the Father.' In proof of this it is shown that the Holy Ghost is equally called the Spirit of *God* (e.g. 1 Cor. 2:11–12) and the Spirit of *Christ* (e.g. Rom. 8:9). Again it is urged that the Holy Ghost is said to be sent by the Father (John 14:26) and by the Son (John 15:26). Hence a parity of relation is said to follow. 'The Father is never sent by the Son because he received not the Godhead from Him; but the Father sendeth the Son because He communicated the Godhead to Him. In the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit. But both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost because the divine nature common to both the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, the Scriptures declare *expressly* that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also *virtually* teach that He proceedeth from the Son.'

PART II.
THE RULE OF FAITH.

6. Of the Sufficiency of the Scriptures.
7. Of the Old Testament.
8. Of the Three Creeds.

ARTICLE VI.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

1. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of faith, or be thought requisite* necessary to salvation.

* So in copy of 1571, collated by Hardwick. Some insert *as*; the common text inserts *or*.

In the name of Holy Scripture we understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

De divines Scripturis, quod sufficiant ad salutem.

Scriptura sacra continet omnia, quae ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam Articulus fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur.

Sacrae Scripturae nomine, eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate, in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth,
The I. Book of Samuel, The II. Book of Samuel,
The I. Book of Kings, The II. Book of Kings,
The I. Book of Chronicles, The II. Book of Chronicles,
The I. Book of Esdras, The II. Book of Esdras,
The Book of Esther, The Book of Job,
The Psalms, The Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes, or Preacher,
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,
IV. Prophets the greater,
XII. Prophets the less.

De nominibus et numero librorum sacrae Canonicae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti.

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteron,
Josuae, Judicum, Ruth,
Prior liber Samuelis, Secundus liber Samuelis,
Prior liber Regum, Secundus liber Regum,
Prior liber Paralipom., Secundus liber Paralipom.,
Primus liber Esdrae, Secundus liber Esdrae,
Liber Hester, Liber Job,
Psalmi, Proverbis,
Ecclesiastes vel Concionator,
Cantica Solomonis,
IV. Prophetae Majores,
XII. Prophetae Minores.

And the other Books (as *Hierome* saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:	*Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia, ad exempla vitar, et formandos mores: illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet, ut sunt*
The III. Book of Esdras, The IV. Book of Esdras,	Tertius liber Esdrae, Quartus liber Esdrae,
The Book of Tobias, The Book of Judith,	Liber Tobiae, Liber Judith,
The rest of the Book of Esther,	Reliquum libri Hester,
The Book of Wisdom, Jesus the son of Sirach,	Liber Sapientiae, Liber Jesu filii Sirach,
Baruch the Prophet,	Baruch propheta,
The Song of the Three Children,	Canticum trium puerorum,
The Story of Susanna, Of Bel and the Dragon,	Historia Susannae, De Bel et Dracone,
The Prayer of Manasses,	Oratio Manassis,
The I. Book of Maccabees,	Prior liber Machabeorum,
The II. Book of Macabees.	Secundus liber Machabeorum.
All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.	Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus, et habemus pro Canonicis.

Notes on the Text of Article VI.

1. The Latin text is in close accordance with the English and needs no elucidation.

2. The enumeration of the Canonical books in this Article is as distinct as the assertion that they are to be accepted as the sole ground for the belief of all Articles of the Faith. But when we proceed to the basis of their canonicity here stated, we find ourselves by no means free from difficulty. We cannot allow that any distinction is intended between those Canonical books which constitute Holy Scripture and the Canonical books generally as some have suggested. Holy Scripture and the Canonical books are obviously one and the same. We have, therefore, as the definition of a Canonical book, one 'of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.' How is this to be understood? It is well known that doubts were entertained by some Churches in the first three centuries as to the canonicity of several books of the New Testament. Accordingly they have been divided into the two classes derived from a passage in Eusebius: ομολογούμενα, those generally received, and αντιλεγόμενα, those disputed by some Churches or individuals. The latter class consisted of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, the Second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of St. John, and the Apocalypse. An account of this may be found in any introduction to the New Testament. [See also Paley's *Evidences*, c. ix. § 8.] The distinction was equally familiar in the age of the Reformation. The Lutheran and Calvinistic divines freely discussed it; and in our own country Tyndale (to go no further) noticed it in his prologues. What, then, was meant by the definition of a Canonical book in our Article? Some have thought that *the Church* here means the Church of England, as it does in some passages in the Formularies. This is scarcely probable and leads to no result of any value. It seems more likely that our Reformers were distinguishing here between the Church Catholic and particular portions or members of it. These last have often expressed doubts about the authority of certain portions of the Word; but the Church as a whole, so far as its collective judgment and general practice can be gathered, never doubted or varied the Canon. If this be so, our Church has given us as exact a definition of a Canonical book as probably could be conveyed in a few words. But the Church of the first three centuries never pronounced, or had an opportunity of pronouncing, its judgment on the subject. Hence the historical demonstration of the Canon of Scripture consists, in point of fact, of a collection of the testimony of individual divines and Churches to the reception of the several books from the first age of Christianity downwards. The hesitation of

some as to a few of the books has been always justly thought to give the greater value to the final and all but general consent of the whole body. So that the less learned reader may rest satisfied with the result briefly and somewhat boldly expressed in our Article, that there has been unanimity from the first as to the authority of every portion of Holy Scripture. Not that every book came at once into the possession of every *individual* Church with the full evidence as to its origin. But that after due communication of the several Churches which possessed the original apostolical writings, the whole Church came to a complete and early agreement; and the hesitation which lingered here or there was very partial, arose out of imperfect information, and before long merged in the general consent. Paley remarks upon this: 'When that diversity of opinion which prevailed and prevails among Christians in other points is considered, their concurrence in the Canon of Scripture is remarkable, and of great weight, especially as it seems to have been the result of private and free enquiry.'

The subject may be illustrated by the following precept of Augustine [*De Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 8.]: – 'In Canonical Scriptures you must follow the judgment of the majority of Churches. You will prefer those received by all Catholic Churches to those which are not received by some: but in those which are not universally received, you will prefer those which the major and graver part receive to those which are received by fewer Churches and those of minor authority. And if you find some received by the majority and others received by the more authoritative Churches (though I do not think this case will ever occur), you may regard them as of equal authority.'

3. For the history and meaning of the word *Canon* reference may be made to Appendix A, to Westcott *On the Canon of the New Testament*. Connected with a large family of words of which the English word *cane* is a member, it meant originally any kind of rule used in measuring. It occurs twice in the New Testament (Gal. 6:16 and 2 Cor. 10:13–16). The word was used by the early Fathers generally, and in the fourth century was applied especially (as it still is) to the enactments of Synods. It is first found in the writings of Athanasius as applied to Holy Scripture. Westcott assigns to it a twofold meaning in that connection, viz.: (1) that the Canonical books may be taken as meaning those which are defined to be Holy Scripture by a canon or rule of the Church, or (2) those which themselves are the canon or rule of faith to the Church.

4. The use of the Apocryphal books is defined as being practical only and not doctrinal.

5. The inspiration of Holy Scripture might have naturally found a place among the statements of the Article. But there was no controversy on this head at the time of the Reformation, and thus all reference to it was omitted. It is, however, necessarily implied and assumed throughout the Articles. In particular, the expression 'God's word written' (Art. II.) may be noted.

6. This Article has been considerably altered from the Fifth Article of 1552 which asserted the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation but did not enumerate or define the Canonical books. The clause which defines the Canonical books was derived from the Wurtemburg Confession in 1563.

7. The Ten Articles of Henry VIII, 1536, had defined the rule of faith to be the Bible and the three Creeds, interpreted literally, and as 'the holy approved doctors of the Church do entreat and defend the same.' We need scarcely say that this possesses no authority. It has only *historical* value as showing the progress of doctrine during the successive stages of the Reformation.

The Proof from Scripture.

Passages bearing on this Article may be arranged in the following manner: –

1. *Texts which imply or assert the Inspiration of Scripture, such as these:*

'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God' (2 Tim. 3:16).

'Which He promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures' (Rom. 1:2).

'The oracles of God' (Rom. 3:2).

'One jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled' (Matt. 5:18).

‘The Scripture cannot be broken’ (John 10:35).

‘In the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth’ (1 Cor. 2:13).

‘The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was in my tongue’ (2 Sam. 23:2).

‘Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth’ (Jer. 1:9).

‘Which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before’ (Acts 1:16).

‘If any man shall add, ... and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life,’ &c (Rev. 22:18–19).

‘No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost’ (2 Pet. 1:20–21).

2. *Texts appealing to the Scripture as authoritative; for example:*

‘What things soever the law saith’ (Rom. 3:19).

‘What saith the Scripture?’ (Rom. 4:3).

‘The Scripture saith’ (Rom. 9:17).

‘The Scripture foreseeing’ (Gal. 3:8).

‘That the Scripture might be fulfilled’ (John 19:28, 36).

‘As the Scripture hath said’ (John 7:38).

‘The Scripture must needs have been fulfilled which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before’ (Acts 1:16).

‘Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith’ (Heb. 3:7).

‘David himself said by the Holy Ghost’ (Mark 12:36).

3. *Forms perpetually recurring, such as these:*

‘Thus saith the Lord;’ ‘The Lord hath spoken;’ ‘The voice of the Lord;’ ‘The word of the Lord by the mouth of;’ &c.

4. *Duties which we owe to the Scripture.*

Search the Scriptures (John 5:39).

Meditation therein (Ps. 119:15).

Love (Ps. 119:97).

Obedience (Rom. 16:26).

They must be taught (Deut. 6:7).

They must be used against our spiritual enemies (Eph. 6:17).

5. *Effects of Scripture on the Believer.*

It makes wise unto salvation (2 Tim. 3:15).

It perfects, thoroughly furnishing unto all good works (2 Tim. 3:17).

It converts the soul (1 Pet. 1:23).

It causes growth in grace (1 Pet. 2:2).

It sanctifies (John 17:17).

The Doctrine of the Roman Church.

The doctrine of the Roman Church on the authority of Scripture is laid down in the decree of the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent. The following extracts contain those portions which bear most closely on the present subject.

The Council declared that 'the truth and discipline' given by Christ and His Apostles 'are contained in books written and in unwritten traditions, which having been received from the mouth of Christ Himself by the Apostles, or at the dictation of the Holy Ghost from the Apostles themselves, and transmitted as it were by hand, have come down to us.' That the Council, therefore, 'following the example of the Orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with equal pious affection the books both of the Old and New Testament, and the traditions themselves, whether pertaining to faith or manners, as having been orally dictated by Christ or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by continuous succession in the Church Catholic.'

An enumeration of the Canonical books follows, including a large portion of those which the Church of England pronounces apocryphal. The Council then decrees that the Vulgate shall be taken *pro authentica* in all public services and that no one shall on any pretext presume to reject it. Further, that no one shall dare to interpret Scripture against that sense which holy Mother Church holds, or against the unanimous consent of the Fathers, even if the interpretation is not meant for publication. It next decrees restraints upon printers and the necessity for an edition of the Vulgate to be printed *quam emendatissime*. With respect to use of the Bible by private persons, the Council decreed (*De libris prohibitis*) that 'he who shall presume to read or to have a Bible without a license may not receive absolution until he has surrendered the Bible.' Much stronger expressions have been used by individual popes or divines, but the above is sufficient as setting forth the unquestionable law of the Roman Church.

The Doctrine of the English Church.

This Article draws a great distinction between things necessary for salvation, and things practically beneficial but not essential. This distinction is the main subject of the second book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. He defends it against some extreme Puritans who demanded Scripture authority for every act of life and for all the minutiae of Church order. The concluding paragraph of that book draws the distinguishing line with admirable clearness: – Two opinions there are concerning sufficiency of Holy Scripture, each extremely opposite unto the other and both repugnant unto truth. The schools of Rome teach Scripture to be insufficient as if, except traditions were added, it did not contain all revealed and supernatural truth which absolutely is necessary for the children of men in this life to know, that they may in the next be saved. Others, justly condemning this opinion, grow likewise unto a dangerous extremity, as if Scripture did not only contain all things in that kind necessary, but all things simply, and in such sort that do anything according to any other law were not only unnecessary, but even opposite unto salvation, unlawful, and sinful. Whatsoever is spoken of God or things appertaining to God, otherwise than the truth is, though it seem an honour, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation; so we must likewise take great heed lest, in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed.'

The sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation (as taught in this Article) was a universal article of faith in the first four centuries. This has been abundantly demonstrated by overwhelming collections of quotations from all the primitive writers. The citations in Paley's *Evidences*, chap. ix. §§ 1, 9, are naturally those which first come before the attention of the student. And these will give him a fair impression as to the usual manner in which the authority and use of the Holy Scripture are handled by the Fathers. But a complete and masterly investigation of this subject will be found in the tenth chapter of the *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*, by the late Dean Goode. The general result of that

investigation may be summed up in the following well-known quotation from Augustine: – 'If it is established by the clear authority of the divine Scriptures, those I mean that are called Canonical in the Church, it is to be believed without any doubt. But other witnesses or testimonies which are used to persuade you to believe anything, you may believe or not, just as you shall see that they have or have not any weight giving them a just claim to your confidence.' [*Ad Paulin*. Ep. 147.]

For a further declaration of the mind of the Church of England on this subject the First Homily may be consulted. It is in entire harmony with this Article, as may be inferred from the following citation: – 'Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions devised by men's imaginations for our justification and salvation.'

It is unnecessary to refer to the Confessions of other Protestant Churches as they are notoriously one with the English Church on this head. Much obloquy has been thrown on the word *Protestant* of late as if it were a mere negation implying no positive truth. It may, therefore, be useful as well as interesting to quote the following passage from the original Protest presented to the diet at Spires, 1529, by the Lutheran princes of Germany from which the name Protestant was derived: – 'Seeing that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scripture ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; and that this holy book is, in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding and calculated to scatter the darkness; we are resolved, by the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive teaching of His only Word such as it is contained in the Biblical books of the Old and New Testament without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

'For these reasons we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree in anything that is contrary to God, to His Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spires.' [This decree had given liberty of worship to each German State.]

Those who read this noble Protest and compare the doctrines of the Church of England and the Church of Rome on the rule of faith as given above can say whether the Church of England is Protestant or no. They may also decide whether Protestantism is a bare negation or the assertion of a living principle, the absolute supremacy of the Word of God, and the right of all men to search that Word. Other Articles protest against individual Roman errors. This Article is the fundamental one which stamps the Church of England as essentially PROTESTANT.

The History of the Canon.

The historical testimony to the Canon of the New Testament requires to be stated first. The ninth chapter of Paley's *Evidences* contains a clear summary of that testimony. As this work is required to be read by nearly all theological students, it is judged inadvisable to burden them at this stage with any different arrangement. Paley divides the proof under the following eleven sections: –

I. That the historical books of the New Testament, meaning thereby the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, are quoted or alluded to by a series of Christian writers, beginning with those who were contemporary with the Apostles, or who immediately followed them, and proceeding in close and regular succession from their time to the present.

II. That when they are quoted or alluded to it is with peculiar respect as books *sui generis*; as possessing an authority which belonged to no other books, and as conclusive in all questions and controversies among Christians.

III. That they were in very early times collected into a distinct volume.

IV. That they were distinguished by appropriate names and titles of respect.

V. That they were publicly read and expounded in the religious assemblies of the early Christians.

VI. That commentaries were written upon them, harmonies formed out of them, different copies carefully collated and versions of them made into different languages.

VII. That they were received by Christians of various sects, by many heretics as well as Catholics, and usually appealed to by both sides in the controversies which arose in those days.

VIII. That the four Gospels – the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the First Epistle of St. John, and the First of St. Peter – were received without doubt by those who doubted concerning the other books which are included in our present Canon.

IX. That the Gospels were attacked by the early adversaries of Christianity, as containing the accounts upon which the religion was founded.

X. That formal catalogues of authentic Scriptures were published; in all of which our present sacred histories are included.

XI. That these propositions cannot be affirmed of any other books claiming to be books of Scripture; by which are meant those books which are commonly called Apocryphal of the New Testament.

These eleven 'allegations' are supported by copious quotations from the early writers of Christianity, which Paley has selected from the results of Lardner's investigations. Few memories can retain even specimens for such an array of citations. But Paley's admirable arrangement of the eleven allegations may be remembered. They are capable of being simply stated to any thoughtful person as propositions capable of distinct historical proof. And the unprejudiced mind of such a person will usually acknowledge that if the history of the reception of the Canon of the New Testament rests on such a basis, partial objections and minor difficulties need not disturb his faith. For a more detailed discussion of the whole question, Westcott *On the Canon of the New Testament* may be consulted.

The authority of the New Testament having been thus assumed, the authority of the Old Testament over Christians follows as being proved from the New Testament. Our Lord and His Apostles quote it and refer to it continually as the one absolute authority in all controversy, and they treat it as wholly inspired. This will be found borne out by an examination of their modes of quotation and reference, and the names and epithets which they apply to the Old Testament. No portion is excepted or subordinated. The whole of what was then held by the Jews as Scripture is endorsed; indeed, all the books, except six, are expressly quoted or referred to.

To know, therefore what are the Canonical books of the Old Testament thus received by our Lord, the simple historical enquiry is needed – What books were at that time included in the Jewish Canon? The evidence is most clearly presented in an ascending order: –

1. The Hebrew Canon of the modern Jews is the same as ours.
2. The Talmud, which was in process of compilation from about A.D. 150 to A.D. 600, recognizes the same. There are also Targums belonging to those and earlier times of our Canonical books and of no others.
3. In the fourth century Jerome enumerates the same books as belonging to the Hebrew Canon.
4. In the third century Origen does the same.
5. In the second century Melito, Bishop of Sardis, gives the same testimony.
6. Josephus in the first century speaks of the books as Jerome did. He, moreover, says (evidently alluding to the Apocrypha) that 'books written since Artaxerxes Longimanus had not the same credit as those before that time because the succession of prophets had failed.'
7. Philo's testimony is similar; but not so precise in detail.

Hence it is concluded that what our Lord and the Apostles sanctioned as Holy Scripture was the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament as its books are enumerated in this Article.

But the version in almost universal use in the Early Church was that of the LXX.

This contained the Apocryphal books inserted by Alexandrian Jews.

There was scarcely any knowledge of Hebrew among Christians after the first century, and the *whole* of the LXX was almost indiscriminately quoted in works on this subject that the Church in general, and her leading divines in particular, never lost sight of the distinction between the Canonical and Apocryphal books.

We may now thus sum up our reasons for rejecting the Apocrypha: –

1. We receive the Jewish Scriptures on the authority of Christ and His Apostles.
2. We have seen what books the Jewish Scriptures of that age included.
3. Therefore the Apocrypha stands excluded as being outside that catalogue and, therefore, destitute of that authority.
4. Also (though not without some confusion) it stands excluded by the testimony of the Early Church, and in particular by that of Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Jerome, the Council of Laodicea, &c.

Finally, if in the face of such a weight of primitive testimony the Council of Trent presumed to decree the reception of a large portion of the Apocrypha, it must be deemed the very arrogance of authority.

ARTICLE VII.

Of the Old Testament.	*De Veteri Testamento.*
The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil Precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet not withstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.	Testamentum Vetus Novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in Veteri, quam in Novo, per Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo, aeterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam lex a Deo data per Mosen (quoad caeremonias et ritus) Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant, nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum (quae moralia vocantur) nullus (quantumvis Christianus) est solutus.

Notes on the Text.

1. The Latin is very closely followed in the English version. In the Article of 1552 *non sunt audiendi* was read instead of *male sentiunt*, and the former is still to be seen in the English version, 'they are not to be heard.'

2. The Article obviously consists of two principal sections: –

I. What was the condition upon which salvation was obtained under the Law.

II. How far the Mosaic Law is binding upon Christians.

This question involves the distinction between moral commandments and precepts ceremonial ritual, or civil.

3. This Article combines with some modifications the Sixth and Nineteenth of 1552. As it will throw some light on the subsequent discussion of the doctrines involved and the errors which our Reformers had in view, those Articles are subjoined.

Article VI. (1552).

The Old Testament not to be refused.

The Old Testament is not to be put away as though it were contrary to the New, but is to be kept still; for both in the Old and New Testaments, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

Article XIX. (1552).

All men are bound to keep the Moral Commandments of the Law.

The Law which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the Ceremonies and Rites of the same: Neither is it required that the Civil Precepts and Orders of it should of necessity be received in any common weal: Yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and loose from the obedience of those Commandments which are called Moral. Wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of Whom (they say) they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.

The Proof from Scripture

For the first section of the Article: –

1. Such passages may be alleged from the Old Testament as show that 'the old Fathers' had a hope reaching beyond the grave (e.g. Ps. 16:8–11).

2. Positive declarations made by our Lord about the hope of the Patriarchs (e.g. John 8:56).

3. The demonstration of the doctrine of justification by faith drawn by St. Paul from the Old Testament (e.g. Rom. 4; Gal. 3).

4. The eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

5. The frequent declarations of Christ and the Apostles as to the true bearing of the (Old Testament) Scriptures on gospel times and promises.

The second section of the Article may be dealt with scripturally under such an arrangement as follows: –

1. A consideration of the relation of the civil law to the theocracy of the Old Testament. It relates to a limited country, and to the past condition of a peculiar race. It is not possible for any nation at will to set up a similar theocracy. Therefore, the civil saw which depends upon it cannot be reenacted and enforced.

2. St. Paul teaches obedience to magistrates generally; and to laws, irrespective of any revealed origin. The declaration of our Lord is express – 'My kingdom is not of this world.'

3. St Paul argues in many passages not only that the Christian is free from the Law, but that he may not place himself under it. The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians may be freely quoted on this head. Gal. 5:3 is in fact a demonstration. The obligation of the Law is bound up with the rite of circumcision and absolutely ceases with it.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews asserts and argues in many places the transitory nature and the abolition of the sacrificial system (e.g. Heb. 8:13).

5. To the moral law the above considerations will not apply because it was antecedent to the peculiarities of the Jewish Law. It was adopted in the law but was itself older than the law and remains when the Mosaical super-addition has passed away.

Hence Christ and His Apostles recognise the Ten Commandments as binding. St. Paul refers to all of them (Rom. 13:9), and to the Fifth expressly (Eph. 6:2). St. James also speaks of them all (Jas. 2:10).

Observations on Article VII.

It will be sufficient to remind the student of the manner in which the Gnostics and Manichees in the early days of Christianity dealt with the authority of the Old Testament. It is assumed that these portions of ecclesiastical history need not be recapitulated.

The Articles of 1552 quoted above make it abundantly manifest that in framing this Article there was a reference to the fanatical sects of that time. Those who have read the correspondence of the Reformers printed in the *Zurich Letters* published by the Parker Society know well how these hydra-headed heresies embarrassed their work.

We may refer to Mosheim [*Cent XVI.* Part ii. c. i. 25, 26, and c. iii.] for some account of those sects which arose first in Germany. But the following extract from Hardwick's *History of the Articles* (chap. v.) will give a general view of the heresies with which that stormy period was rife, and will illustrate not only this Article but several others: –

'The ramification of these varied misbelievers may be traced in many cases to the scene of the original collisions between the old and new learning. One of their distinctive errors, though not *the* grand characteristic of their system, was the absolute rejection of infant baptism, and from this peculiarity came the title "Anabaptists" ... But the points at which they had departed from the ground of the Reformers were not limited to infant baptism. They proceeded to assail the Lutheran formula in which the salvation was attributed to faith only, and in agitating this they fell into further question respecting the two natures of our blessed Lord and His essential divinity. John Denk and others now affirmed that man may earn salvation by his own virtuous actions, and regarded the Founder of Christianity chiefly in His character of Teacher and Exemplar. In Him, as one of the most spotless of our race, the Father was peculiarly manifested to the world, but to assert that Christ is the Redeemer in the ordinary meaning of the term was to convert Him into an idol. He was held to be a Saviour of His people *because* He was the leader and forerunner of all who would be saved.'

'While notions of this kind were rapidly spreading on every side, a second school of "Anabaptists" were devising a very different creed. The tone of thought prevailing in the former school was strongly rationalistic: in the latter it was more entirely mystical. They introduced a dualistic (quasi-Manichean) distinction between the "flesh" and the "spirit"; and instead of holding, like the former sect, that man, though fallen, may be rescued by his natural powers, they alleged that the "flesh" alone participated in the fall, and further that when the material element in him was most of all obnoxious to the indignation of God, the spirit still continued free and uncontaminated by the vilest of the outward actions. They attributed the restoration of harmony between these elements of our nature to the intervention of the Logos, but maintained that His humanity was peculiar, not consisting of flesh and blood which He derived from the substance of the Virgin. Not a few of these same Anabaptists afterwards abandoned every semblance of belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and so passed over to the Arian and Socinian schools then rising up in Switzerland, in Italy, and in Poland.'

'In addition to these deadly errors some of the original Anabaptists had insisted on the dogma of an absolute necessity. Others preached the restoration of all things and the ultimate conversion of the devil. Others fancied that the soul will sleep throughout the interval between death and judgment: while the great majority of them cherished the belief that a kingdom (the millennial) to be speedily established, there would be no longer any need of an external magistracy, nor even of the guidance furnished by the written Word of God. In close connection with this hope they now asserted the community of goods. They censured military service of a merely secular kind and steadily objected to the taking of an oath in their negotiations with the world in general. Some moreover held that the observance of the Lord's Day was anti-Christian; others openly advocated a license of polygamy and are even charged with holding that to those who had received the Spirit, or in other words had passed the Anabaptist ordeal of initiation, adultery was itself no sin. By all it was agreed that Anabaptists were at liberty to evade the jurisdiction both of civil and ecclesiastical tribunals, to denounce the latter as a grievous burden, and to aid in the emancipation of all Christians from the disciplines as well as doctrine of the Catholic Church.'

'If we add to this imperfect sketch of continental Anabaptism one of the most prominent of its remaining features, we shall understand how formidable the system must have looked to all the sober and devout Reformers. It was advocated as a leading principle that every Anabaptist was not only able, but was *bound*, to execute the office of a teacher as soon as he perceived within his breast the motions of the Holy Spirit. The effect of this immediate inspiration also made the preacher independent of the sacred volume which he sometimes ventured to denominate "mere dead letter," obsolete in itself, and in the course of its transmission falsified in such a manner as to be unworthy of the faith of full-grown Christians. Thus the last external check imposed on man's presumptuous speculations ran the risk of being summarily demolished; and if Anabaptism had prevailed, it would have reared its throne upon the ruins of all ancient institutions and have trampled under foot the Word of God itself.'

This account of the Anabaptist heresies will prepare the student for may passages in the Articles, doctrinal, ceremonial, and civil. A few observations may be necessary.

1. It will be seen that the general term 'Anabaptist' groups together a vast variety of opinions from those which simply rejected infant baptism to those which destroyed the very foundations of Christianity itself. Hence it will be seen how modern sects of various hues are more or less directly traceable to these ramifications. The *Baptist* of modern times springs directly from the moderate section of Anabaptists who retained the main doctrines of Christianity and faith in Holy Scripture. The mysticism and claims to inspiration, in independence of Church order and even of the Scripture itself, asserted by George Fox and the early Quakers, have also their manifest origin among some sections of continental Anabaptists. The *family of love* and other extravagances of the seventeenth century are also traced to their root in the more extreme of thee fanatics of the previous age.

2. It is, however, needful to caution the student not to suppose that the monstrous evils portrayed above ever obtained deep hold of the English mind. They were sufficiently formidable; they distracted the attention of the Reformers; they caused a great reaction in favour of Romanism, if indeed they were not willfully fomented by Romish agents, of which there is some evidence, but the mass of the English people rejected these impious absurdities.

3. It is just to the cause of the Reformation to note that fanatical opinions akin to those of the extreme Anabaptists had been secretly held for centuries, and had occasionally broken out, especially in Germany. [See the account of *The Beghards*, Geiseler, vol. iv. p. 220; or Mosheim on 'The Brethren of the Free Spirit and kindred Sects in the Thirteenth Century', *Cent. XIII*. Part ii. c. v. 9–15.]

4. Finally, to return more precisely to the Article before us, we may note among the successors of those against whom it was leveled, that the Brownists, the fathers of the Independents and after them many of the Puritans, held that 'we are necessarily tied unto all the judicials of Moses.' Thomas Cartwright, Hooker's opponent, held that idolaters, among whom he included 'contemners of the

Word and prayers,' should be put to death according to the Mosaic Law. Stubbs – 1585 – speaking of blasphemers being stoned, adds, 'which law judicial standeth in force to the world's end.' [See Rogers *On the Articles*. Parker Society. Art. VII. 4.] The Puritan colonists, commonly known as Pilgrim Fathers, enacted some portion of the Mosaic judicial Law in their new settlement in America and put it in force with severity. And, generally speaking, in the reasonings and policy of a large portion of the Puritans in the days of the Commonwealth there will be found a great confusion between their own condition and that of the Jews under the theocracy.

Turning to our own times, although Antinomian principles may be held directly or indirectly in many various quarters, no considerable section professing to belong to the Church of Christ is chargeable with the errors denounced in this Article.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Three Creeds.	*De tribus Symbolis.*
The three Creeds, *Nicene* Creed, *Athanasius'* Creed, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles'* Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.	Symbola tria, Nicaenum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt, et credenda, nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

Notes on the Text.

The Latin text calls for no special comment.

The word rendered Creed is *Symbolum*, the Greek derivation of which is obvious. Various suppositions rather than reasons have been given to explain the application of this particular name to the Creeds. The learned Bingham [*Antiquities*, bk. x. ch. iii. 1.] thus enumerates some of these: –

1. *Symbolum* signifies a *collection*, so called because each Apostle contributed a clause to it.
2. The military sense of *Symbolum*, a *badge of distinction*, is suggested.
3. *Symbolum* signifies a *collection* or epitome of Christian doctrine.
4. The military oath of service, or
5. The password among the initiated into the ancient mysteries is alleged as a possible origin.

This diversity sufficiently show that the origin of this appellation is unknown, nor is it of any real consequence. Bingham thinks the second suggestion the most probable.

Our English word *Creed* is an obvious corruption of the word *Credo*, the name usually given to it before the Reformation, from the word with which it begins in Latin.

Observations on Article VIII.

We may here note the care with which the Reformers supplemented the Sixth Article with this. They had there laid down the doctrine that the Holy Scriptures are the sole rule of faith. They now took the further precaution to state that the Creeds themselves were no exception to this, for that they derived their authority wholly from the Bible. The necessity for this statement may have arisen from the fact already noted that the Ten Articles of Henry VIII made the Creeds together with the Scriptures the rule of faith. This observation is of considerable value in the face of assertions, often freely made that it is the Church which gives authority to the Bible as well as the Creed. It may also be remarked that the Church of England here claims the right of exercising an independent judgment even on the

two first General Councils which sanctioned the Nicene Creed. This is in strict accordance with Article XXI.

History of the Creeds.

I. *The Apostles' Creed*.

It has often been asserted that this Creed came from the Apostles themselves, and some have added various apocryphal stories to this assertion. Bingham [Bk. x. ch. iii. 4.] shows how baseless this notion is. His arguments may be thus summed up: –

1. The New Testament is silent as to the existence of such a document.
2. The ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries are similarly silent.
3. The ancient Creeds, although agreeing in the main, as setting forth the substance of the Christian faith, differ sufficiently in detail to show that there was no one acknowledged apostolical formula which none would have presumed to change.
4. The ancients call the Nicene and other Creeds apostolical as well as this. The epithet, therefore, referred to the subject-matter, not to the formula.

Unquestionably, however, a profession of faith was made in baptism from the very first (Acts. 8:37, and perhaps also 1 Tim. 6:12 and 2 Tim. 1:13–14), and it would naturally soon take a shape not very different from this Creed.

It is generally admitted from a comparison of early Creeds that the one which ultimately prevailed in the West, and which we call the Apostles', is that which was used in the fifth century in the Roman Church, though not in all other Italian Churches. The subsequent authority of Rome made it universal in the West.

Bingham [Bk. x. ch. iv. 17.] says that it does not appear that the Roman or Apostles' Creed was ever used in the Eastern Church. The latter section of the Church had several symbols resembling the Nicene before that form was adopted.

II. *The Nicene Creed*.

It is assumed that the student has studied the history of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, and the various phases of the Arian controversy.

Bingham [Bk. x. ch. iv. 1–11.] gives ancient Creeds used in different Churches of the East before the Council of Nice. They seem for the most part nearer to the elaboration of the Nicene than the simplicity of the Roman Creed. The basis of the Nicene Creed is said to have been presented to the Council by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. [Neander's *Eccl. Hist.* 'Council of Nice.'] The Council modified this by inserting some expressions more distinctly anti-Arian.

The Creed so sanctioned terminated with the words 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.'

The clauses which now follow those words are to be found in Epiphanius about A.D. 373, and had been probably used for some time in some Churches. They were, however, adopted by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; for which reason this Creed is sometimes called the Constantinopolitan Creed.

We must refer to ecclesiastical history for the introduction of the famous words *filioque* by the Western Church, and the bitter controversies which followed between the Greek and Roman Churches. Some reference has been made to this under Article V.

The practice of reciting the Creed in divine service dates from the middle of the fifth century in the Greek Church and still later in the Latin Church. The early use of Creeds was for the instruction of Catechumens, and as a profession of faith in baptism, but not as a part of the ordinary service of the Church.

III. *The Athanasian Creed*.

This Creed probably received its name because it sets forth so fully the Athanasian doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In the middle ages, and until the seventeenth century it was almost universally believed to be the work of Athanasius himself. The progress of historical criticism showed this view to be untenable. Gerard Vossius – 1642 – in his book *De tribus Symbolis* opened the controversy as to the origin of this Creed. Many learned critical treatises have since been written upon it. A compendious account of the criticism will be found in Bingham's *Antiquities*. [Bk. x. ch. iv. 18.] But Waterland's learned *History of the Athanasian Creed* is the standard work on the subject, and some of his principal conclusions are subjoined: –

1. Setting aside quotations from spurious works, the most ancient testimony to the reception of the Athanasian Creed is stated to be a decree of the Council of Autun about A.D. 670.

2. The most ancient comment on this Creed is ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus, Bishop of Poitiers, about A.D. 570.

3. The earliest Latin MSS. of this Creed are ascribed to the seventh century. The Greek MSS. are much later, few, and disagreeing with each other.

4. This Creed was received in the Gallican Church in the seventh, or perhaps the sixth, century, and in the Spanish Church about the same time. Charlemagne held it in high esteem, and in his days its use extended into Germany, Italy, and England. It was probably received by the Roman Church early in the tenth century. Waterland thinks it has been only partially received by the Oriental Churches.

5. A careful comparison of the controversial modes of expression devised to meet the several heresies on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in the fifth and sixth centuries leads to the conclusion that the Creed was composed after the Arian and Apollinarian heresies, and before the condemnation of the Nestorian and Monophysite opinions. It is also thought to have derived expressions from Augustine *De Trinitate*. From these data the years A.D. 420–430 are assigned as including the probable date of its composition.

6. All the earliest notices of the Creed point to Gaul as the country in which it was written and obtained currency.

7. Out of the Gallic writers in that age, Hilary of Arles is selected as the most probable author of this Creed. What is known of his style and his study of the works of Augustine harmonises with this supposition. It is also affirmed by the writer of his life that he composed an admirable exposition of the Creed [*Symboli Expositio.*] which probably refers to this very document. For it was rarely called in ancient times *Symbolum* (as not emanating from a Council), but rather *Expositio Catholicae Fidei*, or some similar descriptive title. Upon the whole, Waterland concludes that this Creed was probably written in Gaul by Hilary, Bishop of Arles, about A.D. 430.