

of Spain, in its conflict with Arianism on the one hand and Sabelianism on the other, was the first to introduce S. Augustine's language into confessions of faith. The words 'Proceeding from the Father and the Son' had appeared in a profession of faith put forth by a Council of Toledo in 447. It used to be supposed that they were first inserted into the Creed at the Council of Toledo in 589. This, however, is doubtful. Those who denied the double procession were indeed anathematized, but evidence seems to show that the text of the Creed was kept pure by the Council. Their interpolation into the actual Creed was probably the work of copyists, under the influence of the anathema. For a long time the addition remained unobserved and awakened no controversy. It did not become a matter for public debate till the time of Charles the Great. Even then Pope Leo III, though he accepted the double procession, deliberately rejected the addition to the Creed and set up in S. Peter's copies of it without the addition.

It is clear, however, from the protests of the Franks that the interpolated form had spread to Gaul and the question of the procession had begun to arouse controversy. A dispute had arisen at Jerusalem between Greeks and Latins over the use of the new form of the Creed. Rome herself did not accept the addition till after the final breach between East and West. It is usually supposed that it was introduced by the influence of the Emperor Henry II, in 1014, along with the custom of repeating the Creed at Mass. The arguments of the Eastern Church against the language 'from the Father and the Son' were partly theological, partly historical. It has been argued that it implies two independent sources of Godhead and so breaks up the unity. This is untrue. The Western Church means no more by it than Eastern theologians mean when they use the language 'from the Father through the Son'. S. Augustine was most careful to guard against any violation of the unity of the Godhead. Again, it has been objected that it was inserted irregularly. This is partly true. We may reply, however, that the insertion was originally quite accidental and was very useful in dealing with heresy. To set it aside now would run the risk of appearing to deny the truth that it protects. All that the Western Church claims is to repeat the clause in a sense that is perfectly orthodox. We do, however, admit that the clause has not Catholic authority: that it is unfortunate that any addition was made and still more unfortunate that, if any addition was judged to be necessary, it was not made in the form that would have been acceptable to East and West alike, namely 'from the Father through the Son'.<sup>1</sup> In itself it is certainly inadequate to justify any rupture between East and West. We must remember, however, the real causes of division are to be found elsewhere, in political rivalry and jealousy between Rome and Constantinople.†

<sup>1</sup> Certain modern Greek theologians, however, would seem to be unwilling to use the words to denote more than the temporal mission from the Son.

## ARTICLES VI-VII

## THE SCRIPTURES

## ARTICLE VI

*Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation*

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 the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

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

*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,

*De divinis Scripturis, quod sufficient 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.

*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 Paralipomenon,  
Secundus liber Paralipomenon,  
Primus liber Esdrae,

The II Book of Esdras,  
The Book of Esther,  
The Book of Job,  
The Psalms,  
The Proverbs,  
Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher,  
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,  
Four Prophets the Greater,  
Twelve Prophets the Less.

All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

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:

The III Book of Esdras,  
The IV Book of Esdras,  
The Book of Tobias,  
The Book of Judith,  
The rest of the Book of Esther,  
The Book of Wisdom,  
Jesus the Son of Sirach,  
Baruch the Prophet,  
The Song of the Three Children,  
The Story of Susanna,  
Of Bel and the Dragon,  
The Prayer of Manasses,  
The I Book of Maccabees,  
The II Book of Maccabees.

This Article received its final form in 1571. The first paragraph is based on a similar statement in the Article of 1553. The remainder of the Article was added in 1563, being based on the Confession of Württemberg, except that the list of the Apocrypha omitted 'The rest of the Book of Esther', 'Baruch', 'The Song of the Three Children', 'Bel and the Dragon,' and 'The Prayer of Manasses'. It was completed by the addition of these books in 1571. Its immediate object was to state the position of the Church of England with reference to the use and extent of Scripture, against Anabaptists on the one hand and Rome on the other.

(i) Certain among the Anabaptists regarded all Scripture as unnecessary. An Article of 1553 describes them as those '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 learnt such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.' In other words if men claim to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, and to have received a personal

Secundus liber Esdrae,  
Liber Hester,  
Liber Job,  
Psalmi,  
Proverbia,  
Ecclesiastes vel Concionator,  
Cantica Solomonis,  
IV Prophetæ majores,  
XII Prophetæ minores.

Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus, et habemus pro Canonicis.

Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia ad exempla vitae et formandos mores; illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet: ut sunt:

Tertius liber Esdrae,  
Quartus liber Esdrae,  
Liber Tobiae,  
Liber Judith,  
Reliquum libri Hester,  
Liber Sapientiae,  
Liber Jesu filii Sirach,  
Baruch Propheta,  
Canticum trium puerorum,  
Historia Susannae,  
De Bel et Dracone,  
Oratio Manassis,  
Prior liber Machabaeorum,  
Secundus liber Machabaeorum.

revelation, does not this supersede Scripture? Such a view implied a plenary inspiration of individuals, and opened the way for a chaos of interpretations, each claiming the authority of the Holy Spirit.

(ii) The ambiguous language of the Council of Trent had appeared to regard Scripture by itself as insufficient, and to place tradition on a level with it as an independent source of doctrine. In a decree published in 1546, and therefore before the compilers of this Article, it speaks of the 'truth and discipline . . . contained in the written books, and in the unwritten traditions, which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or from the Apostles themselves . . . have come down to us. . . . We receive and venerate these traditions, whether they refer to faith or to morals, with the same (*i.e.* the same as Holy Scripture) devotion and reverence inasmuch as they were dictated either by word of mouth by Christ Himself or by the Holy Spirit, and have been preserved by unbroken transmission in the Catholic Church'. Such language at least suggested that part of the faith was to be found in Scripture and part in tradition. Further, the same decree of the Council of Trent includes within the canon the majority of the books of the Apocrypha (Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, I and II Maccabees, and the additions to the books of Daniel and Esther) and regards them as of authority in matters of doctrine.

This Article is not intended to stand alone. It gives no answer to the vital question, Who is to decide what can be proved from Scripture? This is answered in Art. 20. Again, it deals only with the question of doctrine: questions of authority in matters of custom or ceremonies or organization are dealt with in Art. 34.

## ARTICLE VII

### *Of the Old Testament*

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 notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

### *De Veteri Testamento*

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. Quamquam lex a Deo data per Moysen, 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.

This Article forms a sequel to the previous Article. It was formed by Archbishop Parker out of two of the earlier Articles of 1553, with slight modifications. It is directed against two opposite errors, both maintained by sections of Anabaptists.

(i) Some rejected the Old Testament entirely, and claimed, in virtue of their illumination by the Spirit, to be superior even to the moral law contained in it.

(ii) Others maintained that Christians were under obligation to obey the whole law contained in it, civil and ceremonial, as well as moral. We read of strange attempts to set up a literal 'New Jerusalem' in Westphalia. The Calvinists were not entirely out of sympathy with this idea, as was shown by Calvin's rule at Geneva.

Against both these views the Article insists that the Old Testament represents a preparatory stage in one divine revelation and must be interpreted as such, in relation to the whole scheme of revelation.

### § 1. *The sufficiency of Scripture*

The position of the Church of England laid down in this Article is quite clear. She does not require of a man as a condition of membership belief in any truth which is not contained in or cannot be proved from Scripture. In the ordering of priests the question is asked: 'Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ and are you determined . . . to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?'<sup>1</sup> We are bound to be faithful in declaring to men the 'whole counsel of God' (cp. Acts 20<sup>27</sup>) and to hold fast all that God has revealed (cp. 1 Tim 6<sup>20</sup>), not leaving out or slurring over any truth that is inconvenient or unpopular. But we are no less bound to respect the limits of divine revelation. On many points it is quite possible for good Christians honestly to hold different opinions. Ministers of the Church have no right to force upon men what are only conjectures. To require men to accept as authoritative teaching for which there is no real evidence is to strain and weaken faith. If men are asked to accept indiscriminately anything that individuals choose to teach, the inevitable result is that as soon as they learn the precariousness of part of the teaching, they reject not that part only but the whole. The Church of England, therefore, holds up the Bible as the sufficient standard of Christian teaching and as the embodiment of all those truths to which the Church was formed to bear witness. How can this position be justified?

(a) We must never forget that the Church existed and was at work

<sup>1</sup> What is meant by 'necessary to salvation'? The phrase is intended in this context to refer to those who have a desire to hold and live by the Christian faith. For them it is precarious to assume that they can obey the will of God and attain to eternal life with Him, if they are unwilling to accept in faith the truth that He has revealed. To them the teacher is bound to set forth the whole Gospel as 'necessary to their salvation', as that which 'a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health'. We need not take the phrase as settling questions about the destiny of the heathen who have not heard the Gospel or of those who are 'invincibly ignorant' of it or conscientiously reject it.

in the world for many years before any single book of the New Testament was composed. These books were written by members of the Church for members of the Church. They pre-suppose a certain knowledge in those who read them, based upon oral instruction (cp. Lk 1<sup>4</sup>, Rom 1<sup>6-7</sup>, 1 Cor 11<sup>23</sup>, 15<sup>3</sup>, Heb 5<sup>12-13</sup>, 1 Jn 2<sup>12</sup>). They were written not to create but to strengthen and educate faith. No single book of the New Testament was intended in the first instance for unbelievers. So to-day Scripture cannot be our earliest teacher. It is the Church that points us to the Bible as differing from all other books and that gives us that elementary instruction by word and example in the Christian life without which the Bible would be largely unmeaning. 'For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ, although the Scripture be therein the ground of our belief; yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture. The Scripture could not teach us the things that are of God unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signify those things.'<sup>1</sup> To most of us the beginning of our religion is the teaching of the Church as represented say by a parent. In the earliest days preaching depended on the eye-witnesses and actual hearers of Christ. The first Christians did not test what they heard by the New Testament, for that did not yet exist. Rather as the books of the New Testament came one by one into their hands, they tested them by their conformity to the teaching of the apostles and those who heard them. St. Paul did not go with a Bible under his arm and quote proof texts in support of the Resurrection. Human nature, especially Greek human nature, was not one bit less inquisitive than it is to-day. Questions would be asked, and he would answer them by relating the testimony of eye-witnesses: 'Peter said this, John told me that.' So we must not place the Bible in a false position of isolation and divorce it from the continuous life of the society within which it was written. Behind the books of the New Testament stands the life and witness of the early Church illuminating and confirming them. The great failure of much negative criticism to-day is caused by treating the books of the New Testament as if they came to us from some unknown source. Passages which taken out of their context may be interpreted in more than one way, can only receive one interpretation when they are studied, as they were meant to be studied, in the light of a Christian life. Since the New Testament was written for Christians only Christians can fully understand it. Bible and Church must go hand in hand. The statement has been made that 'the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants'.<sup>2</sup> Apart from the fact that a book cannot be a religion, it denies the intimate connexion between the written word

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, ii. c. 7, § 3.

<sup>2</sup> It is inscribed on the tomb of Chillingworth. It is only fair to add that he did not use it in the misleading sense popular among the less educated Protestants of to-day.

and the Christian community. Like any other book, the Bible can only be interpreted aright by those who approach it with the right presuppositions, and those can only be attained by sharing in the life of Christian fellowship.

(b) Christianity is not the religion of a book but of a Person.<sup>1</sup> 'Christianity is Christ' in a way that Buddhism is not Buddha or Mohammedanism Mohammed. The centre of our faith is not the teaching of Christ but Christ Himself. Behind Church and Bible alike stands the living Saviour. Why then is the Bible placed in this supreme position? The answer lies in its special relation to Christ. The Old Testament is the record of the preparation of the world for His coming. It shows the choice and education of the Jewish people. They were called by God to a special task, and given a vision of His purpose which Christ alone could fulfil. The Old Testament is the book on which His own religious life was nourished. He revered it as the word of God and found Himself there. So in the New Testament we have on the one hand a fourfold picture of the earthly life of Christ, a selection of His teaching and mighty works, the story of His death and resurrection, all given to us on the authority of eye-witnesses and approved by the consent of the early Church as correct. We have further the earliest and most authoritative teaching of the Church itself. The Epistles show us the Gospel as it was proclaimed in apostolic days, and all that the Ascended Christ proved Himself to be to the first generation of Christians. They attest all unconsciously the fulness and vigour of the new life and hope that He had brought. The Apostles are obviously witnesses of special importance. They were trained by Christ Himself (Mk 3<sup>14</sup>): they were promised special guidance by the Holy Spirit to remember and interpret His teaching (Jn 14<sup>26</sup>, 16<sup>13-14</sup>). So the New Testament possesses a unique value from its close relationship to the earthly life of Christ, from the character and position of its writers and its intimate connexion with the life of the early Church. 'It is self-evident to the mind that takes it in as a whole that the New Testament is a single movement of spiritual and Christian thought and life, and that it is complete and sufficient in itself. It is equally certain that neither the succeeding nor any subsequent age had in it either the plastic capacity or the creative power to take for itself a living form such as Christianity easily, freely and naturally assumed in its initiative stage. And therefore it was, to say no more, an act of practical wisdom to accept that first embodiment and expression of itself as in principle at least and in substance final and irreformable.'<sup>2</sup>

(c) The question still remains, can we do what the Article assumes, be assured that it contains all necessary teaching? May not some part have been omitted? We can hardly appeal for an answer to any

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, Lect. i.

<sup>2</sup> Du Bose, *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 25.

definite text of Scripture itself. The very idea of such a collection of Christian writings did not yet exist when any one of them was being composed. Each was written to meet a particular need at a particular time. But we can fairly appeal to the feeling in Scripture itself of the greater security of the written word. Christ habitually speaks of the Old Testament in such a way as to suggest that it is the adequate and authoritative embodiment of God's revelation to the Jewish Church. He finds in it the expression of the Father's will (Mt 4<sup>4</sup>, 7, 10). He proves His own teaching from it (Jn 10<sup>34</sup>, Mk 12<sup>26-27</sup>). He appeals to the written law as against unwritten tradition (Mk 7<sup>1-13</sup>). Again, in his preface to the Gospel, S. Luke refers to the greater certainty of the written word (Lk 1<sup>4</sup>, cp. Jn 20<sup>31</sup>). The New Testament from end to end assumes that the revelation of God in Christ is final and complete. Heb 1<sup>1</sup> ff. contrasts the fragmentary revelations of old times with the fulness of revelation in Christ. It is 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints' (Jude 3). There cannot be a second Christ or a second Gospel (cp. 2 Cor 11<sup>4</sup>, Gal 1<sup>6-8</sup>, etc.). That this message is adequately embodied in our Scriptures is shown by the testimony of the early Church. It was the Church that gradually decided the canon of the New Testament, and we find no consciousness at any time that any part of its message had been omitted or misrepresented. The Church did not in any sense create the Gospel. It is always God's word and not man's, but the Bible is the Church's record of it. This view of the sufficiency of Scripture is for questions of doctrine the unanimous view of the early Fathers. We can only give a few examples here. 'If any thing remains which Holy Scripture does not determine, no other third scripture ought to be received to authorize any knowledge, but we must commit to the fire what remains, that is, reserve it unto God' (Origen, *Hom. V. in Lev.*). 'The holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient to the enunciation of truth' (Athanasius, *Contra Gentes*, 1). 'In these alone the doctrine of salvation is contained. Let no man add to or take from them' (*Festal Epistles*, ii). 'Believe those things that are written: the things which are not written, seek not' (Basil, *Hom.* 29). 'In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, all things are found, which embrace faith and morals' (Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, ii).<sup>1</sup> The position taken up by this Article is in effect a return to antiquity. It is supported both by the intrinsic nature of the New Testament writings and by the unanimous witness of the early Church. We may add that if we believe that the Holy Spirit guided the Church in the selection of these books, we must believe that no vital part of the revelation in Christ was suffered to be lost. The Apostles could hardly understand the importance of their witness for future ages. They expected the immediate return of the Lord. But their witness is all the more valuable because

<sup>1</sup> A long list of references could easily be compiled. See Harold Browne on Art. 6, p. 141 ff.; Palmer, *On the Church*, c. ii.

it is unpremeditated. Just because they built primarily for their own time, they built the better for all time. By the providence of God the Church was provided with a means of testing its faith. It can return again and again to Scripture as the standard expression of its own life, formulated in times of the greatest vitality.

(d) On the other hand, as we have already seen, Scripture needs the Church for its interpretation. Not only is much of it hard to understand (Acts 8<sup>31</sup>, 2 Pet 3<sup>16</sup>), but its leading truths are not arranged in any definite order. We need the right point of view. One of the uses of creeds is to supply a simple scheme of truth. From the first the Church has always attached great importance to tradition, not as alternative to Scripture, but as a means to its correct interpretation. Tradition shows how the words of Scripture have been understood by the Church. Thus, S. Vincent of Lerins ends his *Commonitorium* with the words: 'We said above that this has always been, and even at this day is, the custom of Catholics to try and examine the true faith by these two methods: first, by the authority of the divine canon; secondly, by the rule of the Catholic Church; not because the canonical Scripture is not as to itself sufficient for all things, but because very many, expounding God's word at their own will, do thereby conceive divers opinions and errors. And for this cause it is necessary that the interpretation of the heavenly Scripture be directed according to the one only rule of the Church's understanding; only, be it observed, especially in those questions upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine depend.' It is in the same spirit that the canon of 1571 bids the clergy in their preaching 'see that they never teach ought in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from the same doctrine.'<sup>1</sup> The well-known saying 'The Church to teach and the Bible to prove' sums up the position of the Church of England on this point.<sup>2</sup>

### § 2. *The Canon of Scripture*

(a) The distinction made in this Article between canonical and non-canonical books raises in an acute form the whole question of inspiration. We shall shortly give some account of the history of the formation of the Canon, but the deeper question still remains: does this historical distinction depend upon any intrinsic quality in the books themselves? What is inspiration and how is it present in a unique form in the Bible?

(i) We may begin by drawing a distinction between 'Revelation' and 'Inspiration'. All knowledge implies both something to be known

<sup>1</sup> See Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, p. 476.

<sup>2</sup> On the Roman Catholic view of the authority of unwritten tradition, see Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church* (1952 edition) c. v.; R. Hanson and R. Fuller, *The Church of Rome*, cc. iii and iv.

and a mind that can know it. Revelation and inspiration correspond to these two sides of knowledge. Revelation means the uncovering by God of some spiritual truth that man's mind may apprehend it. Inspiration means the quickening of the human mind and soul to perceive and understand what has been unveiled. 'In the act of revelation God unveils that which He desires men to know: in His act of inspiration He opens the eyes of men's minds to see that which He has unveiled.'<sup>1</sup> The truth which is given and the power of grasping it both alike come from God.

(ii) Neither the Bible nor the Church has ever defined inspiration. It can be recognized rather than defined. The nearest approach to any statement is in 2 Pet 1<sup>20</sup> 'No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of men, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost.' In 2 Tim 3<sup>16</sup> the word *θεόπνευστος* is applied to the Scriptures, *i.e.* the Old Testament, and the passage should probably be translated 'Every inspired scripture is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished unto every good work.' These passages suggest on the one hand that the writers of the Scriptures were directly moved by the Holy Spirit, and on the other hand that this inspiration was given to enlighten and instruct men in the way of obedience to the divine will. Where spiritual truth is concerned God makes a revelation and inspires men to apprehend it in order that they may hear and obey His Word. We shall therefore not look to inspired writings for infallible information on questions of science and history. We have our natural powers of intelligent enquiry by which to investigate and obtain light on these questions. God's revealed and inspired Word is not intended to do for us what His natural gifts to us enable us to do for ourselves. Moreover, in the context of a large group of writings such as the Bible we shall not expect that any one member or part of the group will give us the whole content of God's revelation. The form and content of the inspired message are limited by the capacities of those to whom it is in the first instance given; the individual writer will have his proper place with others who have also received illumination. Thus we believe that four writers were each moved to compose a Gospel and so to give in different ways a fourfold witness to the truth of the Incarnate Life, and in the Old Testament 'the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings' together preserve God's revelation of Himself to His ancient people.

(iii) All forms of inspiration pre-suppose two factors, and this is particularly true of all inspired religious insight. There is first an inheritance of knowledge already embodied in some kind of corporate tradition. The individual is born into a community which

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Watson, *Inspiration*, p. 24.

possesses a religion and he is taught its beliefs and customs. He starts from the common consciousness, however much he may later modify or correct what he has received. Secondly, within a living religious tradition there may arise from time to time individuals who with special gifts and prophetic insight permanently deepen and enrich the tradition or even by their influence turn it in new directions. In the course of time what they first perceived may become part of the common stock of knowledge in the community and receive embodiment in newly-shaped customs and institutions. This general picture is true of the working of inspiration in the biblical writers, but here it takes on a special form. Regarded from a purely historical point of view, the whole of the Bible is the literary deposit of the religious experience of a community with a continuous history and identity. There are crises in the history, above all the crisis of the coming of the Messiah, and each crisis leaves a mark upon the tradition, but there is continuity too from the earliest to the latest of the biblical documents. At each crisis appear prophetic figures. In the Old Testament Moses and the canonical prophets are pre-eminent in the crises of their day, and they are followed by the law-givers, the priests, the prophetic historians and the wise men, who embody the prophetic insight in laws, cultus, wise sayings, and historical tradition. So far the biblical tradition in its various phases is generally comparable to the history of other religious traditions. But in fact the continuity and the movement here take on a form which is not paralleled elsewhere, and that in two particular respects. First, the continuity exhibited in the Bible is not simply that of the story of a single nation with the phases of its religious experience, for the nation was destroyed in A.D. 70 and the continuity remained unbroken. Nor is it that of a developing idea or complex of ideas, for the movement does not depend on the work of a series of great thinkers. Rather the Bible claims to record a continuous and consistent series of divine acts specially related to the history of a chosen people, together with the interpretation of those acts which God made known to those whom He 'called' or 'raised up'. The basic continuity lies on the divine side, in God's will and purpose manifested in acts. On the human side the continuity is not that of steady and consistent development and response; Israel often rejects the divine revelation and learns as a nation only when it has passed through judgment (*e.g.* the Exile). Finally it rejected the Messiah when He came, but the divine purpose continued. Secondly, the determining form of inspiration in the Bible is of a kind which demands a more exact description than 'insight into spiritual truth'. The prophets, for example, did not conceive their function as the preaching of higher spiritual ideas to their contemporaries. They recalled them to knowledge of what God had done in and for Israel in the past; they discerned His present acts; and they announced that which He would do. In all this they were

aware of a consistent divine character and purpose; God's acts revealed for them what He is and what He demands of His people. In so far as they teach truths about the nature of God and the duties of man these truths are derived from an understanding of God's covenant with Israel and are not separable from that understanding. Similarly in the New Testament apostolic inspiration is the gift of insight into the supreme divine act in the life and death and resurrection of Christ. For the apostolic writers everything turns on knowing and obeying the Word of God made flesh. Throughout the Bible we have the record of God's witness to Himself in the events of a particular history, interpreted and set down by minds which He enlightened to understand and expound it. This is the kind of authority which the Bible itself claims.

(b) We may now try to state more exactly what Christians mean by the unique inspiration of the Bible and by describing it as the 'Word of God'.

(i) Even the unbeliever can discern special qualities in the biblical books. As literature they hold a high place among the great books of the world. The philosophical moralist will find much to admire in many passages of the Bible, though some parts of its teaching on conduct may strike him as strange or even perverse. Again, if placed beside the classical scriptures of other faiths and studied by the comparative method, the Bible will hold its own; its place after such a comparison may appear pre-eminent even to some non-Christian minds, if they have been nurtured in our Western tradition. Yet none of these approaches will legitimately yield the conclusion that its authority for us is unique. A comparative consideration of the merits of the Bible as literature, as morals, and as a great religious classic is useful for some purposes and perfectly legitimate; it may for some minds open the way to a more profound insight into its meaning. But ultimately the inspiration of the Bible, as Christians understand it, can only be perceived and apprehended from within Christian faith.

(ii) The reason for this lies in the nature of the contents of the Bible. Its unity is found in its unique relation to Christ. The Incarnation is for Christian faith the central and supreme event in history, and the New Testament records both the facts of the Incarnate Life and their revealing significance. As described in the New Testament the life and work of Jesus Christ cannot be understood except as the climax and fulfilment of a preparatory revelation made to Israel and set forth in the Old Testament. The whole Bible reveals one moving and consistent divine activity of revelation culminating in the Word Incarnate. This unity is perceptible only to those who receive Christ in faith. To them the Bible reveals the story of the divine self-disclosure in a particular history, as its meaning was interpreted by prophets and apostles standing within the actual course of that

history. Thus the Bible gives a knowledge of God which can be found nowhere else, for there is no rival account of what the Bible describes; and it conveys a truth, which, once it is recognized as such, must take a supreme place in the mind and heart of the believer.<sup>1</sup> The Scriptures are the unique Word of God because they are the only vessel containing His divine truth of which the centre and fulness is Christ. Faith in Him as Lord and Saviour is inseparably bound up with the divinely-ordered testimony of the Bible. As the permanent witness to God's truth, declared in God's historical self-disclosure, the Bible in its parts and as a whole has been formed by the creative and illuminating work of the Holy Spirit, whose function it is to bear witness to Christ. The claim that one canon of sacred writings bears unique testimony to God's revelation is a challenge to faith. But it is congruous with the divine choice of one people and the divine way of redemption by particular events.

(iii) The Church reads and hears the Scriptures not only as the record of that which has been revealed, but as the Word by which God speaks here and now to His people. When the divine Word took flesh in Christ He came to judge and to save. So the Word of God received and communicated by prophets and apostles before and after Christ was effective for God's saving purpose. By it the minds and consciences of those whom it reached were brought into a new relation with Him for judgment and salvation. The written Word remains the permanent instrument by which God guides and renews His Church. Through the inspired Scriptures the Holy Spirit to-day instructs, admonishes, and strengthens His people in that faith and life which He has created in them. The Word in the Bible is made contemporary and living when the Church hears, studies and preaches it with a desire to receive and obey it. So in her central act of worship the Church first hears the Scriptures and sums up their message in the Creed before proceeding to the sacramental celebration of Christ's saving work. In the doctrine and the life of the Church the Scriptures have manifestly been the constant source of reformation and renewal by recalling her to her fundamental faith and mission. We must therefore believe that in the divine purpose the Scriptures were formed by the Holy Spirit to be an enduring organ of His guidance of the Church in all ages. Without them the Church

<sup>1</sup> This does not mean that the truth given in the Bible is out of relation with other forms of truth. As the Bible teaches, God is the author of Creation as well as of Redemption. Our 'natural' knowledge of our world and of ourselves, so far as it is accurate and complete, is a true knowledge of His creation and it comes to us through faculties which He has created. But natural knowledge, e.g. scientific and historical, is never complete and is always in process of development. We must not therefore expect that at any particular time every problem of its relation to Biblical truth can be solved. But at all times the central truths of revelation and redemption will throw light on other forms of knowledge, and these truths themselves, having been grasped, by faith, need to be interpreted and set in order by the powers of our understanding.

would be in danger of becoming separated from its roots. At the same time it is true that the Scriptures are, now as in the past, addressed to the living community which is God's people in Christ. Outside the life of that community they may lose the power to convey the wholeness of their message to the separated individual or group.

(iv) The inspiration of the Bible does not imply either that its meaning is self-evident or that it cannot be made the subject of thorough historical investigation. Within the Bible itself we find its writers studying and pondering over the words of earlier prophets and teachers. In the primitive Church of the New Testament period the Jewish scriptures were searched for their testimony to Christ, and ancient words took on a new significance. The utterances of the prophets expressed in limited and often material images could now be understood in their last and final meaning in Christ. The early Church put a considerable intellectual effort into the work of interpreting the Scriptures. In every age the Church must study and teach as well as read the Scriptures, for the divine Word does not operate automatically in a quasi-magical way on minds unwilling to devote themselves to thought and investigation. Again, the historical study of the Scriptures by the best critical methods available is legitimate and ultimately profitable for their understanding. The historical origin of the books of the Bible is relevant to their interpretation, and so too is the manner in which they were composed or compiled, their relation to one another in sequence, and the similarities and differences of their expression, outlook and purpose. It is part of the 'historical' character of the Bible that its books were written at various times over a long period and bear the marks of the different circumstances of their origin. Belief in inspiration does not give us any right to pre-determine how the Holy Spirit must have operated, particularly in the Old Testament, to enlighten men's minds 'by diverse portions and in diverse manners'. The theory of 'verbal' inspiration was the result of such a dogmatic pre-determination. New critical methods and a more intimate knowledge of the ancient world have tended in some phases of modern investigation of the Bible to produce results which appear destructive. The original meaning of important passages is seen to differ from their traditional interpretation; doubt may be thrown on the trustworthiness of important statements of fact. On the whole it may be said that what appeared to be the more destructive results of some of the critical work of the last hundred years were ultimately due not so much to the assured conclusions of scholarship as to the theological pre-suppositions of the critics. The work of analytical criticism is now more often combined with recognition of the underlying theological unity of the Bible, which stands out no less clearly when its books are studied in their setting in the ancient world. The Christian critical scholar who approaches the Bible with intellectual integrity

will often find that he comes upon baffling problems, but without denying the problems or forsaking the method he will have an eye prepared to see the signs of one Spirit informing the whole Scripture.†

(c) How was the 'canon' of Scripture formed? Some account is needed to explain the position of the 'apocrypha'.

(i) The exact sense in which the term 'canon' was first applied to the Scriptures is disputed. Some have held that the word was used in the sense of 'rule of life' (cp. Gal 6<sup>16</sup>) and the books were called canonical as forming a rule of faith or life. More probably the word simply denoted the 'list' by which the contents were defined and 'canonical' simply meant 'on the list'. *κανονίζεω* is applied not only to the books as a whole but to a single book. But the other idea, if not present from the first, was soon suggested, and the Canon of Scripture came to be regarded as a standard to which an appeal could be made. The whole conception is Christian rather than Jewish. We must beware of arguing as if the Jews regarded their Scriptures as canonical in quite the same sense as the Christians.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) The Jews divided the Old Testament into three great divisions: (i) The Law; (ii) The Prophets (these included the 'Former Prophets', *i.e.* the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, and the 'Latter Prophets', *i.e.* Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve); (iii) The Writings (these included the Psalms, Proverbs and Job, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles and the five 'rolls', *i.e.* the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther). It is usually supposed that these three divisions correspond to three more or less distinct stages in the formation of the Old Testament Canon. The traditions found in 2 Esdras 14 and 2 Macc 2<sup>13</sup> assigning the formation of the Canon to Ezra and Nehemiah respectively are historically worth very little. The chief steps that we can trace in the process are these:

(a) The publication of Deuteronomy in 621 B.C. is the first great landmark (2 Kings 23<sup>1-3</sup>). 'We have here a solemn religious act by which the king and people alike . . . accept the book read before them as expressing the divine will and take its precepts as binding upon themselves. This is the essential meaning that, as applied to a book, is contained in the epithet "canonical", which means "authoritative", and authoritative because in its ultimate origin Divine.'<sup>2</sup>

The Law promulgated by Ezra and Nehemiah was substantially our present Pentateuch, with the possible addition of the book of Joshua (Neh 8-10). If we allow for certain minor editorial changes and additions, the whole Law was probably canonical by then, *i.e.* 440 B.C. It is significant that the Samaritans accepted only the Law as canonical. The simplest explanation is that at the time that they

<sup>1</sup> The substantive *κανών* is found first in the writings of Amphilochius (380). Athanasius in his *Festal Epistle* (367) speaks of the books of Scripture as *κανονιζόμενα*.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday, 'Bible', *E.R.E.* ii. 565b.

formed their separate community the Canon of Scripture contained nothing else.

(β) No doubt the collection of prophetic writings began quite early. On the one hand, the failure of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah to find a place in this section of the canon suggests that when they were composed, it was at least on the way to being closed. On the other hand, the Chronicler treats the text of Samuel and Kings with great freedom, which equally suggests that by 300 B.C. they were not canonical in the full sense of the term. The strange variations in the LXX version of Samuel seem to carry this condition of things down even to a later date. The earliest references to the 'prophets' as a definite collection are found soon after 200 B.C. In Ecclus 49<sup>10</sup> (180 B.C.), the 'twelve prophets' are referred to as parallel to Jeremiah and Ezekiel. So, too, Dan 9<sup>2</sup> (168 B.C.) quotes Jeremiah as authoritative. The prophetic canon was therefore probably closed about 200 B.C.

(γ) The formation of the third section of the Canon is more obscure. The earliest mention of any such collection is the prologue to Ecclesiasticus (130 B.C.), which alludes to 'The Law, the Prophets and the other writings'. The very vagueness of the language employed suggests that this last division was not as yet clearly defined. On the one hand, the book of Daniel and certain psalms which are probably Maccabaeian were admitted into it. On the other hand, the so-called 'Psalms of Solomon', composed 70-40 B.C., failed to find admittance. We may conclude, therefore, that this section of the Canon was closed about 100 B.C. It is worth noting that in 1 Macc 7<sup>17</sup>, Psalm 79 is quoted as Scripture. But in any case the Psalms were the earliest of these writings to gain their position in the Canon.

(iii) Among the Jews of Palestine the Canon of Scripture was thus practically closed during the first century B.C. Edifying books were still composed and widely used and quoted, but there had grown up a refusal, at least on the part of the Rabbis, to place them on a level with the Scriptures. Discussion as to the right of certain books to a place in the Canon went on into the second century A.D. The most disputed were the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes and Esther. The idea of canonicity was expressed in Jewish language by saying that the Scriptures 'defiled the hands', *i.e.* rendered those who handled them ceremonially unclean, the object of this rule being to prevent irreverent handling. The final stage in the settlement of the Jewish Canon was reached at the Council of Jamnia held about A.D. 90. After the fall of Jerusalem Jamnia became the centre of Palestinian Judaism. There the Canon of the Old Testament was for all practical purposes determined, and it included all the books in the English Old Testament and no others.

But meanwhile from the middle of the first century B.C. the Hellenistic Jews, especially the Jews of Alexandria, did not follow the



Palestinian Rabbis in the limitation of the Canon and the general treatment of the Old Testament. Not only did they adopt a different arrangement of the books, but they interspersed among the older books many later writings. These included books originally composed in Hebrew, such as 1 Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith and Baruch and also books composed originally in Greek, such as Wisdom and 2 Maccabees and expansions of canonical books. So the Alexandrian Canon was much wider than the Palestinian, and it has even been argued that the Alexandrians recognized no fixed canon at all. They were ready to admit whatever they judged to be edifying.

Accordingly the Christian Church found itself faced both with a larger and a smaller Canon. When the first Christians broke away from Judaism they did not take with them a well-defined Bible. It would seem that on the question of the canonicity they were content to defer to the judgment of Judaism. Even as late as A.D. 170 Melito, Bishop of Sardis, travelled to Judaea to make a special list. Within the New Testament itself all the books of the Old Testament are quoted as authoritative except Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, none of the apocryphal books is mentioned by name, though their language is in some cases undoubtedly in the mind of New Testament writers. But the book of Enoch, which lies outside even the Apocrypha, is quoted as Scripture in Jude<sup>14</sup>. The main body of the Church went on using the Greek Bible and the Alexandrian Canon. It was recognized, however, especially by learned men who were in touch with Judaism, that there was a more limited Jewish Canon. S. Jerome, for instance, who knew Hebrew, took over the canon of his Jewish instructors. Through his influence the knowledge of the difference between the Hebrew and Greek Bibles was kept alive. The influence of S. Augustine on the other side obtained for the apocryphal books a definite footing. Still all through the Middle Ages the more learned scholars drew a clear line between the Jewish Canon and the apocryphal books. At the Reformation the Council of Trent abolished every shade of distinction between the books.<sup>1</sup> Luther, following S. Jerome, separated the canonical from the apocryphal books, but gave the latter a place as 'useful to read'. Our Article, quoting S. Jerome, does the same. The Calvinists rejected the Apocrypha entirely, and the English Puritans wished the Church to follow their example.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the Roman Church does not include in its Canon some of our apocryphal books (1 and 2 Esdras and The Prayer of Manasses) illustrates the point that 'the Apocrypha' is not an undisputed and clearly-defined whole, like the Old and New Testaments.

<sup>2</sup> A relic of this Puritan tendency survives in the exclusion of the Apocrypha from all use in the Irish Church and in the inability of the British and Foreign Bible Society to supply complete Bibles. They are forbidden to include the Apocrypha by their constitution. The apocryphal books, since 'the Church doth read' them, should be included in complete editions of the Bible. The lectionary of 1922 and its more recent successors include lessons from the Apocrypha.

The word 'apocrypha' is one that has had many meanings. Originally it simply meant 'hidden', and 'apocryphal' books were books containing esoteric teaching known only to the few. The idea of such books was increasingly repugnant to the Christian Church and the word acquired a secondary meaning of 'heretical' or 'spurious'. In the fourth century the word is applied in a different sense by S. Jerome, and comes to mean simply non-canonical. 'Quicquid extra hos' (*i.e.* the Hebrew Canon) 'est, inter *ἀπόκρυφα* esse ponendum.' He uses it to include both those books that had previously been termed 'ecclesiastical' and also those usually styled 'apocryphal'. It is from S. Jerome that the title 'apocrypha' as we use it to-day comes.

(iv) The formation of the Canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, was a gradual process. We may summarize its chief stages as follows:

(a) The earliest stage was the informal collection by local Churches of writings of spiritual value. These would include letters from Apostles and other leaders and probably collections of our Lord's sayings and perhaps records of His life and death, that were recognized as coming from reliable sources. A church like Corinth would preserve letters from S. Paul for future guidance. Then local churches would interchange letters and writings. 'Ephesians' was probably in origin a circular letter with the name of the local church left blank to be filled in. The words 'at Ephesus' in 1<sup>1</sup> are absent from the two oldest MSS. *℞ B*. There is some evidence that Romans was also used as a circular letter without the addition of the last chapters. In Col 4<sup>16</sup> the Colossians are bidden to hand on the Epistle to be read at Laodicea and in turn to read 'the Epistle from Laodicea', *i.e.* probably the Epistle to the Ephesians, which had been sent there first. We can see then how the germ of a canon arose. Churches compared notes about the sacred writings that they treasured. They interchanged copies, and so in a sense each church came almost unconsciously to form its own canon.

It is most difficult to ascertain how early the books of the New Testament won general acceptance in any given region. Our earliest evidence is that of quotations. In the earliest days we can hardly expect exact quotations from N.T. writings. They had not yet attained their unique position. Stress was still laid on oral tradition. Phrases from set catechetical formulas still lingered in the memory of the writers. There was as yet no conception of the duty of exact quotations from books that were not yet in the full sense canonical. So it is most difficult to be sure what N.T. books were known to early Christian writers. Our evidence does not become clear till the end of the second century.

(β) The earliest definite mention of anything like a canon of Scripture is found in the case of the heretic Marcion (A.D. 140). He formed a collection of S. Paul's Epistles, rejecting the Pastorals, and

added a mutilated version of S. Luke's Gospel. These alone he accepted as authoritative. About A.D. 200 we find the Muratorian Canon, a fragment containing a list of books recognized as authoritative at Rome. This is the earliest list of the kind that has survived: it need by no means be the earliest that was formed. At the close of the second century we find in several writers the conception of a New Testament as a companion to the Old, and books from this new collection are cited as Scripture. This does not necessarily imply that the limits of this collection were as yet fixed. The Muratorian Canon includes the four Gospels, Acts, all the Epistles of S. Paul, the Apocalypse, two Epistles of S. John, S. Jude, and the First Epistle of S. Peter. The Second Epistle of S. Peter is treated as doubtful. 'Some of the members do not wish it to be read in the church.' It omits Hebrews, S. James, and one of S. John's Epistles, presumably the third. Hermas is to be read privately, but not in church.<sup>1</sup>

(γ) By A.D. 400 the Canon of the New Testament had for all practical purposes become fixed. Early in the fourth century Eusebius gives a list of books as accepted by his contemporaries.<sup>2</sup> He divides them practically into three classes: (1) the 'acknowledged' books (*ὁμολογούμενα*), (2) the 'disputed' books (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*), and (3) the 'spurious' books (*νόθα*). In the first class he places the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of S. Paul, the First Epistle of S. Peter and the First Epistle of S. John. The Apocalypse he places with hesitation in this class, though he afterwards includes it with a similar hesitation in the second class. It would also seem that he includes Hebrews among S. Paul's Epistles as he does elsewhere, though he allows that its authorship is disputed by the Roman Church.<sup>3</sup> In the second class he places, as 'recognized by most', the Epistles of S. James, S. Jude, 2 and 3 John and 2 Peter. Among the 'spurious' he includes the Acts of Paul, Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called 'Teaching of the Apostles', and also perhaps the Apocalypse of John. The Canon of S. Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>4</sup> (A.D. 340) is the same as our own except for the omission of the Apocalypse. The Canons of Athanasius<sup>5</sup> (A.D. 367) and Epiphanius<sup>6</sup> are identical with our own. At this time the chief point of difference was the acceptance of the Apocalypse. It was rejected, e.g. by Gregory of Nazianzum and Amphilochius of Iconium. A Synod of Carthage formally ratified a list identical with our present canon. Its date may be either 397 or 419 and its authority extended beyond Africa. This decision was confirmed by the Trullan Council in 692. But in actual fact the final determination of the New Testament canon was prob-

<sup>1</sup> The Muratorian fragment is given in Gwatkin, *Selections from Early Christian Writers*, p. 82 and Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church*, vol. i, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* iii, 3 and 25, quoted Gwatkin, pp. 33 ff., Kidd, p. 235.

<sup>3</sup> *H.E.* iii, 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Catechetical Lectures*, iv, 33.

<sup>5</sup> *Festal Epistle*, 39.

<sup>6</sup> *Heresies*, c. 76.

ably due to other causes than the decisions of Synods. In the West the influence of the Vulgate and in the East the agreement of a few leading and learned authorities carried great weight. The decisions of Councils did but ratify current usage.

So then we may sum up the history of the Canon by saying it was the gradual work of the collective consciousness of the Church guided by the Holy Spirit. It was a task not only of collecting but of sifting and rejecting. There was a real 'inspiration of selection'. 'What a number of works circulated among churches of the second century all enjoying a greater or less degree of authority, only to lose it! . . . It is certainly a wonderful feat on the part of the early Church to have by degrees sifted out this mass of literature: and still more wonderful that it should not have discarded, at least so far as the New Testament is concerned, no single work which after generations have found cause to look back upon with any regret.'<sup>1</sup> It was a work in which all members of the body played their part. The devotional taste of the multitude was guided and corrected by the learning and spiritual enlightenment of its leaders. Their decisions approved themselves to the mind and conscience of the whole Church. In the recognition of these books as forming an inspired Canon the belief that they were composed by Apostles or their disciples played a part. The Church attempted to make historical judgments because her faith is based on history. Not all books claiming to be by Apostles were accepted (e.g. The 'Gospel of Peter'). The final test was whether the book was recognized to bear the stamp of apostolic truth and to set forth the apostolic gospel. This consideration applies to books which are now believed not to be directly apostolic in origin, e.g. S. Matthew's Gospel.<sup>2</sup>†

(d) The relation of the Jewish Law to the Christian Church was an early problem. On the one hand, Jewish Christians were reluctant to allow that even the regulations of the old law concerning food, etc., were no longer binding. On the other hand certain Gnostics and the Marcionites rejected the Old Testament altogether, partly on the ground that its morality was un-Christian. The Church refused to abandon the Old Testament and in various ways set about making a

<sup>1</sup> Sanday, *Inspiration*, pp. 27-28.

<sup>2</sup> The language of our Article is apparently inconsistent. It first defines as 'Canonical' those books 'of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church', which if strictly interpreted would exclude the 'Antilegomena'. Then it gives a full list of N.T. and says 'All the books of N.T., as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them for canonical.' Westcott suggested that a distinction was purposely made between 'Canonical' Books and such 'canonical books as have never been doubted in the church'. This would allow room for the opinions of reformers who rejected certain books, e.g. Luther rejected the Epistle of S. James. More probably the language is simply careless and we may fairly hold that the appeal is made to the judgment of the whole Church as expressed in the final form of the Canon. The disputed books were at most rejected by parts of the Church and their opinion was finally subordinated to the judgment of the Church as a whole.

reply to Marcion. Thus Irenaeus expounded the view that God's revelation and commandments had been given to men by stages according to their capacities and needs. He and other teachers developed the typological interpretation already begun in the apostolic Church, and by some, as by Origen and his school, allegorization in the manner of Philo was carried to extreme lengths. At the time of the Reformation the new emphasis on the authority of the Bible revived the whole question of the Old Testament. Some rejected it entirely 'as a book nothing necessary to the Christians which live under the Gospel'. Others again insisted on the obligation of the whole Jewish Law upon Christians. Article VII replies by laying down (i) that the O.T. is not to be rejected as contrary to the New; (ii) that it looks forward to Christ. God's promises to the Jews are more than transitory; (iii) that we must draw a distinction between the civil and ceremonial law which are no longer binding and the moral law which remains binding.

(i) *'The Old Testament is not contrary to the New'* because it is an earlier and preparatory stage in one single divine revelation. To say that it is *'not contrary to'*, does not mean that it has the perfection of the New. In earlier times God allowed and even enjoined much that is imperfect and even, in the light of the higher standard of later days, wrong (cp. Lk 9<sup>54</sup> and the Sermon on the Mount). He taught men gradually, as they were able to receive it. We always need to remember that the Church does not accept the Old Testament by itself but only as fulfilled and supplemented by the New Testament. Nearly all the popular objections to Bible morality are based on the fallacy of taking the Old Testament apart in isolation from its fulfilment and correction in the New Testament.

(ii) It is perfectly true to say that the Old Testament offers salvation through Christ, though in a different way from the New Testament. Although in the light of our modern knowledge the history of the Messianic hope has needed to be rewritten, yet it remains as real and true as ever. The prophets and writers of the Old Testament voiced ideals and aspirations that they felt sure that a loving and righteous God must one day fulfil, just because He was loving and righteous. They were inspired to feel their need of a Saviour. This Messianic hope developed on several independent lines. At one time it took the form of an ideal king of the house of David whom God would raise up to do the work that the actual kings were doing so badly (cp. Is 9<sup>6</sup>, Ezek 34<sup>23</sup>, etc.). At other times it was a vision of God Himself coming to judge the earth, to overwhelm the enemies of Israel and establish a reign of perfect justice (cp. Ps 50, Is 59<sup>16</sup> ff., Mal 3<sup>1</sup>, etc.). Elsewhere it appeared in the shape of the 'suffering servant', an idealization of a perfect Israel fulfilling God's destiny for itself and so by its sufferings redeeming the world (Is 53). In short, while other nations were content to look back to the past for a golden

age, Israel was inspired to look for it in the future. This glorious picture they attempted to portray in the highest terms that they knew. In the hands of Israel's prophets it took many shapes, a restored and perfect Jerusalem, a new and painless earth, a kingdom of perfect justice, an age of plenty. The Messianic hope expressed itself in many ways, but all looked forward to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. In this sense certainly *'the fathers did not look only for transitory promises'*. These hopes and aspirations for the complete manifestation of His righteousness and sovereignty they were convinced that God must some day fulfil, because He was God. In a very wonderful way they all met and were fulfilled in Christ. The Old Testament promised a deliverer, the New Testament records His coming.

Again, the faith of Israel really carried with it a belief in a future life. No doubt any such clear and definite belief only appears quite late in Jewish writings. At first it would seem that the Jews regarded life in Sheol as a vague and shadowy existence, hardly worth being called life. The proof of God's favour was to be found in long life and prosperity in this world rather than in any reward in the next. But quite early writings bear witness to a faith in God that was bound to issue ultimately in a belief in a future life worth the name. In Mk 12<sup>26-27</sup> Christ shows that the language of early times carried with it implications that were only partially understood by those who employed it. What the pious Jew really desired was life in union with God. Such life possessed a positive character independent of time altogether. Hence it is most difficult to be sure how much is meant by the language of many of the psalms. Such psalms as the 16th and 17th, for instance, contain the principle of eternal life in conscious fellowship with God, but it is doubtful if they imply anything like a personal resurrection. At the same time a belief that death could not destroy such fellowship was a deduction that faith in God must ultimately make and it is implicit in the psalmists' language. In the famous chapter of Ezekiel (37) the resurrection of dry bones signifies primarily the resurrection of the nation, not of the individual Israelite. But Israel could not contemplate a future reign of God upon earth to be enjoyed only by that generation of Israelites then alive. Therefore they were led to the belief that dead Israelites would be raised up again to share it. The Messianic hope must be for the whole nation, not for one part. This idea of a resurrection of the dead is found quite clearly in the late passage Is 26<sup>19</sup> and again in Daniel 12<sup>2</sup>. It is, as it were, being worked out in the book of Job (cp. 19<sup>25-27</sup>). Though it was rejected by the Sadducees, it formed a part of common Jewish belief in our Lord's day. So we may say that the Jews only gradually came to hold explicitly a full belief in a future life beyond the grave, but that such a belief was contained from the first in their knowledge of God and God's character.

(iii) The difficult question of the O.T. Law is solved by making a distinction between the ceremonial and civil law on the one hand and the moral on the other. The distinction is useful and no doubt corresponds with the decision of the Church made at the Council of Jerusalem, but we need to remember that it is utterly alien to the Jewish mind. There is not one trace of it in O.T. itself. To the Jew all alike was the Law of God: each part was equally divine and equally sacred. If the first disciples more or less explicitly tolerated any such distinction it was because part of the law had been definitely abrogated by an act of God Himself, namely by the teaching of Jesus the Messiah, God's authorized representative. As such He had instituted a New Covenant by His death, under which Jew and Gentile can be saved not by obedience to the law but by faith in Jesus the Messiah. Accordingly, as the Council of Jerusalem and the teaching of S. Paul in his Epistles, especially Galatians and Romans, show, the ritual and ceremonial law was regarded as abolished by One who had authority to abolish it. The one sacrifice of Christ had made the ancient sacrifices superfluous and impossible; the New Israel under the New Covenant had its own rites of cleansing and initiation by which new members were incorporated into Christ. The ceremonial law of the Old Testament could no longer be regarded as God's command for Christians. The civil law was the law of Israel as a nation. In part it had fallen into disuse as a result of changed circumstances. But in any case it was superseded by the law of the New Israel. National distinctions were done away with. Hence the civil law of the Jewish nation was binding at most on Jews. There could be no longer any need for a Gentile to become a Jew in order to enter into God's chosen people. Faith in Christ was the sole essential condition for membership of the New Israel. The case of the moral law was different. It was an embodiment of God's will for all men, a partial disclosure of the law of man's true being. As such Christ did not abolish but rather deepened and enforced it (cp. Mt 22<sup>37</sup>). The righteousness of His disciples was to exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees as being righteousness of heart and will and not only of act (Mt 5<sup>20</sup>). Further, Christians have a new motive, no longer a forced obedience to a law imposed from without, but a free and willing obedience springing from within, from a heart filled with the love of God. This new motive demands an even more complete submission to the will of God than the old. Accordingly we find in the Epistles abundant exhortations to Christians to live worthily of their profession by obedience to the moral law. Rom 13<sup>9</sup>, Eph 6<sup>3</sup>, Jas 2<sup>10</sup>, etc.†

## THE CREEDS

### ARTICLE VIII

#### *Of the Three Creeds*

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.

#### *De tribus Symbolis*

*Symbola tria, Nicaenum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt, et credenda, nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.*

One of the Articles of 1553, slightly altered. It was composed as a protest against Anabaptists, who rejected all creeds.

#### § 1. *The origin of Creeds*

(a) From the first the Church required from all who wished to become her members, some public profession of faith in Christ. Men whose hearts were touched by the apostolic preaching were urged to repent and believe and be baptized (e.g. Acts 20<sup>21</sup>). S. Timothy, probably at the moment of his baptism, had confessed a good confession in the sight of many witnesses (1 Tim 6<sup>12</sup>). In the Bezan text of the Acts we find such a confession put into the mouth of the Ethiopian Eunuch: 'See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God' (Acts 8<sup>36-37</sup>). The last two sentences formed probably no part of the original text as written by S. Luke, but they are quite early<sup>1</sup> and illustrate the practice of the Church at least in sub-apostolic times. So, too, S. Peter speaks of the 'interrogation' (ἐπερωτήματα) in connexion with Baptism (1 Pet 3<sup>21</sup>).

(i) When we wish to go a step further and ask in what form such belief was expressed, the evidence is less clear. Probably some quite short and simple form of words was in use, such as 'I believe that Jesus is Lord'. The primary aim of the earliest apostolic preaching was to create the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth who had been crucified was the Christ. Men already possessed a belief in a Messiah: they were now bidden to identify the Messiah whom they expected with Jesus. The use of some such simple formula is implied in passages of S. Paul. 'No man can say that Jesus is Lord save in the Holy

<sup>1</sup>They were known to Irenaeus (180).

Ghost' (1 Cor 12<sup>3</sup>). 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation' (Rom 10<sup>9-10</sup>, cp. Phil 2<sup>11</sup>). The same custom is also suggested by the First Epistle of S. John. 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and he in God' (4<sup>15</sup>. Notice the aorist, denoting a single definite act of confession.) So, too, in 5<sup>5</sup> the context quite clearly points to a connexion between the confession that 'Jesus is the Son of God' and the coming by water, *i.e.* baptism (cp. also Heb 4<sup>14</sup>). The language of S. John suggests an alternative form of baptismal confession, 'I believe that Jesus is the Son of God', the phrase 'Son of God' having primarily a Messianic meaning. In short, all the evidence goes to show that from the earliest days Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus was accompanied by a public acknowledgement of His lordship by the recipient. Matthew 28<sup>19</sup> shows that before the end of the first century the confession of the three-fold Name accompanied baptism at least in some parts of the Church. The earlier confession of Jesus as Lord or Son of God was thus embodied in a fuller formula which was everywhere adopted in the second century. In these primitive confessions are contained the germs of our later Creeds.

(ii) One of the connecting links between our fully developed creeds and the short and simple formulas of the apostolic Church may probably be found in the questions and responses that formed a part of the service of baptism. The earliest precise evidence we possess about this service shows that these questions and answers were the form in which the threefold Name was invoked *at the moment of baptism*. This may be illustrated from the rite as described in the *Apostolic Tradition* of S. Hippolytus of Rome (A.D. 220).

'And when he who is to be baptized goes down to the water, let him who baptizes lay hand on him saying thus, "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?" And he who is being baptized shall say, "I believe." Let him forthwith baptize him once, having his hand laid upon his head. And after this let him say, "Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus, The Son of God, Who was born by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and died, and rose again on the third day living from the dead, and ascended into the heavens, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the living and the dead?" And when he says, "I believe," let him baptize him the second time. And again let him say, "Dost thou believe in the Holy Spirit, in the holy Church, and the resurrection of the flesh?" And he who is being baptized shall say, "I believe." And so let him baptize him the third time.'

This form of rite consisting of questions and answers at the

moment of baptism was not a peculiarly Roman custom. The evidence points to the conclusion that it was normal in both East and West in the first four centuries. Thus Tertullian in Africa writes 'We are thrice immersed giving a somewhat fuller answer than the Lord laid down in the Gospel.' In the fourth century S. Cyril of Jerusalem describes the act of baptism by saying 'ye were led by the hand to the holy font of the divine baptism . . . and each one was asked whether he believed in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost and ye confessed the saving confession'. There is no suggestion here that the candidate for baptism himself uttered a credal statement in or at the font. The question of the minister with the assent of the candidate constituted both the invocation of the threefold Name and the saving confession of faith. In the questions we have a tripartite *interrogatory* creed forming part of the actual rite of baptism.

But, if at the crucial moment of the baptismal rite there took place this process of definite questioning, this clearly pre-supposed some considerable instruction of the candidates. It is in this preliminary instruction that we find the origin of the fully developed creeds-forms. In reading the Acts of the Apostles we cannot but be struck by the apparent scantiness of the teaching given to candidates for baptism. Partly no doubt this was due to the inchoate form of the Church's belief. She was only making clear to herself, as the result of her growing experience, all that was contained in her belief in Jesus as Lord. Moreover the first converts came almost entirely from Jews or from those under Jewish influence, to whom the fundamental truth of the Unity of God and His creation of the world would be already familiar. But even within the New Testament we find hints of a more or less regular outline of Christian instruction. The Roman Christians had obeyed the 'form of doctrine unto which ye were delivered', *i.e.* as unto a guardian (Rom 6<sup>17</sup>). S. Paul exhorted S. Timothy to 'hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me' (2 Tim 1<sup>13</sup>, cp. also 2<sup>8</sup>). We may be sure that some statement of the main facts about the life and death of the Lord Jesus was always given, where necessary, before Baptism. The early chapters of the Acts suggest that the Church possessed a common store-house of proof-texts from the Old Testament, used to reconcile the Jewish mind to the unwelcome fact of a suffering Messiah. In 1 Cor 15<sup>3-7</sup> we have something approaching an official list of Resurrection appearances (cp. also the later summary given in [Mk] 16<sup>9</sup> ff.). In 1 Tim 3<sup>16</sup> we have a fragment of an early Christian hymn. 'He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory.' In the New Testament generally we find abundant evidence of a tendency to crystallize fundamental points of belief in summary statements. Sometimes, as in 1 Cor 15<sup>3-7</sup>, Phil 2<sup>6-11</sup>, 1 Pet 3<sup>18-22</sup>, these statements are purely Christological in content; others, as in

1 Cor 8<sup>6</sup>, 1 Tim 6<sup>15</sup>, 1 Pet 1<sup>21</sup> (cf. the opening greeting of some of the epistles) are bipartite in form. In other passages, such as 1 Cor 12<sup>4-6</sup>, 2 Cor 13<sup>14</sup>, 1 Pet 1<sup>2</sup>, there is evidence of an underlying threefold structure. None of these are creeds in the sense of a fixed official and exactly worded formula; they all exhibit patterns of formulation which played a part in the final shaping of the creeds. We must note that, then as now, similar patterns of statement would occur in the liturgical prayers of the Church. By the second half of the second century we find these summaries tending to settle into one predominant form, namely, that with which we are familiar in the Apostles' Creed, with an opening section on God the Father, a central and rather longer section on Jesus Christ and the events of His life, and a third section on the Holy Spirit, the Church and eternal life. There is, however, no evidence that in the second or even in the early third century any one such profession of faith with a precise and sacrosanct wording was the officially recognized formula in any local church.<sup>1</sup> This stage was reached at some time in the third century. During this century the course of instruction of catechumens took on a more settled sequence. A few days or weeks before baptism the candidates were taught the words of the creed and its contents were expounded to them. This was the *traditio symboli*. Shortly before the baptismal service came the *redditio symboli*, when the candidate gave back the creed by repeating it in the presence of the Bishop or some other teacher. In East and West alike with variations in detail this procedure was general in the fourth century. The imparting and rendering of the official *declaratory* creed ('I believe'), with its careful and exactly preserved wording was thus the culminating point in the *preparation* of the candidate for baptism; in the rite of baptism itself the *interrogatory* creed retained its central place. The two forms of creed must have influenced one another in ways which we cannot follow in detail. No doubt the declaratory creed ultimately took its tripartite shape because the baptismal questions were naturally constructed on the threefold Name.

(iii) Accordingly we find in the fourth century the established use of official creeds in all the principal churches. The wording of many of them can be reconstructed with reasonable accuracy and in a few cases they are exactly quoted. Their general structure as developed out of the Trinitarian formula is identical; their details vary at different dates and places. There is nothing to suggest that before the rise of the Arian controversy the local creeds were formulated, revised or supplemented with a view to excluding heresy. Their purpose was to set forth positively the fundamental elements of the Christian faith for those who were entering on the Christian life in baptism.

<sup>1</sup> The variations in the creed-like formulas found in authors of the second century are not due to reluctance to quote the exact words of an existing official formula. The rule of secrecy about the creed came in later with the practice of the *traditio* and *redditio symboli*.

We can distinguish two main types of creed, Eastern and Western, corresponding in large measure to the difference between the Eastern and the Western mind. The West was always practical, interested in facts rather than ideas. The East was speculative, interested in ideas rather than facts. The West was unable to speculate for itself and unwilling to pay great attention to the speculations of others. It opposed error less from the love of truth in the abstract than from motives of practical Christianity and the wish to be free from the confusion and distraction of controversy. The East delighted to think out the intellectual content of the Christian faith. Hence, inevitably Eastern Christianity produced a crop of home-grown heresies, side by side with those heathen and gnostic errors that from the first had been the common enemy of the whole Church. These characteristics are reflected in the later development of the creeds. Western creeds are as a rule short, straightforward recitals of fact. Eastern creeds add dogmatic explanations and interpretations. The Western creeds on the whole remain closer to the original purpose of creeds, namely, to state positive truth. The Eastern creeds necessarily betray a more obvious desire to exclude heresy and error. Taking our so-called Apostles' Creed as a typical Western creed and our so-called Nicene Creed as a typical Eastern creed, we may illustrate from them these tendencies:

(a) We find the Eastern creeds giving the reason for certain facts, where the Western creeds are content simply to state the facts, even where there is no theological question at stake. The Apostles' Creed recounts our Lord's birth. The Nicene adds that it was 'for us men and for our salvation'. The Apostles' Creed records the Resurrection on the third day, the Nicene adds that it was 'according to the Scriptures'. The Nicene explains that baptism is 'for the remission of sins'. Similarly Eastern creeds alone have 'shall come again with glory'.

(β) Again, the Eastern creeds tend to greater theological precision. The Nicene, like other Eastern creeds, has 'One' before God, and adds 'Maker of heaven and earth'. Though our Apostles' Creed contains the latter clause, it was, as we shall see, a late addition, and the Nicene Creed amplifies this by adding 'and of all things visible and invisible'. It is characteristic of Eastern creeds to dwell on the life and work of our Lord before the Incarnation. 'The only begotten Son of God,' 'Begotten of His Father before all worlds,' 'Through whom all things were made.' Clause is added to clause in order to insist upon His Divinity. The Nicene addition 'of one substance with the Father' was added only to Eastern Baptismal creeds. The West felt no need of it. In contrast with this the Western creeds go straight on from the mention of our Lord to the fact of His Incarnation and His death. The theological interpretation of His death, 'He suffered' though present in Eastern creeds from the first in order to exclude Docetism, was a late addition in the West. The Nicene Creed further

adds 'Whose Kingdom shall have no end' to refute the heresy of Marcellus, and emphasizes the Divinity of the Holy Spirit 'The Lord and the Giver of life' as against Macedonianism. The only additions found exclusively in the West are 'He descended into Hell' and 'the communion of Saints'.

(b) Hitherto we have dealt with creeds as local variations of a common type, framed for the sole purpose of the instruction and initiation of learners in the Christian faith. At the Council of Nicaea we find the first instance of the employment of a creed for an entirely different purpose, as a test of orthodoxy for teachers. No doubt in earlier days from time to time appeal had been made to the creed as the rule of faith and as the evidence of conformity to primitive and apostolic teaching. But such a use was only secondary and incidental. At the Council of Nicaea we find for the first time a creed deliberately constructed for use as a test of right teaching. This new creed was not intended to supersede existing creeds: it was called into existence for a new purpose. Accordingly we get from this point onwards a new class of creeds, 'conciliar' as opposed to 'baptismal'. The baptismal creed as being the personal confession of faith made by the individual, is naturally in the singular 'I believe'. The conciliar creed, as expressing the faith of an assembled body, is naturally in the plural 'We believe'. The employment of the singular is not a mark of Western as opposed to Eastern creeds, but is found in all baptismal creeds. The distinction between conciliar and baptismal creeds is not absolute. The former were built on the foundation of the latter. The threefold structure is always retained and a conciliar can be adopted as a baptismal creed by the change of the plural into the singular. But the action of the Council of Nicaea marks a revolution in the use of creeds.<sup>1</sup>

A third type of creed deserves mention, namely, private or individual theological confessions. Such sit more loosely to the creed-form and have in themselves no authority but that of the individuals who composed them. We shall see that our so-called Athanasian really belongs to this third type. The object of their existence is to state certain aspects of Christian truth which made a special appeal to their authors.

### § 2. *The Apostles' Creed*

(i) We may now turn to the history of '*that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed*'. Put shortly, the Apostles' Creed as we use it, is

<sup>1</sup> This is why we meet with 'anathemas' for the first time at the end of the creed of the Council of Nicaea. 'The anathemas are there because and only because the creed is no longer the layman's confession of faith but the bishop's. The old principle that the profession of belief of catechumens should be positive in character is not infringed: the Council has not even in view the case of the clergy, still less that of the faithful laity: to bishops alone belonged the office of deciding in the last resort what was Christian and Catholic and what was heretical, and therefore bishops alone should be called upon to guarantee their soundness in the faith by formal and solemn anathema of error,' Turner, *History and use of Creeds*, p. 28.

an enlarged form of the Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church. This 'Old Roman Creed' is first found in Greek in a letter written by Marcellus of Ancyra about A.D. 340 to the Bishop of Rome and preserved in the writings of Epiphanius. Marcellus had been accused of a form of Sabellianism. In order to prove his orthodoxy he left with the Bishop of Rome a formal statement of his faith. This was in reality the Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church, which we find some sixty years later described in the commentary of Rufinus. It runs as follows:

1. I believe in God (the Father) almighty
2. And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,  
Who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary,  
Crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried,  
The third day He rose from the dead,  
He ascended into Heaven,  
Sitteth at the right-hand of the Father,  
Whence He cometh to judge quick and dead.
3. And in the Holy Ghost,  
Holy Church,  
Remission of sins,  
Resurrection of flesh.<sup>1</sup>

The Latin version of the Old Roman Creed first appears in the commentary of Rufinus (A.D. 400), in which he compares the creed of his own Church of Aquileia with that of Rome. This then we can take as our starting-point. By the middle of the fourth century the Old Roman Creed was in use in the form given above. Two questions still remain. How much further back can it be traced? By what process of development did it assume the later form that we commonly call 'the Apostles' Creed'? It was maintained by Burn and others that the Old Roman Creed went back to the early years of the second century. There is nothing in its teaching to render this early date

<sup>1</sup> Our present text of Marcellus omits 'the Father' in the opening clause and adds 'eternal life' at the close. These changes were probably due to the mistakes of copyists. The Latin of Rufinus has 'the Father' and omits 'eternal life', and Jerome expressly tells us that the Roman Creed ends with 'Resurrection of flesh'. Other authorities support this version.

### THE OLD ROMAN CREED

Credo in Deum patrem omnipotentem, et in Christum Iesum filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus; tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram patris, unde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.

### THE LATER APOSTLES' CREED

Credo in Deum patrem omnipotentem, creatorem caeli et terrae, et in Iesum Christum filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria virgine, passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; descendit ad inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit ad caelos, sedet ad dexteram Dei patris omnipotentis, inde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, vitam aeternam.

improbable, but in view of what has already been said about the development of credal forms in the second century we could hardly date the composition of this creed much before the end of this century, and perhaps it was only in the next century that it became the sole official creed of the Roman Church. By the fourth century it was certainly well established, for its influence on the formation of other local Western creeds is apparent.

Harnack and Kattenbusch held that the Old Roman Creed became the direct parent of the Eastern Creeds. These, it was argued, could be traced back to a single model in the creed of Antioch, and this in turn depended on the Old Roman Creed which was introduced at Antioch after the deposition of Paul of Samosata in 272. More probably the local Eastern Creeds developed in the second and third centuries independently of Rome and out of the same fundamental needs and practices of the Church. In any case, the important fact is that they exhibit a similar outline of teaching with those of the West, though with some characteristic features of their own.

(ii) When we contrast the Old Roman Creed with our present 'Apostles' Creed' we find that it has been enlarged by the following additions:

'Maker of heaven and earth'

'Who was conceived'

'Suffered'

'Dead'

'Descended into hell'

'God . . . almighty' (On the right hand of God the Father Almighty)

'Catholic'

'The communion of Saints'

'The life everlasting.'

Of these some appear in use in local creeds earlier than others. 'The life everlasting,' as we learn from Cyprian, had its place in a baptismal interrogation used in the Church of Africa as early as the middle of the third century. The creed of Milan had 'suffered' instead of 'was crucified' by the close of the fourth century, when S. Augustine was baptized. 'Descended into hell' is found in the creed of the Church of Aquileia by the time of Rufinus (A.D. 400) and had previously appeared in an Arian creed drawn up at Sirmium in 359 and accepted at Ariminum. The majority of the additions are found in the creed used by a certain Niceta or Nicetas, Bishop of Remesiana in the Balkan peninsula at the close of the fourth century. His creed contained 'maker of heaven and earth', 'suffered', 'dead', 'catholic', 'communion of saints', 'life everlasting'. His diocese lay on the borderland between East and West, on the high road between Constantinople and Milan, then the chief city of the West, and we may reasonably suppose that these additions were in part due to Eastern

influence. Again, a creed-form has recently been discovered which is probably a personal confession of faith sent by Jerome to Cyril of Jerusalem. It contains practically all the additions in our present Apostles' Creed or some equivalent expression. Jerome came from much the same region as Nicetas, namely, Pannonia, and his creed forms a link between the Old Roman Creed and our present form. Again, we find most of the additions more or less current in Gaul between the middle of the fifth and the opening of the sixth century. We have sermons composed by Faustus, Bishop of Riez, for a time abbot of the great monastery of Lerins and by Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (died 543), and a letter written by Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon. From these we gather that by the close of the fifth century the Gallican Church used a creed that differed from our Apostles' Creed only by the omission of 'maker of heaven and earth'. It has been conjectured that the additions had travelled westwards from Pannonia through Aquileia and Milan to the south of France. There they became diffused through the influence of the school of Lerins. The Apostles' Creed in the precise form in which we now repeat it is first met in a treatise of Priminius, a missionary bishop who had been for a time abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Reichenau and worked in France and Germany about 750. But there are certain earlier creeds found in the Gallican Missal and the Gallican Sacramentary and employed in Gaul before 700 which contain all the additions but are marked by certain slight variations from our present form.

If we ask the further question, how came our Apostles' Creed to be substituted for the Old Roman Creed throughout the West and even in Rome itself, no certain answer can be given. It is a surprising fact (for a fact it appears to be) that from the sixth until at least the ninth century Rome abandoned her own ancient creed and substituted the Nicene Creed in the instruction of her catechumens.<sup>1</sup> At some time between the ninth and the twelfth centuries Rome resumed the use of her ancient formula, now in the expanded form of the Apostles' Creed, which was already prevalent in the Franco-German Church. Having given her creed to the West in early days, the Roman Church took it back again, enriched by additions made by the Christian piety of others, and thus ensured its universal acceptance in the West as the sole baptismal creed.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The interrogations at the moment of baptism remained unaltered, as the Gelasian Sacramentary shows, and closely resembled the Old Roman Creed, though in an abbreviated form.

<sup>2</sup> The only addition that needs explanation is 'the communion of saints'. The Latin 'sanctorum communionem' is ambiguous. Sanctorum may be either masculine or neuter. Probably it is masculine, as it is so taken in the sermon of Nicetas, where the addition first occurs. He explains the clause as the fellowship of holy men in one church. 'Saints' means 'Christians'; it must not be limited to specially famous Christians, but includes living and departed alike. It we take sanctorum as neuter, the 'holy things' mean 'sacraments'. The fellowship in holy things is a visible sign of the communion of saints.



(iii) In what sense, then, may our creed rightly be styled 'Apostles' ? It clearly cannot have been drawn up by the apostles themselves. It is found in a less fully developed form long after the death of the last apostle and its development into its present form can be traced. It is true that Rufinus supposed that the Old Roman Creed was put together by an assembly of the apostles before leaving Jerusalem and had remained unaltered; but there is no trace of any such belief in other writers, earlier and wiser than Rufinus,<sup>1</sup> including, for instance, S. Luke. Still less credence can be given to the legend, found first in Priminus, that assigned the composition of our present creed to the twelve on the day of Pentecost, distributing with some difficulty a fair portion to each apostle. It is possible that a belief of this kind gave rise to the title. More probably, however, the name 'symbolum apostolicum' or 'symbolum apostolorum' is used in a wider sense. It means no more than that the creed is a faithful summary of apostolic teaching and that its substance came from the apostles. In an uncritical age the title was perverted to mean that the actual creed came ready-made from the lips of the apostles. Another possible explanation of the name is that it was the creed of the Roman Church, the one and only apostolic see of the West; hence the creed of the apostolic see came to be called the Apostolic Creed.

(iv) The Apostles' Creed has been for a thousand years the Baptismal Creed of the whole Western Church. It has never been used in the East. In our Prayer Book it is found in two slightly different forms. First the ordinary form recited at Mattins and Evensong, found also in the Catechism. Secondly, an interrogative form found in the Baptismal service and the Visitation of the Sick. This last differs from the first in speaking of the 'Resurrection of the flesh' instead of the 'Resurrection of the body' and in adding 'after death' to the last clause. The Latin is 'carnis resurrectionem',<sup>2</sup> of which the 'resurrection of the flesh' is the more correct translation. The phrase is not Scriptural, but is quite early. 'After death' is an addition found in certain Gallican creeds, which failed to win a place in the final form of the Baptismal Creed.

### § 3. *The Nicene Creed*

Our so-called 'Nicene' Creed has a long and complicated history. We may best begin with some account of the Council of Nicaea itself.

(i) Our information about the proceedings of the Council is very

<sup>1</sup> A similar belief in direct apostolic authorship is found in Ambrose and possibly in Jerome, who speaks of 'symbolum . . . ab apostolis traditum'. Ambrose first applies the title 'apostles' to the Old Roman Creed.

<sup>2</sup> 'Huius carnis resurrectionem' is even found in some early forms, but happily was not adopted. The earliest Eastern creeds may have contained the phrase 'the resurrection of flesh'. But later Eastern creeds, perhaps under the influence of Origen, prefer 'the resurrection of the dead', as being closer to Scripture. We may wish the West had followed their example. Cranmer's translation of 'carnis' by 'body' may have been deliberate, to bring the phrase nearer to Scripture. See Swete, *J.Th.S.*, Jan. 1917.

inadequate. In a letter to his own church written shortly after the event Eusebius of Caesarea related that he had produced to the Council a statement of faith which he quotes. Included in this statement is what was evidently the baptismal creed in use at Caesarea.<sup>1</sup> The letter, after saying that this profession of faith was received as orthodox, appears to suggest that the emperor wished the Council to make the statement its own, with the one addition of the word *homoousios*, though Eusebius, when he goes on to quote the Creed eventually formulated by the Council reveals the fact that this differed from his own in a number of other clauses. Until recently it was generally held on the strength of Eusebius' letter that the Creed of the Council was in fact a revised form of the Caesarean creed. The key phrases 'that is of the substance of the Father' and 'of one substance with the Father' had been added to exclude Arianism, and a number of other changes had been made to give further anti-Arian emphasis. It is, however, by the most recent investigators regarded as unlikely that the Council arrived at its own formulation by taking this creed as its basis. Eusebius had a personal reason, not revealed in his letter, for presenting to the Council a statement of his faith; his orthodoxy had been seriously called in question by a Council held at Antioch a few months earlier. The Creed of Nicaea differs from the Caesarean formula in a number of incidental and comparatively unimportant phrases which can hardly have been the result of deliberate alterations. Probably the Council took as the basis of its new formula a baptismal creed from some Syrian or Palestinian church, closely resembling, but not identical with, that of Caesarea.

The Creed of the Nicene Council runs thus:

'We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible;

'And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, only-begotten, that is, from the substance of the Father, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, through Whom all things came into being, things in heaven and things on earth, Who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and became incarnate, becoming man, suffered and rose again on the third

<sup>1</sup> This creed is an important instance of a local Eastern baptismal creed in use before the Council of Nicaea. It runs as follows:

'We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible;

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Logos of God, God from God, light from light, life from life, Son only begotten, first-begotten of all creation, begotten before all ages from the Father, through Whom all things came into being, Who because of our salvation was incarnate, and dwelt among men, and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge living and dead;

'We believe also in one Holy Spirit.'

day, ascended to the heavens, and will come to judge the living and the dead;

'And in the Holy Spirit.

'But as for those who say, There was when He was not, and, Before being born He was not, and that He came into existence out of nothing, or who assert that the Son of God is of a different hypostasis or substance, or is created, or is subject to alteration or change—these the Catholic Church anathematizes.<sup>1</sup>

This creed decisively excluded Arianism. The two phrases relating to the divine substance meant that the Son shared in the being of the Father; 'begotten, not made' ruled out the Arian assertion that our Lord was a creature. It should be noted that the anathemas are an integral part of the Council's statement, which thus differs in form from a baptismal creed though it is based on one.

(ii) It will have been observed that there are important differences between this creed put out by the Council of Nicaea and our own so-called Nicene Creed. The latter is usually known as the Constantinopolitan Creed (C), because at the Council of Chalcedon (451) it was quoted as 'the faith of the 150 fathers', i.e. the bishops assembled at the Council of Constantinople (381). Since such records as we have about the proceedings at Constantinople are scanty and do not suggest the promulgation of any new creed, the connexion of C with this Council is very obscure. The prevailing view in this country has been that C was already in existence before 381 and was not, therefore, composed at the Council. This was held to be proved by the fact that in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, written in 374, a creed is quoted which is practically identical with C. It was further maintained by Hort<sup>2</sup> that Epiphanius obtained this creed from Jerusalem. When Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, returned from exile in 362 he revised the baptismal creed of his Church and took the opportunity to insert into it some phrases from the Creed of Nicaea. How then did C, originally emanating from Jerusalem, become associated with the Council of Constantinople? It was suggested that Cyril, who was present at the Council, produced C in defence of his own orthodoxy, and his creed, having obtained the approval of the assembled bishops,

<sup>1</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητῆν

καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς

καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ Πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ Ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ κτιστῶν ἢ τρεπτῶν ἢ ἀλλοιωτῶν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ταύτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

<sup>2</sup>In his *Two Dissertations*.

was henceforward associated with them. A further conjecture was that when Nectarius, an unbaptized layman, was elected Bishop of Constantinople during the session of the Council, this creed was employed as his baptismal confession and was then adopted as the baptismal creed of the imperial city.

In this reconstruction of the history of C there is one point which is not likely to be shaken. This creed is not an expansion of the Nicene formula, though from the time of Chalcedon onwards it was referred to as such; it has been formed by adding to some other baptismal creed certain Nicene phrases and some new clauses relating to the Holy Spirit. Whatever was the place and occasion of its origin, C is a baptismal creed supplemented by Nicene phrases and in its third section expanded to combat Macedonian views. Considerable doubt has, however, been cast on a vital point in the rest of the reconstruction outlined above. The creed which originally stood in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius in the place now occupied in the existing manuscripts by C was most probably not C but the Creed of Nicaea. If so, there remains no evidence to necessitate the view that C existed before the Council of Constantinople and the Jerusalem theory loses its main support. Moreover, between 381 and the Council of Chalcedon there is no clear and certain reference to this creed, though references to 'the faith of Nicaea' are frequent. We might infer from this that C was a local baptismal creed first brought into prominence at Chalcedon and then first attributed to the 150 fathers of Constantinople. This, however, would carry scepticism too far. No-one at Chalcedon disputed the assertion that C had been put out by the 150 fathers. This fact alone makes it virtually certain that the Council of 381 in some way gave its authority to this creed. Moreover, the apparent silence about C between 381 and 451 is not necessarily so profound as at first sight it appears to be. Dr Kelly observes<sup>1</sup> that in this period 'the description "the faith of Nicaea" or "the faith, symbol or *ekthesis* of the 318 fathers" was not necessarily applied solely to N (i.e. the Creed of Nicaea) in its pure authentic form. It could equally well be used of a creed, local or otherwise, which was patently Nicene in its general character, while differing from N in much of its language.' When the fathers of Constantinople are said (at Chalcedon) to have 'set their seal to the same (Nicene) faith' they may well have done so by including in their doctrinal statement (which we do not possess) a creed which both contained the vital Nicene phrases and also amplified the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We may sum up by saying that recent investigation has renewed confidence in the ancient view that the Council of Constantinople promulgated and gave its authority to C. Whether the Council composed the Creed<sup>2</sup> or, as Dr Kelly thinks more probable, adopted an existing liturgical formula is a question which must be left open.

<sup>1</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 323. <sup>2</sup>Badcock, *History of the Creeds*, c. xiii.

In any case, after Chalcedon C rapidly won its way in all the orthodox parts of the Eastern Church and even everywhere took the place in the baptismal rite which had previously been occupied by local creeds. This position it owed partly to its intrinsic merits but largely perhaps to its connexion with the now dominant see of Constantinople. Just as the West received its baptismal creed from Rome, so the East received its baptismal creed from the New Rome.

But this is not the most familiar use of the creed. To the modern Christian the Creed of Constantinople is above all the creed of Eucharistic worship. As we have seen, it sprang out of instruction given to candidates for baptism: it was deliberately amended to become a test of orthodoxy. From the sixth century it has been used for a new purpose, as 'the continuous doxology of the faithful, Sunday by Sunday', in the Eucharist. 'To this position no other form of the creed ever aspired than that of Constantinople. Alike in the Greek, the Latin and even the Coptic Churches, its majestic rhythm and its definite but simple and straightforward theology have marked it out as the creed of Christian worship.'<sup>1</sup> It is true that the beginning of this custom was not altogether happy. It was introduced at Constantinople by the Monophysites, in protest against the definition of Chalcedon as a novelty infringing the sufficiency of the all-sufficient creed. But the custom commended itself to the mind of the Church and spread throughout the Churches of the East. Thence it extended gradually to the Churches of Spain, Ireland, and Gaul. But it was not adopted at Rome until 1014, when Pope Benedict VIII was prevailed on by the Emperor Henry II to assimilate the use of Rome to that of Germany and the rest of Christendom. Accordingly the creed, with the addition of the words 'and the Son', for the first time appeared in the Mass at Rome. We can see the appropriateness of our present Western usage. At the font the short and simple baptismal creed is sufficient: at the service which embodies the highest worship of baptized Christians there is a peculiar fitness in reciting the fuller confession of belief, which demands and is itself the product of a more matured faith, based upon a richer Christian experience.

Our English translation is not altogether satisfactory. (i) The word 'Almighty' as applied to the Father does not accurately represent the Greek *παντοκράτορα*, which means rather 'all sovereign'. The English 'almighty', which came in through the Latin *omnipotens*, as in the Apostles' Creed, suggests 'able to do anything'.

(ii) 'By whom all things were made' should rather be 'through whom' (*δι' οὗ*). 'By' in old English meant 'through'. The clause describes the Son as the agent of the Father in creation (*διὰ* as opposed to *ὑπὸ*) in accordance with the teaching of, e.g. Jn 1<sup>3</sup> and 10 and Heb 1<sup>2b</sup>.

(iii) 'The Lord and Giver of Life' is an ambiguous rendering of the

<sup>1</sup> Turner, *op. cit.* pp. 46-47.

original, *τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν*. 'The Lord' is a distinct attribute and expresses the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. A better translation would be 'The Lord and the Life-giver'; or at least a comma should be inserted after Lord.

(iv) The word 'holy' was deliberately omitted by the reformers before 'Catholic Church' not from any doctrinal reasons but because they supposed that it was absent from the best texts. It is clear, however, that the omission is wrong, and 'holy' should be restored, as in the Alternative Order of the Communion, 1928.†

#### § 4. *The Athanasian Creed*

As we have seen, the Apostles' Creed was not composed by apostles and the Nicene Creed did not originate at the Council of Nicaea. So, too, 'Athanasius' Creed' is not the composition of Athanasius. To begin with, it was beyond all doubt written in Latin, while Athanasius wrote in Greek. Greek translations of it do indeed exist, but the clumsiness of their language and the variety of their renderings prove conclusively that they are translations and not original. Further, the 'creed' shows close affinity with the writings of the Latin fathers, Ambrose and Augustine. Its origins, therefore, lie in the Latin-speaking church in a period subsequent to the death of Athanasius. Again, strictly speaking, it is not a 'creed' at all. At best it is an individual profession of faith, framed probably to be an instruction and later on used as a psalm or a canticle. It does not conform to the fundamental creed type arising out of the threefold baptismal formula. It has not been expanded out of any simpler and earlier creed. In doctrine it may be dependent on earlier creeds, but not in form. The title of 'Symbolum' was not given to it in early MSS. It was styled rather 'fides sancti Athanasii'. So, too, it is found at its earliest appearance keeping company not with creeds but with the psalter or with canons or with miscellaneous dogmatic formularies to which were attached, with equal want of justification, the names of great theologians. These last have all been forgotten: the 'Quicumque' survives, and the reason may well have been, not only 'the survival of the fittest', but its actual lack of creed-form. 'Other formularies failed to live, because they perpetuated the structure and arrangement, while destitute of the authority, of the creeds. The "Athanasian" formulary lived on, because it put the old truths in a new and effective setting: in other words, because it was a hymn about the creed, and not itself a creed at all.'<sup>1</sup>

(i) What then can be said as to date and authorship?

The available evidence may be divided into two classes (a) internal, (β) external.

(a) The nature of the heresies combated in the second half of the creed is consistent with an early date before Nestorianism or Monophysitism became prominent. The language used about the two

<sup>1</sup> Turner, *op. cit.* p. 70.

natures of Christ, *e.g.* 'Perfect God and Perfect Man of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting, equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, etc.,' is opposed to Arianism and Apollinarianism, both of which denied to Christ the possession of a 'reasonable soul'. There is nothing in the whole statement that directly hits Nestorianism. The language which insists upon the unity of the Person of Christ (*e.g.* 'not two but one Christ') can be found in the writings of S. Augustine and would be accepted by Nestorians in their own sense. No doubt Eutyches did 'confuse the substance', and much of the language employed would oppose his teaching; but it would be equally suitable to oppose the teaching of Apollinarius. In other words, no phrase in the whole creed compels us to suppose that the writer had ever heard of either Nestorianism or Monophysitism. It has further been argued, *e.g.* by Waterland, that, if Monophysitism had come into existence, the writer would have avoided the expression 'as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ', because this was precisely the illustration employed by the Monophysites. This argument, however, does not hold good, as a long list of Catholic writers can be compiled who all continued to employ the illustration even after the rise of Monophysitism. The internal evidence does not carry us very far. The argument from silence is always precarious. The author may have refrained from combating Nestorianism or Monophysitism, not because they did not exist, but because he and those for whose instruction he wrote were not particularly concerned with them. There is a limit to the number of heresies that can be controverted with profit in a single instruction. All that we can say is that the doctrinal content of the 'Quicumque' shows that the date of origin cannot be earlier than the last quarter of the fourth century, when Apollinarianism came under formal condemnation, and does not preclude, though it does not necessitate, a date earlier than the rise of the Nestorian controversy (428).

(β) The external evidence falls into three divisions: (a) quotations, (b) MSS., (c) commentaries.

(a) The earliest quotation from the 'Quicumque' which can hardly be disputed, is in a canon of the fourth Council of Toledo in 633, which quotes largely from it as a recognized authority. It is also quoted in a sermon found among the works of S. Augustine and for a long time attributed to Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (d. 543). It is now, however, considered that the attribution is doubtful, but even if the authorship is unknown, unless the sermon can be shown to be later, we still possess in it a quotation dating from the sixth century. Further, most authorities agree that there is a remarkable similarity between the undisputed writings of Caesarius and the 'Quicumque'. Again, we have the so-called 'Trèves Fragment', containing part of a sermon on the creed, which quotes from the 'Quicumque'. The Fragment was written about 730, but the sermon must be earlier, perhaps

about 680, and therefore the 'Quicumque' must be earlier still. Other quotations can be found in anonymous sermons of the sixth and seventh centuries, but in all cases the exact date is uncertain.<sup>1</sup>

(b) The earliest MS. of the 'Quicumque' is the Codex Ambrosianus at Milan, written in an Irish hand. It is assigned by experts to the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century. Other early MSS. are the Codex Monacensis at Freising (eighth century), the Codex Petriburg at Leningrad (about 750) and Leidrat's MS. at Lyons (about 800).

(c) Besides these we have an independent source of evidence in early commentaries on the 'Quicumque', which witness to its existence in its present form. The earliest is the 'Fortunatus' commentary, which can hardly be later than 700 and may be much earlier, though our existing MSS. of the commentary are rather later. Other commentaries belong to the ninth and tenth centuries: some may be earlier. In any case the fact that the 'Quicumque' was thought worthy of such commentaries shows that it had been widely known and used for a considerable time. To sum up, our external evidence carries us back to the seventh century at the latest. If we place it side by side with the internal evidence we get a date for the origin of the 'Quicumque' between, say, 380 and 600. Neither on the question of date or authorship is any certainty attainable. All that we can do is to give some of the chief opinions that have been held.

Waterland, in his *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, published in 1723, laid the foundation of all future criticism. Mainly on internal evidence he held that the 'Quicumque' was composed in Gaul between 420 and 430, and he assigned it to Hilary, Bishop of Arles (d. 449), a pupil of Honoratus, the founder of the monastery of Lerins, the great centre of learning in south Gaul, and later Bishop of Arles. As we have seen, however, the internal evidence is perhaps less conclusive than Waterland supposed.

Burn<sup>2</sup> agreed with Waterland as to the early date of the creed, assigning it to Honoratus himself. He reinforced the previous arguments for an early date with strong arguments based on new evidence. He showed that the 'Quicumque' is exactly what would be needed against the teaching of Priscillian, Bishop of Avila in Spain (about 380). Writings of Priscillian were discovered in 1885 and they prove that what he taught consisted of a mixture of Sabellianism and Apollinarianism. These are just the two heresies that are most clearly opposed by the teaching of the 'Quicumque'. Further, he claimed that quotations from it occur in the writings of Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (d. 523), and of Faustus, Bishop of Riez (about 480). There are

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that the 'Quicumque' had reached England by 798 since it is quoted by Denebert, Bishop of Worcester, on his election to the bishopric, as an authoritative formula.

<sup>2</sup> Burn, *Athanasian Creed*, pp. 30 and 33.

undoubted similarities of thought and expression between the 'Quicunque' on the one hand and the writings of Caesarius and Vincent of Lerins (d. 450) on the other. So near do they come to it that each of them has been suggested as its author. Two explanations are possible. Either such language was in the air and both avail themselves of current theological phrases, which later on materialized into our 'Quicunque'. Or each was quoting from the 'Quicunque' which they knew and respected as coming from an author belonging like themselves to the school of Lerins. Burn held that the latter is the true explanation. He believed that it 'had been taught to him' (*i.e.* Caesarius) 'from his early years and came as naturally to his lips as the phrases of our Church Catechism rise to our lips', and that 'it is easier to believe that Vincentius used the creed than that any one in a subsequent generation or century, of less exact scholarship, picked out his phrases and wove them into a document of this kind.' He went on to point out that there are considerable parallels to the teaching of the 'Quicunque' not only in S. Augustine but in S. Ambrose. That is to say, the elements out of which it is composed were already present in the minds of the Church's teachers.

The great Benedictine writer, Dom Morin, proposed Caesarius as the author on the strength of the close parallelism of style and thought between the 'Quicunque' and his works. Dom Morin at one time altered his opinion and regarded the 'Quicunque' as composed not in Gaul but in Spain, by a certain Martin, Bishop of Braga, at the close of the sixth century. He accepted no quotation from it earlier than that in the canon of Toledo, and pointed to the existence of a large number of anonymous formularies of Spanish origin dating from the fifth century onwards, but he later returned to the view that it was composed in Gaul.

In 1909 the Jesuit scholar, Heinrich Brewer, maintained that the 'Quicunque' was the work of S. Ambrose. This view has in recent years found more support than when it was originally put forward, and Burn himself in 1926 announced his acceptance of it.<sup>1</sup> The 'Quicunque', like the hymns of S. Ambrose, is anonymous. It may have been intended for antiphonal singing which he introduced at Milan. Its style and many of its expressions can be closely paralleled in his known works. Certain of its phrases may go back to a letter addressed to Ambrose and others by the Bishops assembled in Constantinople in 382. Brewer's argument in favour of the Ambrosian authorship of the 'Quicunque' is weighty, but it cannot be said to have closed the question, and some scholars still prefer to assign the work to a fifth- or sixth-century composer.

(ii) The 'Quicunque' falls into three parts: (α) a summary of the doctrine of the Trinity (vv. 3-25); (β) a summary of the doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> See *J.Th.S.*, vol. xxvii (1926) pp. 19 ff. But Burn doubts whether the creed can have been intended by its author for antiphonal singing.

the Incarnation (vv. 28-38); (γ) at the beginning and end, and in between these two large sections, we find warning clauses (vv. 1-2, 26, 27 and 40). We may take these in order.

(α) This section on the Trinity is a summing up of the successive negative answers given by the Church to those attempts to explain the facts of the divine revelation in Christ, which she saw either to ignore or contradict some of those facts. The early heresies either 'confounded' (*i.e.* confused) 'the Persons' by practically denying the distinction between them or else divided the substance by introducing a form of tritheism or polytheism. As against Sabellianism v. 5 asserts the distinct Personality of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. As against Arianism and Macedonianism, vv. 6-14 assert that whatever Godhead is, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost possess it equally: this is illustrated by selecting certain of the attributes of Godhead and assigning them to each Person in turn. In v. 9 'incomprehensible' in the P.B. version, is a translation of the Latin *immensus* and means 'above the limitations of space'; the word probably came in to the English version through a Greek translation, *ἀκατάληπτος*. In vv. 15-20 the Trinity of Persons is asserted side by side with the counter-truth of the Unity of Substance. In vv. 21-27 the modes in which the Three Persons possess the Godhead are set out in language taken from Scripture. All through the primary object is to say 'no' to ingenious speculations which explained away the mystery to mean either that the Three Persons are only three aspects of One God or that they are three separate divine Beings.

(β) The second section deals similarly with the Incarnation. vv. 30-33 emphasize alike Christ's true divinity and His true and full humanity as against Arius and Apollinarius. vv. 34-37 assert that the reality of His two natures did not destroy either the unity of His Person or the reality of either nature. Apollinarians in their wish to avoid a double Personality had 'confused the substance'. vv. 38-40 are a simple statement of the facts and issues of Christ's redemption. Once again we find not speculation, but the attempt of the Church to preserve the whole truth, by rejecting explanations that in reality were inconsistent with some of the facts.

(γ) The minatory portions require more explanation. Their interpretation depends upon the importance of the truth enshrined in the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. All Christians agree that Christ is the only Saviour. The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were only formulated to safeguard that conviction. The Church found in Christ the saving power of God Himself and hence was compelled to say 'no' to all explanations that must in the long run undermine that truth. Further, if we believe that Christ is the only Saviour, all who wilfully reject Christ, so long as they reject Him, cut themselves off from the only source of life and health and therefore incur the risk of grave loss and injury. These 'damnatory' clauses are

primarily a warning of the terrible consequences that must follow the rejection of Christ.

Viewed in this light they are capable of a perfectly charitable interpretation, though it must be admitted that the English translation is inaccurate and harsher than the Latin original. In the first verse 'Whosoever will be saved', which suggests to modern ears 'Whosoever is going to be saved', should be translated 'Whosoever wishes to be sound' or 'healthy'. (Quicumque vult salvus esse.) The Latin 'salvus' may refer either to a present state of salvation (*σωζόμενος*) or to the final issue. Examples of either sense can be quoted from contemporary ecclesiastical writers. Again, 'hold' (Latin *teneat*) would be better rendered 'hold fast', and in the following verse 'keep' (Latin *servaverit*) would be better rendered 'preserve'. So the opening would run: 'Whosoever wishes to be in a sound state, before all things it is necessary that he hold fast the Catholic faith: which except he preserve whole and undefiled, etc.' This makes it clear that the clause does not invoke damnation on heretics or heathen, but is a warning to those who possess the Catholic faith not to let it go through indifference or slackness. The words cannot apply to heretics or heathen who cannot hold fast or preserve what they have not got.

Again, in v. 26 'He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity' is not a fair rendering of the Latin 'Qui vult ergo salvus esse: ita de Trinitate sentiat.' 'Must' in the sixteenth century meant little more than 'should' and the whole sentence would more accurately run: 'Let him then who wishes to be in a healthy state, thus think of the Trinity.' In the following verse an even more serious mistranslation occurs. 'It is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.' 'Rightly' came into our version through a Greek translation, which apparently the reformers took as the work of Athanasius himself! This had *ὀρθῶς*, whereas the true Latin original has 'fideliter', 'faithfully.' To 'believe faithfully' is not the same as to 'believe rightly'. It involves the will and heart and conscience and is a moral act of the whole personality, not merely an affair of the intellect. Once again it is an appeal to the Christian to be faithful to the light that he has received.

So, too, v. 40, 'This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved' (or rather be in a sound state), is no more than the assertion that without Christ the truest kind of life is impossible.

What then are we to say of heretics and heathen who do not possess the Catholic faith? On the interpretation given above they are not under consideration at all. Christ is the only Saviour, but we believe that many who do not consciously believe in Him as yet, are unconsciously following His guidance. Since He is the light that 'lighteth every man', all that is good and true in the world comes

from Him. Those men who follow the light that is given to them and live up to the best that they know are in reality disciples of Christ, though they may never have heard of Him (cp. Mt 25<sup>31</sup> ff., which would seem to refer to the judgment of the Gentiles, *τὰ ἔθνη*). All that the Church teaches is that without Christ a man cannot be his best self. We are sure that every man whom God has created and for whom Christ has died will have an opportunity of knowing Christ, if not in this world then in some other. Whether that opportunity has yet been given in the case of any particular individual, we cannot say. We dare not say of any man, even the worst, that he has rejected Christ. It may be that in spite of a Christian home and education, Christ has been hidden from him by the sins and inconsistencies of Christians. The Church has her calendar of saints: she has no roll of the lost. God alone knows the secret of a man's heart and whether Christ has really been presented to him. Again, acceptance of Christ is far more than acceptance by the intellect of certain theological statements about Him. The 'Quicumque' itself makes this quite clear. It exhorts us not to understand but to 'worship' the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity. It warns us that we shall be judged at the Last Day for our works. 'They that have done good, shall go into life everlasting.' Its exhortations and warnings are addressed less to the mind than to the conscience and the will. Experience shows that on the whole the greatest hindrance to the acceptance of Christ and His claims is not intellectual difficulties, but moral indifference and sloth or the cherishing of unlawful desires.

But this position carries with it the conviction that the rejection of Christ involves loss. Whether finally any will reject Christ altogether is a question to which Scripture hardly gives a definite answer. While we dare not say dogmatically that any individual is finally lost, the teaching of Christ strongly suggests that there is such a possibility as that of final separation from Christ. He could say of Judas Iscariot 'It were good for that man, if he had never been born' (Mk 14<sup>21</sup>). So the language of the 'Quicumque' 'they that have done evil' shall go 'into everlasting fire' and 'he shall perish everlastingly', if we substitute 'eternal' and 'eternally' (Latin 'aeternum' and 'in aeternum') is simply a repetition of the language of Scripture. Christ pictures Himself as bidding those on His left depart into 'eternal fire' Mt 25<sup>41</sup> (*πῦρ αἰώνιον*), and He explains this in v. 46 as 'eternal punishment'. The phrase 'perish eternally' occurs in Jn 11<sup>26</sup> (cp. 2 Thess 1<sup>9</sup>, 'Eternal destruction from the face of God'). Whatever Scripture means, the 'Quicumque' means the same. The whole teaching of Christ insists upon the importance of life on earth and on the far-reaching results of our conduct here. Our mind rightly revolts from the thought of useless tortures prolonged through all eternity and from the pictures of the torments of hell to be found in mediaeval pictures. But such conceptions are no essential part of the doctrine of

eternal punishment.<sup>1</sup> Some have thought that all will ultimately become reconciled with God and be saved—the doctrine known as universalism. But this lacks positive evidence in Scripture, and indeed is hardly consistent with certain statements in it. Others, again, hold that since Christ is the source of all life, final rejection of Him must involve as its consequence, annihilation. This view of ‘conditional immortality’ can be supported by very strong arguments and to many minds appears the most probable answer to the problem; but it can hardly be proved from Scripture. A view perhaps more consistent with Scripture is to suppose that there are, as it were, ‘degrees of salvation’. It may well be that through suffering after death men will be brought to repentance, but that the consequences of their past will remain. They will be in a lower state than they might have been, but yet they will accept their condition as just. Punishment so accepted is still ‘eternal punishment’, but yet it has ceased to be torment.<sup>2</sup> But on such matters we can do little more than wonder. God has not given us any answer to the many questions that we would wish to ask. It may well be that our minds are as yet incapable of grasping the conditions of another world that lies wholly outside our present experience.

Lastly it may be urged that though the ‘Athanasian Creed’ may be interpreted in this sense, that was not the sense in which it was originally composed. That may well be true. It is quite possible that the author meant by ‘salvus’ final salvation, and that he believed in the eternal damnation of all heretics and heathen and even rejoiced in such belief. A cruel and barbaric age found small difficulty in cruel and barbaric ideas about God. But even if this is so the words of the formula admit of a perfectly Christian interpretation and we are not tied down to sixth century ideas about God. The clauses rest on Scripture, and if our interpretation of Scripture has changed, then we can with perfect honesty change our interpretation of these clauses too.

(iii) As regards the authority of this formula, let us frankly admit that it does not possess the same oecumenical authority as the Apostles’ and Constantinopolitan Creeds. It has never been formally accepted by the Orthodox Church of the East. It is found (of course without the words ‘and the Son’) in modern editions of the Horologion placed apart from the Hour offices, possibly because these were first printed at Venice under Western influence. In the Russian service books it has been placed at the beginning of the psalter, perhaps since the middle of the seventeenth century. But it never has been recited at any office and is at best treated as an estimable theo-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> In defence of mediaeval pictures of hell, we must bear in mind that it was only through such gross and literal representations of the consequences of sin that spiritual truth could be brought home to rough minds.

logical exposition. Even its acceptance in this form would appear to be due to the belief that it was the work of Athanasius himself. In the West it came to be recited at Prime, on Sundays according to the Roman use, daily according to the use of Sarum. In the later middle ages Prime was frequently said by accumulation with other offices under the general title of Mattins. The more devout lay people would attend Mattins on Sundays and holy days. They would therefore be present at the recitation of the ‘Quicumque’. How far they would attempt to join in or understand it is a different question. Few would understand Latin and the poor could not afford a Breviary. They would probably be occupied with their own private devotions. Hence it was a great change when in 1549 the ‘Quicumque’ appeared in English for recitation by the priest and people at Mattins on certain days, followed by the Apostles’ Creed. In 1552 the number of days on which it was to be recited were increased. In 1662 it was definitely made a substitute for and not an addition to the Apostles’ Creed. Its repetition was required some thirteen times a year at Mattins. This position assigned to it by the Reformers was due to the belief that it was a Greek Creed and the work of Athanasius. Owing to the position which Mattins came to hold in the life of the ordinary English layman, the ‘Quicumque’ assumed a prominence which was never intended and which has no parallel in any other part of the Church.

The new rubrics relating to the use of the ‘Quicumque’ in the revised Prayer Book of 1928 probably reflect with sufficient accuracy the present mind of the Church on this subject. Its use becomes on all occasions permissive. The first rubric says that it ‘may be sung or said’ at Morning or Evening Prayer on Trinity Sunday, the Sunday after Christmas, and the Feast of the Annunciation, or else that the section relating to the Holy Trinity may be used on Trinity Sunday and the second section relating to the doctrine of the Incarnation on the other two occasions. A further rubric suggests other feasts on which it may be used, and a revised translation is provided which takes account of the linguistic and textual points mentioned above. Permission is given to omit the ‘damnatory’ clauses at the beginning and the end when the new translation is used. To some these relaxations of the 1662 rubric may be welcome because they sympathize with the modern tendency to dislike dogma; the majority will think them right on broader grounds of liturgical and pastoral expediency. We may believe that every clause in the ‘Quicumque’ can fairly be interpreted in a sense agreeing with Scripture, and yet take account of the fact that its recitation has proved a stumbling-block to many devout Christians. It may not be wise to enjoin the frequent public use of a document which requires so much explanation and which, at the same time, cannot claim either the oecumenical authority of the Nicene Creed or an established place in the liturgy like that of

the Apostles' Creed, the ancient baptismal confession of faith. The faithful adherence of the Church of England to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation is fully expressed in other liturgical forms; it remains an obligation on her pastors to teach and expound the truths set out in the 'Quicumque'. As a summary for the use of the teacher it is of outstanding and permanent value.†

## ARTICLES IX-X AND XV-XVI

## THE NATURE OF MAN

## ARTICLE IX

*Of Original or Birth Sin*

Original sin standeth not in the following of *Adam*, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam*; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And, although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

*De peccato originali*

Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium, et depravatio naturae, cuiuslibet hominis ex Adamo, naturaliter propagati: qua fit, ut ab originali iustitia quam longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis haec naturae depravatio. Qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Graece *Φρόνημα σαρκός*, (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium carnis interpretantur), legi Dei non subjiciatur. Et quamquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam, fatetur Apostolus.

Almost unchanged since 1553. The words 'which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew' were originally present after 'as the Pelagians do vainly talk'. This sufficiently shows the object of the Article. It is directed against the Pelagian views of Anabaptists.