

ARTICLE II.

Of the Word or Son of God which was made very Man.

Verbum Dei verum hominem esse facturū

THE SON, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

FILIUS, qui est Verbum Patris, ab æterno a Patre genitus, verus et æternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero beatæ Virginis, ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duæ naturæ, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personæ fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctæ: ex quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus, et verus homo, qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THIS Article evidently treats of three distinct points. I. The Divine nature of the Son of God; II. His incarnation; III. His sufferings, sacrifice, and propitiation.

I. First, as regards the Divine nature of the Son of God: as it was shown under the first Article that He was of one substance and coeternal with the Father, so the history of the different opinions concerning His consubstantiality and co-eternity formed part of the history of that Article. It is not necessary to repeat either those arguments or that history here.

I shall consider that I have said enough concerning the Divine nature of our blessed Lord, when, in addition to His consubstantiality and co-eternity before treated of, I have spoken concerning His generation from the Father, whereby He is the Begotten or Only-begotten Son of God.

It has already been shown that the Arians and Eunomians held that the Son might be called *μονογενής*, not as being the only-begotten of the Father, by a true and proper generation, but as

having been begotten or created by the Father alone;¹ and the Socinians have endeavoured to explain the word as though it meant no more than *beloved*, as Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, though Ishmael was his son also.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the orthodox fathers held that the Son was begotten of the Father from all eternity, so before all time deriving His Divine Essence from His Father (*μόνος ἐκ μόνου γεγέννηται τοῦ Πατρὸς*. Cyril. Alexandr. *in Act. Concil. Ephes.*) This eternal generation they held to be a proof that He was of one substance and eternity with the Father; but the relation of Father to Son they held to constitute a priority of *order*, though not of *nature* or *power*. They held, that is, not that the Son was, in His nature as God, in any degree different from, or inferior to the Father; but that, as the Father alone was the source and fountain (*πηγή, ἀρχή, αἰτία*) of Deity, the Son having been begotten, and the Spirit proceeding, so there was a subordination, without diversity, of the Son to the Father, and of the Spirit to the Father and the Son.² It may be difficult to conceive of priority of order, without being led to believe in superiority of nature. This seems to have been the cause why Dr. Clarke and other high Arians, perceiving the truth of the doctrine that there was a certain priority of order among the Persons of the undivided Trinity, and unable to distinguish between priority of order and superiority of nature, were led into an assertion of the heretical doctrine of the inferiority of the nature of the Son.

II. The second part of the Article contains the doctrine of the Incarnation.

Errors upon this doctrine were held by the Gnostics, or *Docetæ*, and the Manichees, who taught that our Lord's Body was but a phantom, and that He came not in the flesh, but in appearance only (*οὐκ ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλὰ δοκῆσει*); by those heretics, who denied the Divinity of our Lord, and therefore, of course, the union of the two natures in one Person; and in short by all the Oriental and Judaizing sects. But the most important controversies on this mystery arose from the errors of, 1, the Arians and Apollinarians; 2, the Nestorians; 3, the Eutychians; 4, the Monothelites.

1. Arius taught that the Son of God did not take human nature,

¹ Οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ λέγουσιν, ὅτι μονογενὴς λέγεται, διότι αὐτὸς μόνος γέγονε καὶ ἐκτίσθη ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὰ ἑ' ἄλλα πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. — Theophyl. *in Joh.* cap. iii. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 138; Suicer, II. p. 375.

² The statements of the Ante-Nicene fathers on this subject are fully investigated by Bp. Bull, *F. D.* Sect. iv. *De Subordinatione Filii*. See also Suicer, s. vv. *αἰτία, ἀρχή, πηγή*.

but a human body only, and that the Divine Word was in the place of the soul.¹

Apollinaris, who maintained against Arius the consubstantiality of the Son, agreed with him in a great measure concerning the mode of His incarnation, teaching that our Lord took a human body, and a sensitive or *animal* soul, but that the place of the *rational* soul was supplied by God the Word, thus distinguishing, according to a common notion of those times, between the *νοῦς*, or *mens*, and the *ψυχή*, or *anima*.²

2. The Nestorian controversy arose as follows: The Greek fathers, justly esteeming that our Lord, from the moment that He was conceived in the womb of His mother, was not only man but God also, and maintaining that the union between His two natures was so perfect that it was right, for example, to say "God suffered," went so far as to call the Virgin Mary by the title Θεοτόκος, or *Deipara*. Nestorius declaimed strongly against this title, as indicating, according to his view of the subject, that God was liable to change, whereas God can neither be born nor die. He held that the *Man* Christ Jesus only could derive His birth from His earthly parent; and that therefore the Virgin might be called Χριστοτόκος, but not Θεοτόκος. These statements were considered to involve a denial of the union of the two natures of God and man in the one Person of Christ.³ Nestorius was accused of teaching that there were not only two natures, but two persons in Christ, namely, the Person of God the Son, and the person of the man Christ Jesus. For this doctrine (though he appears to have denied the inferences drawn from his statements) he was condemned in the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, summoned by Theodosius the younger, and at which Cyril of Alexandria presided. This council determined that the true doctrine was that "Christ was but one Person, in whom two natures are intimately united, but not confounded."⁴

The tenets of the Nestorians, however, spread rapidly and widely in the East. They were embraced by the school of Edessa, were eagerly propagated by Barsumas, who became Bishop of

¹ See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 160. "In eo autem quod Christum sine anima sola carnem suscepisse arbitrantur minus noti sunt: . . . sed hoc verum esse et Epiphanius non tacuit, et ego ex eorum quibusdam scriptis et colloctionibus certissime comperi."—Augustin. *Hæres.* 49, Tom. VIII. p. 18.

² Pearson, as above. Mosheim, Cent. IV. pt. II. ch. v. § 17. Neander, *C. H.* IV. pp. 98-106. "Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi

a Catholica dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua quæstione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, defuisse animæ Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse dixerunt."—Augustin. *Hæres.* 55, Tom. VIII. p. 19.

³ The technical term for this union was the *ἑνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*—hypostatic union.

⁴ Neander, IV. pp. 123-152.

Nisibis in 435, and by his influence took such root in Persia that a Nestorian Patriarch was established at Seleucia, to whose authority, even to modern times, the Nestorian churches have been subjected. Nestorianism took deep root in many soils; and the Nestorians proved themselves zealous missionaries. Their opinions spread rapidly into Armenia, Chaldæa, Syria, Arabia, and India.¹ They afterwards extended the Christian faith among the Tartar tribes of Scythia; and, in the thirteenth century, established their bishops and clergy even among the Chinese. In the eighth century, the sect called Adoptionists revived unconsciously a form of Nestorianism in Spain.² And, in the twelfth century, the Nominalists were accused of Nestorianism, as well as Tritheism, by their adversaries.³

3. Eutyches, an abbot at Constantinople, from opposition to Nestorianism, was led into the other extreme. He asserted that the Divine and human natures of Christ were originally distinct, but that, after their union, they became but one nature, the human nature being transubstantiated into the Divine. Before the hypostatic union, he acknowledged two natures; but after that union he acknowledged but one. The Council of Chalcedon, which was summoned by Marcian in 451, and is reckoned the fourth general Council, condemned Eutyches, and declared the Catholic doctrine to be, that "in Christ two distinct natures are united in one Person, without any change, mixture, or confusion."⁴

The Eutychian, or Monophysite doctrine, notwithstanding this condemnation, rapidly gained ground, principally through the zeal of Jacob Baradæus, Bishop of Edessa, from whom the sect of the Eutychians are called Jacobites. It was established in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, Abyssinia. The Eutychians became united under the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and so continue to this day. They are now divided into three principal societies: the Oriental Monophysites, subject to the patriarch of Antioch; the African Monophysites, subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, embracing the Copts and Abyssinians; and thirdly, the Armenians, who, though agreeing with the other Monophysites concerning the natures of Christ, are not united with them in other points of faith and discipline, and are subject to patriarchs of their own.⁵

¹ Suicer, s. vv. Θεολόγος and Χριστοτόκος. Pearson, *On the Creed*, pp. 178, 163. Mosheim, Cent. v. pt. ii. ch. v. Neander, *C. H.* iv. pp. 269-271.

² Neander, v. pp. 216, seq.

³ See p. 33, note 1.

⁴ Suicer. s. v. ἁκέφαλοι. Pearson, p. 162. Mosheim, Cent. v. pt. ii. ch. v. Neander, iv. pp. 203-231.

⁵ Mosheim, Cent. iv. pt. ii. ch. v. Cent. xvi. pt. i. § 3. Neander, iv. pp. 271-278.

4. In the seventh century a new controversy on this important subject arose; and a more subtle question was mooted. This question was, whether in Christ there were two distinct *wills*, the Divine and the human, or but one, the Divine. Those who adopted the opinion that there was but one will in Christ, among whom was Honorius, Bishop of Rome, were called Monothelites, *Μονοθεληται*, and were condemned in 680 by the sixth general Council, the third Constantinopolitan. Their doctrine was supposed to border too closely on that of the Monophysites. It appears, however, that they entirely disclaimed Monophysite errors; and from the ambiguous manner in which their views were expressed, it has been questioned whether they held that the human will in Christ was wholly swallowed up in the Divine will, or only that it was so completely subservient to the Divine will as always to move in unison with it.¹

III. As to the third division of this Article, the terms of it probably had reference to the error of the Docetæ, who denied that our Lord "*truly*" suffered, teaching either that He suffered only in appearance, or, as Basilides would have it, that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in His place.

Of course it may be added, that the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ is necessarily denied by all humanitarian heretics, and others, who nearly symbolize with them. The Swedenborgians also of late times, though in some sense admitting the Atonement, appear to deny anything of the nature of a vicarious sacrifice, maintaining that redemption consists in the subduing of the powers of evil within the Christian, by virtue of union with the Redeemer in His human nature.

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **T**HE division of the subjects treated of in this Article, which has been suggested above, leads us to consider in the first place the eternal generation of the Son of God.

That the nature and being of the Son were from all eternity, and that He was of one substance with the Father, having been shown in the First Article, it is only necessary to prove here, that

¹ Mosheim, Cent. VII. pt. II. ch. v.

that nature, though eternal, is yet derived from the Father in such a manner that the relationship of the Father to the Son is best expressed to our understandings by the term, and under the notion of generation.

In order to represent to us the mode of existence of the Second Person in the Trinity, and His relation to the First, Holy Scripture has used various terms, drawn from human relations. The most common and important are the terms "Word" and "Son." The term "Word," or "Logos," is probably used to exhibit the intimate connection of the one Person with the other; that, as reason dwells in man, so the Logos dwells in God, and that, as the word goeth forth from the heart and lips of man, so the Word is sent forth from God the Father.

In like manner, we must conceive the term "Son" to indicate something definite concerning the relation of the Son to the Father; the variety of terms being adopted, probably because no one term could sufficiently convey to our understanding just notions of the nature and of the connection of the Persons in the Godhead.

That God the Son is not the same Person with God the Father has already been shown. That He is called the "Word" and the "Son" of the Father, seems sufficiently to declare that He derives in some manner His Being from the Father, even as the word springs from him who thinks and speaks, as the son is derived from him who begets him. This is farther evident from express statements in Holy Scripture. For example, our Lord is distinctly said to be *begotten* of the Father. He is called the Begotten and "Only-begotten of the Father," John i. 14. The Psalmist, as explained by St. Paul, tells us that God said to our Saviour, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," Ps. ii. 7. Acts xiii. 33. Heb. i. 5. And so He is spoken of as having been "begotten before every creature." (*Πρωτόκοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15.)

In correspondence with this notion of Sonship, our Lord is constantly called "Heir of all things," and said to be Possessor of all things, by right of Sonship. (See Heb. i. 2, 3, 4; iii. 6. John xvi. 15.) Again, our Lord speaks of Himself as deriving His own eternal Being from God the Father.¹ "As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father" (John vi. 57),

¹ In John v. 18, our Lord speaks of God as His true and proper Father, *ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἰδίον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν*. Compare John vi. 46, *ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, He that hath His being from God.

and again, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself" (John v. 26). From which we learn that the mode of existence which the Father possessed from all eternity, He communicated to the Son. All created beings have their existence from, and their life in, God. But the Son, who is uncreated, derives indeed His Being from the Father, but it is a Being of the same kind as the Father's, and therefore not dependent, like a creature's, but independent, self-existent, having life in itself.

Accordingly the Son is farther called "the Brightness of His Father's glory, the express Image of His Person," Heb. i. 3; words which in the Greek indicate a relation of the Son to His Father, like that of brightness to light, like that of the impression of a seal on wax to the seal, to which it answers.¹

Now the communication of the nature of God, thus made by the Father to the Son, may be called a proper generation. Nay! it is more proper than any earthly generation. For, in human generation, the son indeed derives his nature from his father, but it is in a manner according with the imperfection of humanity. Man's generation is in time, and, as connected with that which is material, results, in part at least, from that property of matter called divisibility. The son too, in human beings, when derived from the father, becomes separate from him.

But this is not so with God. God's eternal perfections He, from all eternity, communicated to His Son. "So also the Divine Essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied, insomuch that He, which proceedeth by that communication, hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; Abraham man, and Isaac man: but Abraham one man, Isaac another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another; but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him; being the full, perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately, and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generation; it followeth, that this communication of the Divine nature is the proper

¹ Origen, commenting on these words of the Apostle, *Splendor est gloriæ Dei*, says: "*Deus lux est, secundum Joannem. Splendor ergo hujus Lucis est Unigenitus*

Filius, ex ipso inseparabiliter velut splendor ex luce procedens, et illuminans universam creaturam." — *De Principiis*, Lib. 1. ch. 11. n. 7.

generation, by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God."¹

This peculiar relation of the Father to the Son is that which has authorized the Church, while she confesses an equality of nature, to admit also a priority of order in the Persons of the Trinity. The Father hath this preëminence, that He is not only uncreated, but unbegotten, too. He derives His essence from none, being Himself the Fountain of life and the Source of being. The Son, too, is uncreated, deriving His being, not by creation but by generation, from the Father. Yet in this He is subordinate to the Father; not that His attributes are lower, or His nature inferior, but that both are derived. The Father begat; the Son is begotten. The Father is Life, Christ too is Life; but He confesses that He has life from the Father (John vii. 29), and that "He liveth by the Father" (John vi. 57). "The Father hath life in Himself:" so too has the Son. But the Father not only in Himself but from Himself. The Son in Himself, but from the Father (John v. 26).² On this account, therefore, and in this sense, "the Father is greater than the Son" (John xiv. 28); greater as regards priority of order, not greater as regards infinity of nature.³

II. The second part of the Article concerns the true doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God. It is thus expressed: "The Son . . . took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man."

1. The wording of this is very important. "The Son of God took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin." It appears directly from Holy Scripture, that the Being conceived by the

¹ Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. II. p. 138, fol. So Hooker, *Ecl. Pol.* Bk. v. ch. LIV. 2. "By the gift of eternal generation, Christ hath received of the Father one and in number the self-same substance, which the Father hath of Himself unreceived from any other. For every 'beginning' (Eph. iii. 15) is a father unto that which cometh of it, and every 'offspring' is a son to that out of which it groweth. Seeing therefore that the Father alone is originally that Deity, which Christ originally is not, (for Christ is God by being of God; light by issuing

out of light); it followeth hereupon, that whatsoever Christ hath common unto Him with His heavenly Father, the same of necessity must be given Him, but naturally and eternally given; not bestowed by way of benevolence and favour, as the other gifts" (*i. e.* those of union and of unction) "both are."

² "Pater vita in Semetipso, non a Filio: Filius vita in Semetipso, sed a Patre." — Augustin. *In Johan. Tract.* XIX. Tom. III. par. II. p. 443.

³ See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. I. p. 34; Bull, *F. D.* § 4.

Virgin was, from the moment of His conception, the Son of God (Luke i. 35, 43. Matt. i. 20, 23). Had the human nature of our Lord been conceived in the womb of the Virgin, and then united to the Divine nature; it is clear that Christ would have consisted of two distinct persons: one person, the Son of God, the other person, that human being who had been conceived of the Virgin Mary. For if a human being had been first conceived of the Virgin, and then united to God, it is clear that that human being must have been a human *person*, previously to the union with the Divine Person; and so the incarnation would have been the union of two persons, not the union of two natures.¹ It was from want of attention to this, that Nestorius was led into error. He denied that the Person, who was born of the Virgin, was God; and said that He was only man. Hence he was obliged to divide Christ into two persons. "If," says Hooker, "the Son of God had taken to himself a man now made and already perfected, it would of necessity follow that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming, the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's person to His own, but a man's nature to His own Person; and therefore took *semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. The flesh, and the conjunction of the flesh with God, began both at one instant; His making and taking to Him our flesh was but one act; so that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting. By taking only the nature of man, He still continueth one Person, and changeth but the manner of His subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh."²

Thus it is said by St. John, "The Word was made flesh" (John i. 14); by St. Paul, "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also took part of the same" (Heb. ii. 14). "He took not the nature of angels, but He took the seed of Abraham" (Heb. ii. 16). It was "Emmanuel, God with us," who was born of the Virgin (Isai. vii. 14. Matt. i. 23); yea, "the Son of God" (Luke i. 32, 35).³

¹ "Primo illud nos oportet scire, quod aliud est in Christo Deitatis ejus natura, quod est Unigenitus Filius Patris; et alia humana natura quam in novissimis temporibus pro dispensatione suscepit."—Origen. *De Principiis*, Lib. i. ch. 11. n. 1.

² Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. v. LII.

³ The Scriptures clearly indicate this to have been the case. See Luke i. 39—

44; ii. 11. The former passage is especially clear, showing that Elisabeth by the Holy Ghost, and even the yet unborn "prophet of the Highest," acknowledged the presence of their "Lord," when He was yet in the womb of His mother. The earliest fathers speak as plainly on the subject as if they had foreseen the heresy of Nestorius: *e. g.* ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ

The fact, thus exhibited, that the Son of God took in the womb of the Virgin the nature of man, explains some of the most remarkable passages in the new Testament. As there is but one Person in Christ, and *that* the Person of the Son of God, it naturally follows, that even the actions proper to man will at times be attributed to God, and the actions proper to God will be attributed to the man Jesus.¹ Thus we understand the Scripture, when it says that men “crucified the Lord of glory” (1 Cor. ii. 8); when it says that “God purchased the Church with His own Blood” (Acts xx. 28); because, though God in His Divine Nature cannot be crucified, and has no blood to shed; yet the Son of God, the Lord of Glory, took into His Person the nature of man, in which nature he could suffer, could shed his Blood, could be crucified, could die. Thus again, we understand the Scripture, when it attributes to a man powers and attributes which belong only to God. Our Lord (John iii. 13) speaks of none having gone up to Heaven “but the Son of man, which is in Heaven”: yet the Son of man was then on earth. Omnipresence is an attribute of none but God. But the Son of man here spoken of was God, God having taken into His own Person man’s nature.² And so “as oft as we attribute to God what the manhood of Christ claimeth, or to man what his Deity hath right unto, we understand by the name of God and the name of Man, neither the one nor the other *nature*, but the whole *Person* of Christ, in which both natures are.”³ Of that Person, then, we may say, that He reigns as God, that He was subject as man. Of that Person we may say, that He liveth forever, and yet that He suffered and died. Of that Person we may say, that He “was crucified through weakness,” and yet that He hath “the Power of God.” Of that Person we may say, that whilst He was bound down to live on earth, He yet filled Heaven with His presence and glory.⁴

Χριστός ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ’ οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, Πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου. — Ignat. *Ad Ephes.* 18.

¹ “Cum ergo in eo quædam ita videamus humana ut nihil a communi mortalium fragilitate distare videantur, quædam ita divina ut nulli alii nisi illi primæ et ineffabili naturæ convenient Deitatis, hæret humani intellectus angustia, et tantæ admirationis stupore percussa quò declinet, quid teneat, quo se convertat, ignorat. Si Deum sentiat, mortalem videt: si hominem putet, devicto mortis imperio cum spoliis redeuntem a mortuis cernit. . . . Nam et Filius Dei mortuus esse dicitur, pro ea scilicet natura quæ

mortem utique recipere poterat: et filius hominis appellatur, qui venturus in Dei Patris gloria cum sanctis angelis prædicatur.” — Origen. *De Principiis*, Lib. II. ch. vi. n. 2, 3.

² Compare John i. 48.

³ Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v. LIII. 4.

⁴ Ἐπὶ γῆς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος βεβήκει, οὐρανοῦ δὲ ἤπτετο, καὶ πάντες ἐχθροὶ ἐπληροῦντο τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης· καὶ ἐν Μαρίας ἐτύγχανε, καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ ἐπλήρου τὰ σύμπαντα. — Epiphani. *Hæres.* LXIX. Tom. I. p. 788. Colon.

Hooker does not scruple to say: “The union of the flesh with Deity is to that

2. The Article, having expressed the truth that the Son of God took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, adds, "So that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead, and Manhood, were joined together in one Person." Having already shown that there was but one Person with two natures, it is necessary farther to observe, that those two natures continued perfect and entire; for though the Person was but one, the Person of the eternal Son of God, yet we must not suppose that the verity of either of His natures was lost or absorbed.

(1) That He was perfect God appears by what was proved under the first Article; and indeed His Divine nature could not cease to be Divine by his taking to Him the nature of man; for God is not liable to change or to diminution. And though, by taking human nature, the Son of God was enabled to suffer, which to God simply would have been impossible, yet by taking human nature He did not change the nature of God. And this appears from plain passages of Scripture; for where the Son of God is spoken of as God, it is constantly in those very passages where He is called by the name of Christ or of Jesus or of the Son of Man, or is spoken of as incarnate, *e. g.* John i. 14; iii. 13; viii. 58; x. 30. Acts xx. 28. Rom. ix. 5. Phil. ii. 5, 6. Col. i. 14, 15, &c.

(2) That He was perfect Man will appear, if we can show that He had a human Body and a human Soul, both subject to human infirmities and invested with human attributes.

That he had a human Body appears from His birth of the Virgin (Matt. i. 25. Luke i. 35; ii. 7); from His growth like other children (Luke ii. 52); from His liability to hunger (Luke iv. 2); to weariness (John iv. 6); to pain (Luke xxii. 44); to bleeding and bloody sweat (John xix. 34. Luke xxii. 44); to wounds and laceration (John xx. 27); from His possessing flesh and bones (Luke xxiv. 39, 40); from His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection.

That he had a perfect human Soul appears from His "increasing in wisdom" (Luke ii. 52); from the possibility of His being ignorant (Mark xiii. 32), (which could not be true of Him con-

flesh a gift of principal grace and favour: for by virtue of this grace, *man is really made God*, a creature is exalted above the dignity of all creatures, and hath all creatures else under it." And again, "Since God hath deified our nature, though not by turning it into Himself, yet by mak-

ing it His own inseparable habitation, we cannot now conceive, how God should without man either exercise Divine power, or receive the glory of Divine praise; for man is in both the associate of Deity." — *Eccl. Pol. Bk. v. LIV*

sidered only in His Divine nature); from His being liable to temptation (Matt. iv. 1. Heb. iv. 15); from His feeling sorrow and sympathy (Luke xix. 41. John xi. 35. Matt. xxiii. 37, 38, &c.); from the separation of His Soul from His Body at death, the Soul descending to Hades, whilst the Body was laid in the grave (Acts ii. 27, 31).

And as the nature of His Godhead was not changed (God not being capable of change) by union with His manhood; so also the nature of His manhood was not changed by being taken into His Godhead, farther than that it was thereby exalted, ennobled, glorified. For the object of God's taking flesh was that He might take to Himself a nature like our own, in which He might be tempted with our temptations, liable to our sorrows and infirmities, and subject to our sufferings and death. The properties therefore of His human nature were not sunk nor absorbed in His Divine nature, any more than His Divine nature was altered or corrupted by His human nature.

3. That these two natures, thus united in the one Person of Christ, shall "never be divided," appears from the nature of the union, the object of that union, and the declaration of Scripture.¹ The nature of the union being that the Person of the Eternal Son took to Himself human *nature*, not a human *person*, it follows, that, if the two natures were divided at any time, either a new person would be brought into being, or else the human nature of Christ would utterly cease to exist. According to the latter supposition, instead of being highly exalted and set above all His fellows, Christ's human Body and Soul would be annihilated and

¹ One of the errors of the Photinians was that they believed the kingdom of Christ would wholly cease at the end of the world, and that the Word would be wholly resolved into the Father, and as a separate Person cease to exist. See Pearson, Art. vi. p. 284, note. The only text which can appear even for a moment to favour the notion that Christ shall ever cease to be both perfect God and perfect Man, is the remarkable passage 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, where it is said that Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and "the Son Himself shall be subject to Him that did put all things under Him, that God may be all in all." We cannot, however, from this infer, that the Son of God shall leave His human nature and be absorbed into the Person of the Father, and that then the human nature of Christ divested of the Divine shall be subject to God; for, if no other passage in Scripture

opposed that notion, this very passage would of itself refute it. It is the *Son* who is to be subject to the Father; but the human nature of Christ, separated (if that were possible) from His Divine nature, would not be the Son of God. The true interpretation of the passage is, that the Son, who, in His human nature and touching His manhood, is inferior to the Father, yet now seated on the throne of His mediatorial kingdom, reigns supreme over men, angels, and devils. But at the end, when the need of that mediatorial reign has passed away, then the mediatorial sceptre shall be laid down, Christ shall reign with God, upon His right hand; but as *κατ' οὐκονομίαν*, and in His human nature, He is inferior to the Father, so then He shall be subject to the Father; God shall be all in all. — See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. vi. p. 283.

perish. Surely neither of these hypotheses is tenable. Again, the end and purpose of the union, whereby the Son of God took the nature of man, being that He might join together God and men, Himself both God and man, and the necessity of such conjunction never ceasing, it follows that the union of the natures shall never cease. It is through the instrumentality of Christ's humanity that man is united to God. When the union has been effected, we cannot suppose that the bond will be destroyed, the link annihilated. It is by virtue of incorporation into Christ's Body, that the saints shall rise and reign; and we cannot suppose that Christ's Body shall cease to be one with the Son of God, when the saints, incorporated into It, reign because of It.

And this farther appears from Scripture; where we read, that "Christ *ever* liveth to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 25); that "He is a Priest *forever*" (Heb. vi. 20; vii. 21, 24), "consecrated for *evermore*" (Heb. vii. 28); that "He is set down at the right hand of God *forever*" (Heb. x. 12); that "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and that He shall reign for ever and ever" (Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14, 18, 27. Luke i. 32, 33. Rev. xi. 15).

III. The Article, thirdly, asserts that the Son of God, having thus taken man's nature, "truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

To enter at full length into each portion of this clause of the Article, would necessarily exceed our present limits. The student may be referred to the Fourth Article of Pearson, *On the Creed*, for a most able exposition of the doctrine of Scripture concerning our Lord's sufferings, crucifixion, death, and burial.

1. To show the *reality* of our Lord's sufferings and death, it is only necessary to read the last chapters of the four Gospels, which require no comment. If they did, such comment would be found in the prophecies of Christ's sufferings (*e. g.* Ps. xxii. Isai. liii.), and in the letters and discourses of the Apostles on them (*e. g.* Acts ii. 22, 23; iii. 15; x. 39; xiii. 29. Rom. v. 10; vi. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 5; iv. 10. Phil. ii. 8. Heb. ii. 9, 10; v. 7, 8; ix. 17-28; x. 10; xii. 2; xiii. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 21; iii. 18). The reality of the death, indeed, is a subject immediately connected with the reality of the human nature of Christ. The Docetæ, who denied the one, naturally and necessarily denied the other. It was against them that St. John appears to have written many passages both in his Gospel and Epistles, as for example,

John xix. 34, 35. 1 John iv. 3; v. 6. 2 John 7. Errors, against which the words of Scripture are specially directed, cannot lightly be disregarded by the Church. But as such errors are not likely to prevail extensively now, it may be unnecessary to dwell at length upon their refutation.

2. One subject connected with the death and sufferings of our Saviour requires to be a little further considered. The Son of God by taking on Him human nature became truly man; and one of the chief ends of His thus becoming man was, that He might die. But it may be asked still, Wherein did His death consist, and how did He suffer? Man dies, when His soul leaves his body. Man suffers, because his whole nature is passible. But Jesus Christ was man; yet not mere man. His Person consisted of the Eternal Son united to a human Body and a human Soul. How then did He suffer, and how die?

He suffered in His human nature, which, being a perfect human nature, was capable of suffering both in Soul and Body. We may not imagine, as has already been shown, that His human nature ceased to be human nature when it was taken by His Godhead; "that the properties of the weaker nature have vanished with the presence of the more glorious, and have been therein swallowed up as in a gulf." It is true, then, that the Son of God suffered; but not in the Godhead. His Godhead could no more suffer than the Godhead of the Father. But He took human nature, that He might suffer, and in His manhood the Son of God was crucified, and suffered and died.

And His death consisted, not in the separation of His Divine Being from either Body or Soul. Then would not the Son of God have died at all. Then Christ would have been divided into two separate Persons, by the Godhead leaving the manhood; and the mystery and the blessing of the Incarnation would have been lost. The soul does not die by leaving the body, neither would the Son of God have died by leaving either Body or Soul. It was the Person of Christ that suffered death; and as that Person was invested with the nature of man, death was to Him what death is to other men, namely, the separation of the human soul from the human body. The union of the Godhead with the manhood was not disturbed; but the human Soul of Christ left His human Body. But even when the Soul forsook the Body, the Godhead forsook neither Body, nor Soul.¹ "If it had, then could we not truly hold

¹ Ὡστε οὐκ ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ ἐχωρίζετο, γέιτο· οὔτε ἡ νέκρωσις ἀποχώρησις Θεοῦ, ἢ ὅτι Θεὸς πρὸς ἄνθρωπον ἐγκατάλειψεν διη· ἀπὸ σώματος ἦν μετάστασις, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς ἀπὸ

either that the Person of Christ was buried, or that the Person of Christ did raise up itself from the dead. For the Body separated from the Word can in no true sense be termed the Person of Christ, nor is it true to say that the Son of God, in raising up that Body, did raise up Himself, if the Body were not both with Him and of Him, even during the time it lay in the sepulchre. The like is also to be said of the Soul; otherwise we are plainly and inevitably Nestorians. The very Person of Christ therefore, forever one and the self-same, was, only touching bodily substance, concluded within the grave; His soul only from thence severed, but by personal union His Deity still inseparably joined with both.”¹

3. The conclusion of the Article concerns the end and object of our blessed Saviour’s sufferings.

The Socinians deny that there was any necessity for a propitiatory sacrifice, or that God had need to be reconciled to man. Man, say they, was at enmity with God, not God with man. Man therefore needed to be reconciled, and so Christ came to call men to repentance and to move them to it by His precept and example, and so committed to his disciples the ministry of reconciliation. But to say that God needed to have blood shed, and *that* the blood of an innocent and holy Victim, in order to appease His wrath, is to make God a vindictive and implacable Being, not a God of love.

The answer to this is twofold.

(1) “A God all mercy is a God unjust:” Justice is an attribute of God as well as mercy. Justice therefore calling for wrath on man, and the love of God calling for mercy, it was necessary, in order to reconcile both these attributes of God, that some means should be devised for satisfying both. We do not say that God was tied to the means which He ordained; but we learn, that His wisdom ordained the sacrifice of His Son, and in that sacrifice we perceive a manifestation of infinite justice and infinite love.

σώματος χωρισμός. — Athanasius, *De Salut. Advent. Jesu Christ.* Tom. I. pp. 645, 646.

Compare the passage from Fulgentius quoted in the exposition of the next Article: “Secundum Divinitatem suam, quæ nec loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima.” — Fulgent. *Ad Trasimund.* Lib. III. ch. 34.

This is well expressed in some of the Calvinistic Confessions: *e. g.* *Confessio Belgica*, Art. XIX.: “Cæterum duæ istæ naturæ ita sunt simul unitæ et conjunctæ

in unam Personam, ut ne morte quidem ipsius separari potuerint. Quod igitur Patri suo moriendo commendavit, id vere erat spiritus humanus a corpore ipsius egrediens; at interim divina natura semper humanæ (etiam in sepulchro jacenti) conjuncta remansit: adeo ut Deitas ipsa non trinus in ipso tunc fuerit, quam cum adhuc infans esset, etsi exiguum ad tempus non sese exerceret.” — *Sylloge*, p. 338.

¹ Hooker, v. LII. 4. The whole subject is admirably treated by Hooker; and by Pearson, Art. IV. “Suffered,” “Dead.”

(2) But the same thing appears, too, from many passages in Scripture. There is some ambiguity in the words used in the new Testament for "reconciliation." The most learned critics have observed, that those words are used in a somewhat different sense from that in which the classical authors use them. But it is quite clear from the contexts that in some passages God is spoken of as needing to be reconciled to man. For example, in 2 Cor. v. 19, where it is said that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," there might be some ambiguity, if it were not added, "not imputing their trespasses unto them;" but these words clear up the doubt. Indeed the whole context speaks as of two offended parties, God and man. God is represented as giving up His wrath and being reconciled through Christ, and then as sending to man, to invite him to give up his enmity and be reconciled to God.¹

That the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against sinful man seems hardly necessary to be proved. The Article on Original Sin is the more proper place for proving it. It may be sufficient now to refer to such passages as the following: Rom. v. 9. Eph. ii. 3. 1 Thess. i. 10. Heb. x. 26, 27. Rev. vi. 16, 17.

The Jewish sacrifices were expressly appointed to deliver from the wrath of God.² The Passover was appointed, that the wrath of God might be averted, when the first-born of Egypt were slain. In the 4th and 5th chapters of Leviticus, directions are given for the mode in which those who have sinned shall make atonement for their transgression. Whether it were priest, prince, or people, they were to bring a victim, to confess the sin upon the head of the victim, and then slay it as a sin-offering. The same is observable of the offerings on the day of expiation; when the high-priest made atonement, first for himself, and then for the people; and also of the scape-goat, which was offered at the same time, the sins of the people being confessed on his head (Lev. xvi.) The Jews looked on these sacrifices as strictly propitiatory.³ The Gentiles, who imitated them, evidently had a similar notion of

¹ See, at length, Magee, *On Atonement*, i. p. 202, fifth edition, and the authors referred to there; especially Hammond and Whitby on Rom. v. 10, xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20; Ephes. ii. 16; and Col. i. 20, 21.

² It is quite unnecessary to consider the question whether sacrifice was a rite in the first instance divinely instituted, or devised by man. If the latter be, as some learned and pious authors have be-

lieved, the truth, still it sprang from a natural feeling of guilt, and the need of atonement, and was sanctioned by Almighty God and made a type of Christ, and rules were given for its observance, that the type might be more clear and express. The argument in the text therefore would not be invalidated, even if the divine institution of sacrifice be denied.

³ Magee, as above, *Illustrations*, No xxxiii.

their offerings; and those especially, who, in times of peculiar danger, had recourse to human sacrifice, appear to have entertained a strong feeling of the necessity of propitiating the gods with the noblest victims. That the legal sacrifices were types of the death of Christ, and therefore that Christ's death was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, appears plainly from the fact that the terms taken from the Jewish sacrifices are applied in Scripture to describe the death of Christ. Thus He is said to have been "led as a lamb to the slaughter" (see Isai. liii. 5-8). He is called "the Lamb slain" (Rev. v. 6, 12; xiii. 8). "A Lamb without blemish and spot" (1 Pet. i. 19); "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world" (John i. 29). St. Paul expressly compares the priesthood of Aaron with the priesthood of Christ; explaining to us that whereas the priest of old offered the blood of bulls and goats which could not take away sin, but availed only to a carnal purifying (Heb. ix. 13), so Christ offered, not the blood of others, but His own Blood — offered Himself to bear the sins of many; and so put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. As under the Law, without shedding of blood was no remission, and as the patterns of heavenly things were purified with the blood of sacrificed victims, so the heavenly things themselves were purified with better sacrifices, even Christ. (See Heb. ix. x.)¹

4. It may be well to observe one more expression, which occurs at the very end of the Article, namely, "to be a sacrifice, *not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.*" It seems as if the reformers were anxious to meet a possible, perhaps an actual error, which, admitting the sacrifice of Christ for original sin, either denied remission to actual sins, or looked for pardon of them to something beside the propitiation offered on the cross. That actual, and not only original sin is pardoned for the sake of Christ, is taught repeatedly in the old Testament, as well as the new.

Isaiah, besides saying that Christ "was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities," adds a passage expressly indicating actual sin: "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all" (Isai. liii. 6). It is from "*all iniquity*" that "He gave Himself to redeem us" (Tit. ii. 14). It was when we were not only "alienated" by original guilt, but "enemies through *wicked works,*" too, that Christ reconciled us (Col. i. 21). The persons whom the Apostle speaks of as not capable of being

¹ On the whole subject consult Magee, the *Illustrations* at the end of Vol. i., and *On Atonement and Sacrifice*; especially the authors there referred to.

saved by the law, but "justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," are described in the strongest terms as *actual* sinners (see Rom. iii. 12-26). And again (in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, 11) he paints the characters of some who had been "justified in the name of the Lord Jesus," as having been stained with the foulest vices and the deadliest sins. St. John (1 John ii. 1, 2) distinctly assures us that "if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins." And that he meant actual sins is most apparent, because he begins the sentence with "My little children, these things I write unto you that ye sin not."

We conclude, therefore, that the sacrifice of Christ, the Son of God, offered by Him upon the cross, whereon in His human nature He suffered and died, is a propitiation, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

[The following passage is worthy of consideration in more aspects than one. It is from the pen of the Abbé Guettée. "The existing Roman Church attacks [the doctrine of the Incarnation] indirectly, by the worship which it renders to the *sacred heart of Jesus*. In truth, worship is due only to the divine *person* of Jesus Christ; the human nature in Him shares in it only because of its hypostatical union with the divine nature. It is not permissible to offer worship to the human nature of Jesus Christ, in itself and separately considered, much less to a single organ of His body. The Roman Church excuses this worship by saying that it has relation to the person of Jesus Christ. But the greater part of its writers at this day teach, authoritatively, that the heart of Jesus is adorable by itself." *Exp. de la Doctrine*, p. 64. — J. W.]

ARTICLE III.

Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

De descensu Christi ad Inferos.

As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell.

QUEMADMODUM Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.

TO the understanding of this Article it seems desirable to investigate, historically and from Scripture, FIRST, What is meant by "*Hell*;" SECONDLY, What is meant by Christ's descending into hell; THIRDLY, What was the purpose or object of that descent.

I propose, therefore, to depart from the arrangement adopted in the two former Articles, and to examine the meaning of the word "*Hell*," first historically, and then scripturally, — and next to proceed in the same manner with the doctrine of our Lord's descent into hell; and thirdly, with the reason or object of his going thither.

FIRST. The word "*Hell*," as used in the Article, is plainly borrowed from the Apostles' Creed; for it appears that the first five Articles of the Church are little more than an amplification of the Articles of the Creed, intended to set forth, that the Church of England continued truly Catholic in its doctrines, whilst it was constrained to protest against the corruptions of some branches of the Church. In the Latin, the word used is either "*inferi*" or "*inferna*." The Greek corresponding to this was either τὰ κατώτατα or ἄδης; the former referring to Eph. iv. 9, the latter to Acts ii. 27. It has, however, generally been admitted, and may fairly be assumed, that the Greek word ἄδης is the word of Scripture, which both the Creed and the Article render *inferi* and *hell*; and it has been observed, that, according to their derivations, these words answer to one another. Ἄδης is something unseen, from ἀ and εἶδον. *Inferi* is the Latin from the Greek word ἕνεποι or ἕνεροι, i. e. those beneath the earth, the Manes or Spirits of the

dead.¹ *Hell* is from the same root as *hole* and *hellier* (*i. e.* a roofer, a coverer), and signifies *the covered or hidden place*, the Saxon root being *helan*, to cover.

There is indeed another word in the new Testament often rendered in the English by *hell*. That word is γέννα; and some confusion arises from this indiscriminate translation. As, however, neither the Creeds nor the Church have been wont to use γέννα, to express the place to which our Lord went after His death, we may lay aside the consideration of the word at present; merely observing that it is the proper term in the new Testament for the state or place of damned souls and apostate spirits.

As *regarūs*, then, the signification of the word *Hades*, it will be well to consider the subject:—

I. Historically. II. Scripturally.

I. The history may be divided into

(1) The use of the word among the Greeks; (2) among the Jews; (3) among the Christians.

1. It may be true that the Greeks sometimes used *Hades* to signify no more than the Grave; but if so, it was by an improper and less common use of the word. According to them, *Hades*, or the abode of *Hades*, was that place to which the Ghosts or Manes of the dead went after their burial. The unburied were detained on this side the Styx; the buried passed over, and mingled with the souls of men, which were there detained apart from the bodies they had left (εἶδωλα καμόντων). *Hades* himself was the deity who presided over these lower realms. In the abode of these disembodied souls were placed, on the one hand the happy fields of *Elysium*, on the other the gloomy realms of *Tartarus*. In the former, the souls of the virtuous enjoyed themselves, not however without regret for the loss of the body and the light of day. In the latter, the wicked, such as *Ixion*, *Tantalus*, the *Danaiids*, and others, were tormented with various sorrows. This is known to every one who has read the *Odyssey* and the *Æneid*.²

¹ This seems a doubtful derivation. *Infer*, *Infra*, *Inferus*, *Inferior*, are obviously all connected. Though this connection does not make the derivation given in the text impossible. The Greek *ἔρα* is the same as the Hebrew עָרָא, in Chaldee and Syriac אַרְעָא, in Arabic أرض. The latter is the same as the German *Erde*, English *earth*. The Chal-

dee and Syriac אַרְעָא is, in sound as well as in its radical letters, the same as the Greek *ἔρα*. And it is remarkable that it is used as a preposition to designate below, אַרְעָא מִתַּתָּא, *Infra*. So אַרְעָא מִתַּתָּא, *Infra te*. This may account for the force of the preposition *infra*, on the hypothesis that the derivation given in the text is correct.

² See *Hom. Od.* xi. *Virg. Æn.* vi

2. The Jews in like manner believed in a state of being after death, in which the soul existed previously to the final Resurrection, apart from the body, yet in a state of consciousness, either of happiness or of misery. This state or place they called in Hebrew, Sheol (שְׁאוֹל), in Greek, Hades (ᾍδης). Its position, according to their notions and language, was underground. Thus Josephus says that the soul of Samuel, when he appeared to Saul, came up (ἐξ ᾍδου) from Hades.¹ He tells us that the Sadducees "took away the rewards and punishments of the Soul in Hades."² Whereas he says of the Pharisees, that "they held the immortality of the Soul, and that men were punished or rewarded under the earth, according to their practice of virtue or wickedness in life."³ Lightfoot has shown that the Jewish schools dispose of the souls of the righteous till the Resurrection, under the threefold phrase: (1) "the Garden of Eden," answering to the "Paradise" of the new Testament (Luke xxiii. 43). (2) "Under the throne of glory," being nearly parallel with the expression (in Rev. vi. 9) of souls crying "under the altar;" for the Jews conceived the altar to be the throne of the Divine Majesty. (3) "In Abraham's bosom," which is the expression adopted by our Lord in the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 22).⁴ He shows that the abode of the wicked before the Judgment is placed by the same Rabbins within sight of the abode of the just, and so that the one can converse with the other, as Dives is by our Lord represented as conversing with Abraham.⁵ From these, and similar authorities, we may conclude that the Jews, like the heathens, looked for a state immediately after death, which in their popular language was said to be under ground, and in their ordinary phraseology was called

The latter describes the two sides of Hades thus:—

Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas:
Dextra, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit;

Hæc iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, et ad impia Tartara mittit.

Æn. vi. 540-543.

¹ Joseph. *Ant. Lib.* vi. c. xv. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. v. p. 239.

² *De Bell. Jud. Lib.* ii. c. vii. Ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ' ἑδον τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. — Pearson, as above; King, *On the Creed*, p. 189.

³ *Ant. Lib.* xviii. c. ii. Ἀθάνατόν τε ἰσχυρὸν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιοῦσεως τε καὶ τιμῶς οἷς

ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτῆδεναις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε. — See Pearson and King, as above.

⁴ See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Luke xvi. 22; and Luke xxiii. 43.

⁵ *Horæ Hebr.* on Luke xvi. 23, 26. See also Bp. Bull, *Works*, i. Disc. 111. p. 59. Bp. Bull, p. 61, quotes from the Chaldee Paraphrast on Cant. iv. 12. who, speaking of the Garden of Eden (that is Paradise), says that "thereinto no man hath the power of entering but the just, whose souls are carried thither by the hands of angels." "If this," adds the learned writer, "had been an erroneous opinion of the Jews, doubtless our Saviour would never have given any the least countenance to it, much less would He have plainly confirmed it, by teaching the same thing in the parable of Dives and Lazarus."

Sheol, Hades, Hell; that in this state were both the just and the unjust: the latter in a state of misery, the former in blissful enjoyment, called sometimes "Paradise, the Garden of Eden," sometimes "beneath the throne of glory," sometimes "in Abraham's bosom."

3. It is well known that the early Christians believed in an intermediate state of the soul between death and Judgment; and this intermediate state they, too, like the Jews, called "Hades." Justin Martyr, speaking against some of the Gnostics who denied the Resurrection, and by consequence the intermediate state of the soul, says, "those who say that there is no Resurrection, but that immediately after death their souls are taken up to Heaven, these are not to be accounted either Christians or Jews."¹ He himself distinctly asserts that "no souls die (that would be a Godsend to the wicked); but the souls of good men remain in a better, of bad men in a worse place, awaiting the time of the Judgment."² Tertullian distinctly states his belief, that the souls of all men go to Hades (*inferi*) until the Resurrection, the souls of the just being in that part of Hades called the bosom of Abraham, or Paradise.³ Irenæus says, that the souls of Christ's disciples "go into the invisible place prepared for them, and there remain awaiting the Resurrection; after which they shall receive their bodies again, and rise complete, that is, in the body, as the Lord arose, and so shall come to the vision of God."⁴

Origen declares his belief, that "not even the Apostles have received their perfect bliss; for the saints at their departure out of this life do not attain the full rewards of their labors; but are

¹ Οἱ καὶ λέγονται μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις, ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, μὴ ὑπολύβητε αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς· ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ἰουδαίους. — *Dial.* p. 307. Paris, 1615. That the still earlier apostolical fathers held the same sentiments concerning an intermediate state may be seen from Clem. 1 Corinth. c. 50. Herm. III. *Simil.* ix. 16. On the former passage see Bull, *Works*, I. Sermon. III. p. 63. Both his Sermons on this subject are deserving of all attention.

² Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημι πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ· ἔρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἄληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς. Ἀλλὰ τί; τὰς μὲν τῶν εἰσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονι ποιῶν ἡμῶν μένειν, τὰς δὲ ἄδικους καὶ πονηρὰς ἐν χειρόνῃ, τὸν τῆς κρίσεως ἐκδεχομένης χρόνον τότε. — *Dialog.* p. 222.

³ "Nobis inferi non nuda cavositas, nec subdivalis aliqua mundi sentina creduntur; sed in fossa terre, et in alto vastitas,

et in ipsis visceribus ejus abstrusa profunditas." He then says, Christ went there, and his servants must not expect to be above their Lord, but will have to wait in Abraham's bosom for the resurrection. "Nulli patet cælum, terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi reserabuntur regna cælorum. . . . Habes etiam de *Paradiso* a nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini." — Tertull. *De Anima*, cap. 55.

⁴ Αἱ ψυχὰ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν [ὠρατον] τόπον τὸν ὠρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κἀκεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως φοιτοῦσι, περιμένουσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν· ἔπειτα ἀπολαβοῦσιν τὰ σώματα, καὶ δλοκλήρως ἀναστήσῃ, τοῦτο ἔστι σωματικῶς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀνέστη, οὕτως ἐλεύσονται εἰς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. — Irenæ. v. 31. See also Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xviii.

awaiting us, who still remain on earth, loitering though we be, and slack." ¹

Lactantius is very express upon the same point. "Let no one," says he, "think that souls are judged immediately after death; for they are all detained in the same common place of keeping, until the time come when the Supreme Judge shall inquire into their good or evil deeds." ²

Hilary says, that it is the "law of human necessity, that bodies should be buried, and souls descend to hell or Hades." And again, that "the faithful, who depart out of the body, are reserved in the safe keeping of the Lord for an entrance to the kingdom of Heaven, being in the mean time placed in Abraham's bosom, whither the wicked cannot enter on account of the great gulf fixed between them, until the time comes when they shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven." ³

Ambrose still more fully says, that, "while the fulness of time is expected, the souls await the reward which is in store for them. Some pain awaits, others glory. But in the mean time the former are not without trouble, nor are the latter without enjoyment." ⁴

Augustine writes, "The time between death and final resurrection holds the souls in hidden receptacles, according as each soul is meet for rest or punishment." ⁵

II. We have now to consider what we learn from *Scripture* of the state of the departed, and of the meaning of Hades.

1. The soul, after it has left the body, is not represented as passing directly to its final reward. This will appear from the following considerations:—

Our Lord distinctly assures us, that "no one hath ascended up

¹ "Nondum receperunt lætitiã suã ne Apostoli quidem, sed et ipsi expectant, ut et ego lætitiã eorum particeps fiam. Neque enim decedentes hinc sancti continuo integra meritum suorum præmia consequuntur, sed expectant etiam nos, licet morantes, licet desides." — Origen. *Hom.* vii. in Lev. num. ii.; Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. vii.

² "Nec tamen quisquam putet animas post mortem protinus judicari: omnes in una communique custodia detinentur, donec tempus adveniat quo maximus Judex meritum faciat examen." — Lactant. *Institut. Divin.* Lib. vii. c. 21; Usher, as above; King, p. 202.

³ "Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut conspultis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendant." — Hilary. *In Ps.* cxxxviii. Edit. Benedict. col. 514.

"Futuri boni expectatio est, cum exe-

utes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cœlestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interim Abraham collocati, quò adire impios interjectum chaos inhibet, quò usque introeundi rursum in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat." — Hilary. *In Ps.* cxx. Edit. Benedict. col. 383. See Usher, and King, as above.

⁴ "Ergo dum expectatur plenitudo temporis, expectant animæ remunerationem debitam. Alias manet pœna, alias gloria: et tamen nec illæ interim sine injuria, nec istæ sine fructu sunt." — Ambros. *De Bono Mortis*, c. x. Usher, as above.

⁵ "Tempus, quod inter hominis mortem et ultimam resurrectionem interpositum est, animas abditiis receptaculis continet, sicut unaquæque digna est vel requie vel ærumna." — Augustin. *Enchirid. ad Laurent.* c. cix. Tom. vi. p. 236.

to Heaven but He that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven" (John iii. 13). If then no one had then ascended up to Heaven, except the Lord Jesus, the saints departed could not have gone to their place of final and eternal bliss, which is always called Heaven.

Again, our Lord promised the thief on the cross "that he should be with Him that day in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43). Now Christ did not go from the cross to Heaven, but, as will appear hereafter, He went to hell or Hades, and did not go to Heaven till after His resurrection. Therefore Paradise, to which the thief went with Him that very day, was not Heaven.¹

Again, in the Revelation (vi. 9), "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God" are not represented as in Heaven, but they cry from under the altar; and, though white robes are given them, they are bid "to rest for a little season, till their fellow-servants and their brethren should be fulfilled."

Again, our Lord and His Apostles never comfort the Church concerning those who are asleep with the assurance that their souls are in Heaven, nor do they alarm the wicked with the fear that at the instant of death their souls will pass into a state of final punishment. It is ever to the Resurrection of the dead and the Judgment of the great day that the hopes of the pious and the fears of the ungodly are directed. This may be seen most plainly by referring to such passages as the following: Matt. xiii. 40; xvi. 27; xxv. 31-33. Mark viii. 38. Luke xiv. 14. John v. 28, 29. Acts xvii. 31. 1 Cor. xv. passim. 2 Cor. iv. 14; v. 10, 11. Phil. iii. 20, 21. Col. iii. 4. 1 Thess. iv. 13-17; v. 2, 3, 23. 2 Thess. i. 6-10. 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. Heb. ix. 27, 28. Jas. v. 7, 8. 1 Pet. iv. 5; v. 4. 2 Pet. iii. 10-12. Rev. xx. 13-15.

2. But though the soul does not receive its final reward until the Resurrection and the Judgment, when it shall be united to the body, and receive the sentence of the Judge; yet the soul does not die with the body, nor sleep in unconsciousness between death and Judgment.² This appears from the following.

1 "Si ergo secundum hominem quem Verbum Deus suscepit, putamus dictum esse, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiso*, non ex his verbis in cœlo existimandus est esse paradisos: neque enim ipso die in cœlo futurus erat homo Christus Jesus; sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro autem secundum carnem." — August. *Epist. LVII. ad Dardanum*. Edit. Benedict. *Ep. CLXXXVII.* Tom. II. p. 679.

² The reformers of the Church of Eng-

land were so strongly of this opinion that they put forth the following in the reign of Edward VI., as one of the Articles of the Church: it is the 40th of the 42 Articles of 1552:—

"The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly.

"They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving,

The soul of Samuel returned to earth after his body was in the grave (1 Sam. xxviii. 11, 14). This took place four years after Samuel's death. In the parable or history in Luke xvi., both Lazarus and Dives are represented as alive, one in torments and the other in Abraham's bosom; and that all this took place before the Resurrection and the Judgment appears from this, that in vv. 27, 28, the brothers of the rich man were then alive on earth and in their state of probation, and Dives wished that Lazarus should be sent to them to bring them to repent. It is therefore quite clear that the present world was still in existence, and therefore Judgment yet future. The same observations apply in all particulars to the account given of the souls beneath the altar, so often referred to in Rev. vi. 9-11. The promise also to the thief upon the cross, that he should be that day with Christ in Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43), must show that his soul would not be in a state of insensibility, but of bliss.

The same may be inferred from the words of our Lord, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul" (Matt. x. 28). If death be, not only corruption of the body, but insensibility of the soul, then men *can* kill the soul, as much as they can kill the body; for they cannot kill the body eternally, nor prevent its rising again. They can kill the body and reduce it to corruption now; but the soul they cannot kill, neither now, nor ever.

Again, the language used by our Lord and St. Stephen at the instant of death shows that the spirit would live: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit," said Christ (xxiii. 46). "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," said Stephen (Acts vii. 59).

St. Paul speaks of the Church as, among other companies, having in it "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23); where the whole context shows that he refers to the present, not to the future state of Christian privilege and blessing. He declares of himself that he is in a strait between two, "having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better." But if death be annihilation, until the Resurrection wakes both body and soul, he could hardly have called death better than life, nor have spoken of it as "being with Christ" (Phil. i. 23). And again, the same Apostle, speaking of death, and calling the body a tabernacle of the soul (2 Cor. v. 1, 2), says, "Whilst we are at home in the

until the day of Judgment, or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture.'

body, we are absent from the Lord;” and then adds, “we are willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord” (vv. 6–8).

From all this we must conclude that the spirit still lives, when it has left the body, and that, though it loses the benefit of having a bodily tabernacle, yet, in the case of pious men, it is very vastly a gainer by death, inasmuch as, though absent from the body, it enjoys the presence of Christ.

3. Having thus seen that the disembodied soul neither sleeps nor enters into its final reward, we have only farther to show that the soul is in an intermediate state, called Sheol or Hades; and that that state is a state of partial and expectant bliss to the righteous, of partial and expectant misery to the wicked, preparatory to the final consummation of bliss or misery, to be assigned to each at the resurrection of the last day.

It has been seen that this was the opinion of the Jews, and also that our Lord and the Apostles use the very expressions which Lightfoot has shown that the Jews used concerning the state of the departed, namely, “Paradise,” “Abraham’s bosom,” and “beneath the altar,” answering to “beneath the throne of glory.” This would of itself imply that our Lord and His Apostles sanctioned the sentiments of the Jews upon the subject. The same has appeared concerning the Jewish use of the term Hades, which is a term frequently adopted by the writers of the new Testament.

The various passages of Scripture already referred to fully confirm this view of the case. For example, the souls beneath the altar (in Rev. vi.) are clothed in white robes, and comforted with hope, but plainly not in perfect consummation and bliss. St. Paul (in 2 Cor. v. 1–8), when looking forward to the hope of resurrection, distinctly describes the state of the disembodied soul as imperfect; and though he says, it is “better to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord” (ver. 8), he still says, that our earnest desire is for the resurrection of the body, which he calls being “clothed upon” (ver. 4). Again (Rom. viii. 19–23), he represents the whole creation as longing to be delivered from bondage, and waiting for the redemption of the body. In Heb. xi. 40 he represents the saints departed as not “made perfect,” until those who should succeed them were added to the number of the redeemed.

To these passages we must add the promise to the thief upon the cross, that he should be in Paradise, a place evidently of bliss, yet, as has already been seen, not the same as Heaven. Lazarus

is spoken of as *comforted* in Abraham's bosom; an expression by no means answering to the glowing descriptions of the eternal Kingdom of God, though corresponding with the Jewish and early Christian ideas of the state of intermediate bliss. Dives, too, is represented as being in the same place with Lazarus, though separated by a great gulf from him, and, unlike him, suffering torment; and that place is expressly called Hades (Luke xvi. 23). In correspondence with all this, we find, in the old Testament, that Jacob expected "to go down to Sheol (*i. e.* Hades) unto his son" (Gen. xxxvii. 35). Korah, Dathan, and Abiram are said to go down "quick into Sheol" (Num. xvi. 30); and when the king of Babylon's fate is foretold by Isaiah, it is said that "Hades (or Sheol) from beneath shall be moved to meet him;" which is explained by what follows, that the "mighty dead shall be stirred up" at his approach (Isai. xiv.) I think it hardly necessary to add more to show that on this point the opinion of the ancients is more correct than that of the modern popular creeds; and that the Roman Catholic notions of purgatory, the common opinion that the soul at once passes to its final reward, and the belief that the soul sleeps from death to Judgment, are all without support from the Scriptures of God. Those Scriptures plainly speak of the final reward to be attained only at the Resurrection; yet they show, too, that the soul is in a state of consciousness between death and Judgment. That state of consciousness is evidently a happy, though not a perfect state to the good, a suffering, though not a fully miserable state to the wicked. This state also is called at times by various names; but its general designation, whether as regards the just or the unjust, is in the Hebrew *Sheol*, in the Greek *Hades*, and both these words (as well as others of a different signification) are generally rendered by our English translators *hell*.

Our SECOND consideration is, What is meant by our Lord's descent to hell,— and what authority there is for the doctrine.

I. Historically.

The article, "He descended into hell," was not very anciently in the Creeds. The first place we find it used in, was the church of Aquileia,¹ about A. D. 400. Yet it is contained in a sort of exposition of the Christian faith given by Eusebius, which he translated from the Syriac, and which he states to have been given by Thaddæus, the brother of the Apostle Thomas, to the people of

¹ Pearson, p. 225.

Edessa.¹ It is not, however, in the Creeds of Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, in the Creed of the Council of Nice, nor in the more ancient draughts of the Roman or Apostles' Creed. Still there can be no question of its very general acceptance, as an article of faith, by all the earlier fathers of the Church. Ignatius, Hermas, Justin M., Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, have all spoken clearly on this subject; besides later fathers, such as Cyril, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom. It will be necessary to refer more particularly to the sentiments of some of these fathers, when we come to our THIRD division, concerning the object of Christ's descent. At present let it suffice to quote a few of the more striking, as well as the best-known passages, from some of the earliest Christian writers. Irenæus says, that "our Lord was in the middle of the shadow of death, where are the souls of the dead, and after that rose again with His body."² Tertullian, in a chapter before quoted, says that "Christ, who is God, yet being man too, died according to the Scriptures, was buried, and went through the form of human death in Hades; nor did He ascend into Heaven till He had gone down to the lower parts of the earth."³ Cyprian shows that our Lord "was not to be overcome by death, nor to remain in hell."⁴ Lord King says that in sundry places Athanasius shows,⁵ "that, whilst Christ's Body lay buried in the grave, His Soul went into hell, to perform in that place those several actions, and operations, which were necessary for the complete redemption and salvation of mankind; that He performed after His death different actions by His two essential parts: by His Body He lay in the grave, by His Soul He went into hell and vanquished death."

One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades was this. The Arians and

¹ Euseb. i. 13; Bingham. x. 4, 18; Hey, Bk. iv. Art. III. § 1; Hammond's *Pract. Catech.* Bk. v. § 2.

² Irenæ. v. 31. "Cum enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit."—See Pearson, p. 237; and Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xviii.

³ *De Anima*, c. lv. "Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum Scripturas, et sepultus secundum easdem, hic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum," &c.

⁴ "Quod a morte non vinceretur, nec

apud inferos remansurus esset."—Cyp. *Test. adv. Judæ.* lib. 2. c. 24.

⁵ King, p. 179. The words are Lord King's, not Athanasius's. Nevertheless, Athanasius's language may justify Lord King's statement: . . . μήτε της θείτης του σώματος εν τῷ τάφῳ ἀπολιμπανομένης, μήτε της ψυχῆς εν τῷ ἀδη χωριζομένης. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐτι τὸ βῆθεν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἀδην, οὐδὲ ὄψεις τὸν δαίον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. . . . Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μὲν ψυχῇ Θεοῦ ἡ κρίτης του θανάτου ἐλύετο, καὶ ἐξ ἄδου ἀνάστασις ἐγένετο, καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς εἰηγγελίετο· ἐν δὲ σώματι Χριστοῦ ἡ φθορὰ κατηγορεῖτο, κ. τ. λ.—Athanas. *De Salut. Advent. Jes. Christ.* et *adv. Apollinarium.* Tom. i. p. 645.

Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ.¹ Now the true doctrine of our Lord's humanity, namely, that "He was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting," was most strongly maintained by asserting the Article of His descent to Hades. For whereas His Body was laid in the grave, and His Soul went down to Hades, He must have had both Body and Soul.² Accordingly, the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's Soul to Hell.

II. The Scriptural proof of our Lord's descent to Hades rests chiefly on three passages. One is the difficult verse, 1 Pet. iii. 19, which was generally esteemed by the fathers to apply to this subject, and was thought conclusive by the reformers of the reign of Edward VI. Yet, as many of our most learned divines have denied its application, I shall defer the consideration of the question till we come to speak of the *object* of Christ's descent.

Another passage is Eph. iv. 9: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?"

It is undoubted, that both Jews and Greeks placed Hades, according to their popular notions, beneath the earth, or in the lower parts of the earth; and it is not improbable that the Apostle may have used this popular language to express our Lord's descent or passage to the place of disembodied souls. It is undoubted, too, that some of the fathers and creeds adopted these words, or words similar to them (*τὰ κατώτερα*),³ to express the doctrine of the descent to Hades. And Bishop Pearson has truly observed, that this exposition of the passage "must be confessed so probable that there can be no argument to disprove it." Yet there is also no question, that the Apostle's language might be used to express merely the fact of the incarnation, or of the burial of Christ. The "lower parts of the earth" may mean only the place beneath, *i. e.* the earth itself, in contradistinction to the heights of Heaven.

Although, then, both these passages may, and we may not be far

¹ See an account of their doctrines under Art. 11. § 1.

² Most pertinent is the passage of Fulgentius, *Ad Trasimund.* Lib. 111. c. 34, quoted by Pearson, p. 238: "Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, et secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit: . . . secundum divinitatem vero suam, quæ nec loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepul-

chro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima; ac per hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus, quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam susceperat separatus," &c.

So Hilary, *In Ps. cxxxviii.* "Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit."

³ See Pearson, pp. 226, 228. Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Jerome, all quote this passage to prove or express the descent into hell.

wrong in saying that they both very probably do, refer to our Lord's descent to the place or state of departed souls; yet, seeing this application is open to doubt, it may be well to rest the doctrine on a passage the force of which can hardly be evaded. The passage is Acts ii. 27-31. St. Peter there quotes the sixteenth Psalm, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades (*εις ᾗδου*), neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption;" and he explains it, that the Psalmist "spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His Soul was not left in Hades, neither His Flesh did see corruption."¹ In which explanation by the Apostle it is plain that the *soul* is in antithesis to the *flesh*, and *Hades* to *corruption*; so that the miracle of our Lord's resurrection was the consequence of His Flesh not being suffered to be corrupted in the grave, and His Soul not being suffered to remain in Hades. That is to say, our Lord had a human nature like our own. When human beings die, the soul leaves the body; the latter is laid in the grave, the former passes to the intermediate state of souls. With ordinary men, the body sees corruption, the soul is left in Hades till the Judgment. But with Christ, though He fully passed into the state of death, yet death did not retain dominion over Him. Although, therefore, His Body was laid in the sepulchre, it saw not corruption; although His Soul went to Hades, where other souls go, yet God did not leave it there, but it was on the third day reunited to the Body, and so the Body was raised from the grave.

If it be necessary to add anything to this passage, we may further remark, that, as it has already been shown that Paradise is the state of the departed souls of the redeemed, so our Lord's promise to the thief upon the cross, that he should be with Him that day in Paradise, proves clearly that our Lord, and with Him the repentant thief, passed from the cross into the state of the souls of the dead, which, as has been shown, is called Hades or hell. It was, indeed, into the happy division of Hades called Paradise, or Abraham's bosom; but still it was to part of Hades.²

We now come to the THIRD division of our subject, to consider what was the *object* of our Lord's descent to Hades.

¹ "Et Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in infernum satis constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno*; quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit." — Augustin. *Epist.* CLXIV. Tom. II. p. 574.

² So the author of the Homily on Dives and Lazarus, attributed to Chrysostom: "Dicat mihi aliquis, in inferno est Paradisus? Ego hoc dico, quia sinus Abrahamæ Paradisi veritas est; sed et sanctissimum Paradisum fateor." — *Homil. in Luc. xvi. De Divoite.* Tom. II. Oper. Chrysost. Latin. Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. VIII.

I. Historically, we must consider this subject as briefly as we can.

1. It has already been seen, that many of the fathers looked on the belief in our Lord's passage to Hades as necessary for the acknowledgment of the verity of His manhood and of His death. This indeed appears to have been the universal sentiment of the primitive Church; and, accordingly, the descent to Hades was urged by the fathers against the Apollinarian heresy.¹

2. But, though this may be said to have been the universal sentiment of the early Christians, there were also various opinions current among them, as to what our Lord did during His stay among the souls of the dead.

Almost universal appears to have been the belief, that the Spirit or Soul of Christ preached the Gospel to the souls of the dead.² Hermas, who is reckoned apostolical, has set forth the doctrine, that not only Christ preached to the spirits in Hades, but that the Apostles too preached, to those who had died before them, the name of the Son of God.³ In this he is followed and quoted by Clement of Alexandria.⁴

Irenæus, again, says that he heard from a certain presbyter, who heard it from those who had seen the Apostles, that our Lord descended to the places beneath the earth, and preached His Gospel to those who were there; and all believed in Him who had foretold His advent, — the just, the prophets, the patriarchs; whose sins He forgave, as He does ours.⁵

The passage of Scripture on which this general belief of the early Christians was founded is 1 Pet. iii. 19. Justin Martyr and Irenæus also quote a passage from Isaiah or Jeremiah, which is not extant in any copies of the Bible. The passage is this, "The Lord God remembered His dead, who slept in the sepulchral earth, and descended to them to preach His salvation."⁶ Justin charges the Jews with having erased it from the LXX. Of the spuriousness of the text there can be no doubt; but it sufficiently shows the judgment of those fathers who quoted it, concerning the doctrine which it was adduced to prove.

Thus far then the early Christians appear almost unanimous.

¹ See under the second division of this Article passages from Irenæus, Tertullian, Athanasius, Fulgentius. See also Pearson, p. 238.

² Καδικόμενος ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τοῦ ᾗδου μυχοῖς, καὶ διακηρύξας τοῖς ἐκεῖσε πνεύμασιν. — Cyril. Alex. *Hom. Paschal.* xx. Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

³ Lib. III. *Simil.* ix. c. xvi. Coteler. i. p. 117.

⁴ *Stromat.* vi. Potter, pp. 763, 764. See Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 189.

⁵ Iren. Lib. iv. c. 45.

⁶ Justin. M. *Dial.* § 72, p. 398. Iren. III. 23. IV. 39. V. 81.

On the purpose or end of Christ's preaching, however, there existed no small difference.

(1) The earlier fathers seem generally to have held, that no change took place in the condition of souls after our Lord's descent among them, and in consequence of His preaching to them. Justin Martyr held, that all souls still remain in Hades: the just in a happy, the unjust in a wretched place, and so shall remain to the Judgment.¹ Irenæus and Tertullian are clearly of the same opinion. The former says,² that "no disciple is above his master," and thence infers that, as our Lord went to Hades, so all His servants shall go thither. Tertullian asserts that "Heaven is not open until the end of the world,"³ and that all men are in Hades, either comforted or tormented.⁴ Accordingly, he says that our Lord's descent to Hades was, that the patriarchs might be made partakers of Him.⁵

(2) But, on the other hand, many of the early Christians were of opinion that our Lord, when He descended to Hades, delivered some who were there, and carried them thence to some better place.

Some thought that the prophets and patriarchs were in Hades till the coming of Christ, and that after that they were translated to a better place, called Paradise; whilst others again believed that our Lord preached His Gospel to the souls of the dead, and that those who believed in Him were saved and delivered from Hades, those who rejected Him were condemned.

There seem traces of this opinion in the above-noticed passage of Hermas, commonly called an apostolical father, and in Clement of Alexandria, who followed him. Origen, however, appears to be the first who distinctly propounded the opinion, that, after the coming of Christ, the souls of the just, instead of going to Hades, pass at once to some better place, called Paradise.⁶

¹ See the passages quoted in the note under the FIRST head, i. 3, p. 87, note 1.

² "Nunc autem [Dominus] tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui. . . Cum enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant, . . . manifestum est quia et discipulorum ejus, propter quos et hæc operatus est Dominus, αὐψυχὰ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν [ἄορατον] τόπον τὸν ὀρισμένον αὐταῖς. . . Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum: perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum a Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus, . . . post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic et nos sus-

tinere debemus definitum a Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus, prænuntiatum a prophetis, et sic resurgentes assumi." — Irenæ. v. 31.

³ *De Anima*, c. LV., quoted above.

⁴ *De Anima*, c. LVIII.

⁵ "Descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes sui faceret." — *De Anima*, c. LV.

See also *Adv. Marcion*. Lib. iv. c. xxxiv. Also Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 262.

⁶ This is apparent, as the opinion of Origen, in the whole of the 9^d Homily on the 1st Book of Kings, shown as the Homily *De Engastrimytho*. There he argues that the soul of Samuel, which

Accordingly, the later fathers generally adopted the notion, that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ promised to the thief on the cross that he should be with Him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which therefore they distinguished from Hades.¹ Hades indeed they looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better.²

Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the *Limbus Patrum*. Yet that the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the mediæval Church, will be sufficiently apparent to any one who will read the passages which have been thrown into the notes.

Another opinion, however, grew up also in the early ages, namely, that Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those who in old times had been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and hell.³ This

was called up by the witch of Endor, was in Hades; so were the souls of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets; none of them could pass the flaming sword, till Christ came to set them free. Therefore it was that Lazarus, though in Abraham's bosom, could see Dives, who was in torments. But after Christ is come, Christians can pass the flaming sword into Paradise without harm. Paradise, however, was not in Heaven, according to Origen, but still an intermediate state, though better than Hades. This appears from the following, if Rufinus has rightly translated him: "Puto enim quod sancti quique discedentes de hac vita permanebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem Paradisum dicit Scriptura divina, velut in quadam eruditionis loco, et, ut ita dixerim, auditorio vel schola animarum, in quo de omnibus his quæ in terris viderant doceantur, indicia quoque quædam accipiant etiam de consequentibus et futuris." &c. — *De Principiis*, Lib. II. cap. XI. num. 6.

Bp. Beveridge, on this Article, quotes a passage from Ignatius, which should show that that ancient father took the same view as Origen and others after him. The passage, however, is from an interpolated Epistle, and therefore proves nothing. *Ad Trall.* ix. Cotelier. II. p. 64.

¹ "Dominus resurrectionis suæ pignore vincula solvit inferni, et piorum animas elevavit." — Ambros. *De Fide ad Gratian.* Lib. IV. c. 1.

"Ante adventum Christi omnia ad inferos pariter ducerentur. Unde et Jacob ad inferos descensurum se dicit. Et Job

pios et impios in inferno queritur retentari. Et Evangelium, chaos magnum interpositum apud inferos, et Abraham cum Lazaro, et divitem in suppliciis, esse testatur. Et revera antequam flammeam illum rotam, et igneam romphæam, et Paradisi fores Christus cum latrone reseraret, clausa erant cælestia." — Hieron. *Com. in Eccles.* c. III. Tom. II. col. 786. Edit. Bened. Quoted in part by King, p. 209 See also Pearson, p. 250.

² "Si enim non absurde credi videtur, antiquos etiam sanctos, qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remotissimis, sed apud inferos fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi et ad ea loca descensus erueret, profecto deinceps boni fideles effuso illo pretio jam redempti, prorsus inferos nesciunt, donec etiam receptis corporibus, bona recipiant quæ merentur." — August. *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. XX. c. XV. Tom. VII. p. 593. Quoted in part by King, p. 212. See also *Epist.* CLXIV. Tom. II. p. 575; *Epist.* CLXXXVII. p. 679.

³ "Expers peccati Christus, cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, seras inferni januasque confringens, vinctas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, e diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam." — Ambros. *De Mysterio Pasche*, c. 4.

"Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui ad fornacem descendit inferni, in quo clausæ et peccatorum et justorum animæ tenebantur, ut absque exustione et noxa sui eos, qui tenebantur inclusi, mortis vinculis liberaret." — Hieron. *In Daniel.* c. III. Tom. III. col. 1086.

"Invocavit ergo redemptor noster no-

appears to have been the opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades, and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at times he appears to have admitted that it did); and thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence.¹ Some indeed went so far as to think that hell was cleared of all the souls that were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ, when He arose from the dead, and ascended into Heaven. But this was reckoned as a heresy.²

Such were the principal varieties of opinion in early ages touching the end of Christ's descent to hell.³

In more modern times, many other sentiments have been adopted. Among the rest, the opinion held by Calvin⁴ appears to have been, that our Lord's descent to hell means not His going to the place of spirits, but His suffering upon earth, in Gethsemane and on the cross, all the torments of hell, and the sufferings of damned souls. Dr. Hey thinks that the growing popularity of Calvin's views induced the reformers of Elizabeth's reign to omit the latter part of the Third Article as put forth in Edward's reign, because it was not acceptable to those who followed Calvin on this head.

Others again have supposed that our Lord went down to hell, (taking hell in the sense of Gehenna, the place of the damned,) and that He went there in order to meet and confront Satan in his own abode, and as He had conquered him on earth, so finally to subdue him in hell.⁵

men Domini de lacu novissimo, cum in virtute divinitatis descendit ad inferos, et destructis claustris Tartari, suos quos ibi reperit cruens, victor ad superos ascendit." — Id. Lib. II. In *Lamentat.* c. iii. Tom. v. col. 829. The genuineness of this commentary is doubtful.

"Nec ipsam tamen rerum partem noster salvator mortuus pro nobis visitare contempsit, ut inde solveret quos esse solvendos secundum divinam secretamque justitiam ignorare non potuit." — Augustin. *De Genesi ad literam.* Lib. XII. c. 66. Tom. III. p. 322.

Κατέλθων γὰρ εἰς ἄδου, καὶ τοῖς ἐκέεισε διακηρύξας πνεύμασιν, ἀνείξτε τοῖς κάτω τὰς κεκλεισμένους πόλεις, καὶ τὸν ἀπληστον τοῦ θανάτου κενώσας μυχόν, ἀνεβίω τριήμερος. — Cyril. Alex. *Hom. Paschal.* xi.

σεσύλητο τῶν πνευμάτων ὁ ἄδης. — Id. *Hom.* vi.

See most of these and some other passages referred to in Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

¹ See Augustin. *Epist.* CLXIV. Tom. II. p. 573. Pearson, p. 241, refers to it as *Epist.* XCIX. Concerning Augustine's doubts on the nature of Hades, see Pearson, p. 239; King, p. 210; and the places referred to *supra* note 3, pp. 124, 5.

² Augustine, in his book *De Hæresibus*, reckons this as the seventy-ninth heresy. "Alia, descendente ad inferos Christo, credidisse incredulos, et omnes exinde existimat liberatos." — Tom. VIII. p. 23. See Pearson, p. 241, note.

³ Tertullian mentions, but does not approve of, an opinion in his day, that Christ went to Hades that we should not go thither: "Sed in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus." — *De Anima*, c. 55.

⁴ See Calvin. *Institut.* Lib. II. c. 16, § 10: quoted by Pearson, p. 230, where see Pearson's own observations on this notion.

⁵ On the other hand, Mede (*Disc.* IV. *Works*, p. 23, Lond. 1677) has made it

II. To pass from the *Historical* to the *Scriptural* consideration of the end of Christ's descent to Hades, we may observe: —

1. That it is plain He went thither that He might fulfil the conditions of death proper to human nature. When man dies, the spirit leaves the body, the body is buried, the spirit goes to the abode of the departed, where the souls of men await the Resurrection of the dead. Christ fulfilled this twofold condition. His Body was buried, and His Soul passed into Hades or Paradise. This it is unnecessary to dwell upon, as it seems evident, that, as our Lord was perfect man, so it was His will, and the will of His Father, that He should undergo all the conditions of human nature, and especially that He should truly suffer death. Now death cannot be truly suffered, unless the soul leaves the body, and goes to the abode of departed spirits.

2. But it becomes necessary here to consider, whether the text 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, (which was so applied by all the fathers, and by the English reformers of the reign of Edward the Sixth,) gives us any farther account of the end and object of Christ's descent to Hades. Many divines of the English Church deny altogether its applicability to this question. Writers of no less name than Hammond, Pearson, Barrow, &c. contend that the only meaning of St. Peter's words is, that our Lord by His Holy Spirit, inspiring Noah, preached to the disobedient antediluvians, who are now for their disobedience imprisoned in hell.¹

This interpretation of the passage depends on the accuracy of the English version. That version reads in the eighteenth verse "quicken'd by the Spirit." It is to be noted, however, that all the ancient versions except one (the Ethiopic) seem to have understood it "quicken'd in spirit;" and it is scarcely possible, upon any correct principles of interpretation, to give any other translation to the words.² If, therefore, we follow the original, in preference to the

most probable, if not certain, that Satan is not yet cast into hell, but that evil spirits are allowed to walk to and fro on the earth. So Satan is called the prince of the powers of the air, and it is not till the Judgment that he is to be cast into hell. This, like most of J. Mede's learned discourses, is well worth reading.

See also this view of the end and character of our Lord's descent into hell considered and disproved by Bp. Pearson, p. 248.

¹ A question as to whether this might be the meaning of the passage had been proposed by St. Jerome and St. Augustine. Hieron. Lib. xv. *In Esai.* cap. liv.

August. *Epist.* clixiv. See Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

² The words in the Greek are *θανατωθεῖς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεῖς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι*. The article *τῷ* before *πνεύματι* is of so little authority, that Wetstein, Griesbach, and Matthäi have rejected it from the text. Bishop Middleton has observed, that in order to admit of the rendering of the English version, or to allow us to understand by "spirit" here the Holy Spirit of God, it would be absolutely necessary that there should be not only an article, but a preposition also before *πνεύματι*. If the article be not authentic, we must render "dead carnal'y, but alive

English version, we must read the passage thus: "Christ suffered for us, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quick in His Spirit; by which (or in which) He went and preached (or proclaimed) to the spirits in safe keeping," &c. There is, it will be observed, a marked antithesis between "flesh" and "spirit." In Christ's Flesh or Body He was put to death. Men were "able to kill the body," but they could not kill His soul. He was therefore alive in His Soul,¹ and *in* or *by* that He went to the souls who were in safe custody (*ἐν φυλακῇ*); His Body was dead, but His Spirit, or Soul, went to their spirits or souls. This is the natural interpretation of the passage; and if it ended here, it would contain no difficulty, and its sense would never have been doubted. It would have contained a simple assertion of our Lord's descent to the spirits of the dead.²

But it is added, that He not only went to the spirits in safe keeping, but that He went and *preached* to them. Hence it has been inferred, that, if He preached, they had need of, and He offered to them, repentance. Hence the passage has appeared to savour of false doctrine, and hence its force has been explained away. But the word "preached," or "proclaimed," by no means necessarily infers that He preached either faith or repentance. Christ had just finished the work of salvation, had made an end of sin, and conquered hell. Even the angels seem not to be fully enlightened as to all the work of grace which God performs for man. It is not likely, then, that the souls of the departed patriarchs should have fully understood or known all that Christ had just accomplished for them. They indeed may have known, and no doubt did know, the great truth, that redemption was to be wrought for all men by the sufferings and death of the Messiah. But before the accomplishment of this great work, neither angels nor devils seem fully to have understood the mystery of it. If this be true, when the blessed Soul of our crucified Redeemer went among the souls of those whom He had just redeemed, what

spiritually." If we admit the article, we must then translate, "dead in body, but alive in His Spirit," *i. e.* in His soul. The ancient versions support this rendering, and Michaelis and Rosenmüller give a similar interpretation. Bp. Middleton refers with full approbation to Bp. Horsley's Sermon mentioned below. See Middleton, *On the Article*, in loc.

¹ *ζωοποιηθεὶς* corresponds with the *Hiphil* of *קָיָה*, which means "to keep alive," as much as "to make alive."

² The expression *ἐν φυλακῇ* by no means necessarily signifies a place of punishment. It may mean a place of protection. It is simply *in ward*, *in guardianship*. The rendering of the Syriac, which from its antiquity is so important, is *ܘܕܝܠܘܫ*, *in Hades*. The following is its rendering of the whole passage: "He was dead in body, but alive in spirit: and he preached to those souls which were kept in Hades."

can be more probable than that He should have "proclaimed" (*ἐκήρυξεν*) to them, that their redemption had been fully effected, that Satan had been conquered, that the great sacrifice had been offered up? If angels joy over one sinner that repenteth, may we not suppose Paradise filled with rapture when the Soul of Jesus came among the souls of His redeemed, Himself the herald (*κήρυξ*) of His own victory?

This is the view propounded by Bp. Horsley in his admirable sermon on this text.¹ It is perfectly unnecessary to suppose that the consequence of Christ's preaching in Hades, or Paradise, was similar to His or His Apostles' preaching on earth. Both indeed were preachings of glad tidings. But in this was the difference. Preaching on earth is to men, who need repentance, and whose repentance is acceptable. Preaching to the souls of the departed was a mere proclaiming of blessedness to men who had already repented when on earth, and had no need of repentance after death, when it never comes, and could not avail, even if it did come.

The only difficulty in this interpretation of this difficult passage is in the fact that the preaching is specially said to have been addressed to those "who had once been disobedient in the days of Noah." That many who died in the flood may yet have been saved from final damnation seems highly probable, and has been the opinion of many learned divines. The flood was a great temporal judgment, and it follows not that "all who perished in the flood are to perish everlastingly in the lake of fire." But the real difficulty consists in the fact that the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of salvation is represented by St. Peter as having been addressed to these antediluvian penitents, and no mention is made of the penitents of later ages, who are equally interested in the tidings.

It must be confessed that this is a knot which cannot easily be untied. Yet should not this induce us to reject the literal and grammatical interpretation of the passage, and to fall back upon those forced glosses which have been devised in order to avoid, instead of fairly meeting and endeavouring to solve, an acknowledged difficulty. Bishop Horsley says that he thinks he has "observed, in some parts of Scripture, an anxiety, if the expression may be allowed, of the sacred writers, to convey distinct intimations that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption and the final retribution." It may be conceived, too, he thinks,

¹ Vol. 1. Sermon. xx.

that those who perished in the most awful of God's temporal judgments would, more than any, need and look for the comfort of Christ's presence, and that consolation which His preaching in the regions of the departed would afford "to those prisoners of hope." Whether or not such ideas give any clue to the solution of this difficulty it may be hard to say. But in the same author's words, "Is any difficulty that may present itself to the human mind, upon the circumstances of that preaching, of sufficient weight to make the thing unfit to be believed upon the word of the Apostle?—or are we justified, if, for such difficulties, we abandon the plain sense of the Apostle's words, and impose upon them another meaning, not easily adapted to the words, though more proportioned to the capacity of our own understanding, especially when it is confirmed by other Scriptures that He went to that place? In that place He could not but find the souls that are in it in safe keeping; and in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed, He would hold conference with them; and a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction to a general communication with all. If the clear assertions of Holy Writ are to be discredited, on account of difficulties which may seem to the human mind to arise out of them, little will remain to be believed in revealed or even in what is called natural religion: we must immediately part with the doctrine of atonement,—of gratuitous redemption,—of justification by faith without the works of the law,—of sanctification by the influence of the Holy Spirit; and we must part at once with the hope of the Resurrection."¹

¹ P. 436. The whole Sermon deserves careful attention, and should be compared with Bishop Middleton, on 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is to be lamented that Bishop Pearson, in his most learned and elaborate article on the Descent into Hell, should have written less lucidly than is his wont. In more passages than one, unless I greatly misunderstand him, he has contradicted himself. At one time he defines hell as the place of departed spirits, and makes our Lord's descent thither no more than

a passing into the state of the dead. At another time he argues as if hell meant the place of torment, and says that Christ went there to save us from going thither, for which he quotes Tertullian, who, however, mentions the opinion only to condemn it. See especially p. 251.

[See also Bishop Hobart, *On the State of the Departed*; and Bishop Seabury's Sermon, *The Descent of Christ into Hell*.—*J. W.*]

ARTICLE IV.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

CHRIST did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day.

De Resurrectione Christi.

CHRISTUS vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanæ naturæ pertinentibus recepit: cum quibus in cœlum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THE subjects treated of in this Article may be divided as follows:—

FIRST, We must consider Christ's Resurrection with His human Body; SECONDLY, His Ascension, and Session at God's Right Hand; THIRDLY, His Return to Judgment.

I—II. The first and second of these divisions may historically be considered together.

Christ's Resurrection forms a part of all the ancient Creeds, and is followed by the Ascension, Session, and Judgment, as in this Article.

The Sadducees, who denied all resurrection, of course would deny the resurrection of Christ. The Essenes also, though they believed the immortality of the soul, yet did not believe that the body would rise. We find, as early as Apostolic times, that some heretics had crept into the Christian Church, who said that "there was no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 12), and that "the resurrection was past already" (2 Tim. ii. 18). Whoever these heretics may have been, not long after them the Docetæ, denying the reality of Christ's flesh, and holding the doctrine of the general malignity of matter, of necessity disbelieved the truth of the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Augustine tells us that the Cerinthians held that Jesus, whom they took to be a mere man,

had not risen, but was yet to rise.¹ Apelles, a disciple of Marcion's, held that, when Christ came down from Heaven, He formed for Himself as He descended an airy and sidereal flesh, but when He arose and ascended into Heaven, He restored this body to its pristine elements, which being thus dispersed, His Spirit alone returned to Heaven.²

Some of the earlier heretics, though otherwise connected with the Gnostics, did not absolutely deny either a body or a resurrection to Christ, but invented strange fables concerning it. Thus, according to Theodoret, Hermogenes believed our Lord's Body to be placed in the Sun.³ And Tertullian mentions certain heretics who taught, "that the flesh of Christ was in the heavens devoid of sense, as a scabbard or sheath, Christ being withdrawn from it."⁴ The Manichees, like the Gnostics or Docetæ, denying the reality of Christ's flesh, and believing matter to be evil, denied Christ's resurrection; but as they seem to have identified Christ with Mithras (æthereal Light, the Sun), there may have been some connection between their belief and that of Hermogenes mentioned above.⁵ The doctrine of Eutyches concerning the Person of Christ, as it was opposed to the verity of His Manhood, so it by implication opposed the verity of His resurrection; and so Theodoret accuses him of considering that the Godhead only rose from the grave.⁶

In later ages, when the controversies arose concerning the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, it has been thought that divines of the Roman and Lutheran communions were led to use language concerning the glorified Body of our blessed Lord, and its ubiquity, which almost savoured of Eutychianism; as though, after His ascension, His human nature had become so deified as to have lost the attributes of humanity, and have been transubstantiated into His Divinity. There is little doubt that the strong language of this Article was designed to oppose so exaggerated an opinion,

¹ "Jesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec resurrexisse, sed resurrecturum asseverantes." — August. *Hæres.* viii. Tom. viii. p. 7.

² Tertullian. *De Præscript. adv. Hær.* c. 38. *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 5. Epiphian. *Hær.* xlv. August. *Hæres.* xxiii. Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 272. Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, Book II. chap. xii. sect. x. King, *On Creed*, p. 261.

³ Theodoret. *Hæret. Fab. Lib.* i. c. 19. Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 273. King, p. 263.

Philaster and Augustine ascribe the same opinion to the followers of Seleucus

and Hermias. See Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, Book II. ch. xviii. sect. viii.

⁴ "Adfirmant carnem in caelis vacuum sensu, ut vaginam, exempto Christo, sedere." — *De Carne Christi*, c. 24. Pearson, p. 272. King, p. 269.

⁵ Μέχρι σήμερα Μανιχαίοι λέγονσι φαντασιώδη και ούκ ἀληθῆ τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὴν ἀνάστασιν γεγονέναι. — Cyril. Hierosol. *Catech.* xiv. Suicer, i. col. 311.

⁶ Theodoret (*Hæret. Fab. Lib.* iv. cap. xlii.) says he asserted τὴν θεότητα τῶ τάφῳ παραδοθεῖσαν τετυχηκεῖν τῆς ἀναστάσεως. — See Suicer, i. col. 311.

if such really existed; which may be the better seen by comparing the words of the Article with the rubric at the end of the Communion Service.¹

It is not to be concealed, that in later times some persons, of very sound opinions in the main, have been offended by the statement that our Lord took into Heaven “flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to man’s nature;” whereas they contend that our Lord’s Body at His ascension, if not before, became a spiritual body, and a spiritual body cannot be said to have “flesh and bones,” which pertain only to a natural body. This objection must be considered hereafter; and in the mean time we have only to add, that the language of the Article corresponds with that of the early fathers. Ignatius says that “he knew and believed Him to be in the flesh after His resurrection.”² Irenæus, in one of his creeds, confesses his belief in “the reception of Jesus Christ into Heaven in the flesh.”³ In the Epistle of Damasus to Paulinus, the following anathema occurs amongst others, “If any one shall not acknowledge that Christ is set down at the right hand of the Father, in the same flesh which He took here, let him be anathema.”⁴ Augustine meets the objection which may be made to this doctrine: “It offends some,” he says, “that we believe an earthly Body to have been taken into Heaven; they understand not how it is said in Scripture, It is sown a natural, it is raised a spiritual body.”⁵ To the like purpose writes Epiphanius: “He ascended into Heaven, not divesting Himself of His holy Body, but uniting it to a spiritual one.”⁶

The fathers indeed held that Christ’s Body, after His resurrection, remained truly a human Body, and was not changed into a

¹ The rubric, after explaining that by kneeling at the Communion no adoration is intended either to the “Sacramental Bread and Wine, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood,” adds, “The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.” This rubric was first inserted in the Second Service-Book of Edward VI. It was omitted in the Prayer-Book in Elizabeth’s reign, probably from a wish not to offend the many persons of Lutheran sentiments then in communion with the Church. It was restored in the last revision in the reign of Charles II., at the request of the Puritan Divines.

² Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα, καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα.—*Epist. ad*

Smyrn. c. 3. Pearson, p. 255. Suicer, i. col. 307.

³ τὴν ἐνσάρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.—*Lib. i. c. 2.*

⁴ Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* Lib. v. c. xi. King, *On Creed*, p. 268.

⁵ “Solet autem quosdam offendere, vel impios Gentiles vel hæreticos, quod credamus assumptum terrenum corpus in cœlum. Sed Gentiles plerumque philosophorum argumentis nobiscum agere student, ut dicant terrenum aliquid in cœlo esse non posse. Nostras enim Scripturas non noverunt, nec sciunt quomodo dictum sit, *Seminatur corpus animale, surgit corpus spirituale.*” — August. *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. vi. Tom. vi. p. 157.

⁶ Ἀνεβλῶν εἰς οὐρανοὺς, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐν δόξῃ, οὐκ ἀποθέμενος τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα, ἀλλὰ συνενώσας εἰς πνευματικόν.—*Αν-ακρῆ.* Tom. ii. p. 156. Colou. King, p. 262

spirit, or absorbed into God.¹ Yet they held, that it was divested of all that was mortal, carnal, and corruptible, and became a spiritual Body, incorruptible, unchangeable, impassible. So Theophylact, "Did He lay aside His flesh? God forbid; for as He was taken up, so shall He come. But He was taken up in the flesh, and with a Body. Now Christ is said to have lived after the flesh, when He lived subject to natural and blameless affections and feelings, — hungering, thirsting, sleeping, working. But now He is no longer after the flesh, that is, He is freed from all such natural and blameless affections, having a body impassible and incorruptible."²

III. The third head concerns our Lord's return to Judgment.

The Marcionites and other Gnostics are supposed to have denied a future Judgment. Their creed was, that God was of infinite grace and mercy; that the Creator, whom they distinguished from God, was just; not so God, or His Son Jesus Christ. They were also accused of holding that the actions of men in the body were indifferent; and this tenet, by implication, is a denial of the Judgment.³ The Manichees are charged, in like manner, with denying a Judgment, as they, no doubt, did deny a resurrection of the body.⁴

One of the peculiar views of Emmanuel Swedenborg in modern times, and of his followers, who call themselves the Church of the New Jerusalem, was that the passages of Scripture concerning the Judgment are not to be literally interpreted. Swedenborg taught that all men are subject to two opposite influences, one from God and good spirits, the other from evil angels; that according as they yield to one or the other influence, the soul rises or falls. Heaven and hell then are not the result of a Divine appointment, or of a

¹ Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εἰς θεότητος μετεβλήθη φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀθάνατον μένει καὶ ἀφθαρτον, καὶ θείας δόξης μεστόν· σῶμα δὲ ὅμως, τὴν οἰκειάν ἔχον περιγραφῆν. — Theodoret. *Demonstr. per Syllog.* Ὅτι ἀσύγχυτος ἡ ἑνωσις, Syl. ix.

Again: Οὐ μετεβλήθη εἰς πνεῦμα τὸ σῶμα· σὰρξ γὰρ ἦν, καὶ ὅστέα, καὶ χεῖρες, καὶ πόδες· τοιγαροῦν καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν σῶμα τὸ σῶμα μεμένηκεν. — *Ibid.* Syl. x. See Suicer, i. coll. 307, 308.

² Theophyl. ad 2 Cor. v. 16.

Τὴν σάρκα ἀπέθετο; μὴ γένοιτο· ὡς γὰρ ἀνελήφθη, οὕτω καὶ ἐλεύσεται· ἀνελήφθη δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ μετὰ τὸ σῶματος. . . . Ὁ δὲ

Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα λέγεται ζῆσαι, ὅτε καὶ τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα πάθη ἔζη, πεινῶν, διψῶν, ὑπνῶν, κοπιῶν· νῦν δὲ, οὐκέτι κατὰ σάρκα· τουτέστι, τούτων τῶν φυσικῶν καὶ ἀδιάβλητων ἀπηλλάγη, ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἀκῆριτον σῶμα ἔχων.

So Theodoret on the same passage: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς πάθη- τῶν εἶχε τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ πάθος ἀφθαρ- τον τοῦτο πεποίηκε καὶ ἀθάνατον. — See Suicer as above.

³ See King, *On the Creed*, p. 74.

⁴ Hey's *Lectures*, II. p. 390; and Lardner as referred to there.

future Judgment, but the necessary conditions of a man, according as he is good or evil. The passages of Scripture concerning the last Judgment are to be understood of the end and consummation of the Church which now is, and the establishment of a purer and better Church, which is called the descent "of the New Jerusalem from God out of Heaven."

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **A**S regards the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, it requires very little argument to prove that Scripture teaches the *fact*. The truth of such teaching must be here, as usual, assumed; all argument on such subjects being referred to the head of evidence.

The concluding chapters of the four Gospels, and the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, contain the fullest account of that miraculous event. They should be studied together, and with such aids as have been furnished by writers on the harmony of the Gospels.¹

It is to be observed, however, that the Resurrection is in many respects the key-stone of the Christian Faith. On the truth of it depends the truth of the Gospel; for it was to this great fact especially that the Apostles bore witness, and on its veracity they rested their claims to be heard and believed. Our Lord Himself continually foretold it, and so its occurrence became essential to the establishment of His truth. Accordingly we find, both before and after the event, most numerous allusions to it in the writings of the new Testament. For example, Matt. xvii. 9, 23. Mark viii. 31; ix. 31. John ii. 19; x. 17, 18. Acts i. 22; ii. 24, 36; xiii. 30-37. Rom. iv. 25; vi. 4. Eph. i. 20. Col. ii. 12; iii. 1, &c. &c.

Yet the historical is scarcely greater than the doctrinal importance of the Resurrection. In Scripture, the life of the Christian and of the Christian Church is represented as connected with, and depending on the life of Christ, who is the Head of the

¹ Those most approved of in our own language are Lightfoot, Macknight, Greswell, &c. Greswell's *Harmonia Evangelica*, and his five volumes of *Dissertations* on the subject, should be in every student's library.

Church and the Saviour of the Body.¹ The Christian therefore is said to die with Christ, and to rise again with Him.² And this connection of the Redeemer and His redeemed is spiritual here, and bodily and spiritual both hereafter. For here the union of the Christian with Christ is the cause of spiritual life; hereafter the same union shall be the cause of resurrection to life eternal. The Apostle speaks of the power of Christ's resurrection as having been shown already, thus: "God who is rich in mercy . . . when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," Eph. ii. 4, 5, 6; and again: "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above," Col. iii. 1. But he also speaks of the power of the same resurrection as to be shown hereafter, not only in raising the soul from sin, but the body also from corruption. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit which dwelleth in you," Rom. viii. 11. And again, "He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus," 2 Cor. iv. 14. And thus it is that by virtue of His own resurrection, or, as St. Paul calls it, "the power of His resurrection" (Phil. iii. 10), the Lord Jesus is to His disciples "the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25).

II. The second head of this article concerns the Ascension, and Session at God's Right Hand.

1. The Ascension into Heaven is related in Mark xvi. 19. Luke xxiv. 51. Acts i. 1-12.

It had been predicted in the old Testament (especially Ps. lxxviii. 18, which is explained by the Apostle, Eph. iv. 8); it had been foretold by our Lord Himself (John vi. 62; xx. 17); and it finally took place in the presence of His chosen disciples.

The importance of it to us was typified on the great day of atonement, when the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies once every year. The tabernacle, as is familiarly known, consisted of two principal parts. The first was called the Sanctuary or holy place, which typified the world, or more properly the Church on earth; where daily the priesthood ministered, offering sacrifices for the people, and sending up incense, the symbol of prayer and

¹ John xv. 1-7; xvii. 23. Rom. xii. 5. ² Rom. vi. 8. Eph. ii. 5, 6. Col. ii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 15; xii. 27. Eph. i. 22, 12; iii. 1. 1 Pet. i. 3. 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, 23; iv. 15, 16; v. 23. Col. i. 18, &c. 14. Rom. viii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 14, &c.

praise. But within the veil, whither no common priest had access, was the Holy of Holies, or the Holiest of all. Into this, once every year, on the tenth day of Tisri, the Fast, or day of atonement, the High Priest alone entered. He had made atonement for himself, for the sanctuary, and for the people, by sacrificing a bullock, a ram, and a goat; and dressed in the white robes common to the priesthood, he went with blood of the victims into the most holy place, and sprinkled seven times before the mercy-seat the blood of the bullock and the goat (Levit. xvi.) That this all prefigured the entrance of Christ "into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," we have the word of the Apostle in the ninth chapter of the Hebrews. As the High Priest was in the common white garments, not in the gorgeous robe of his high priesthood, so Christ went up in the likeness of sinful humanity, carrying our nature with Him, though pure from the sin of humanity, as the garment of the priest was holy and white (Lev. xvi. 4). As the priest took with him the blood of the sacrifice, so Christ offered His own Blood, and before the mercy-seat of God pleaded, and forever pleads, the merits of His Sacrifice, "seeing that He ever liveth to make intercession for us."¹

2. The Session at the Right Hand of God, foretold Ps. cx. 1 (comp. Luke xx. 42), and by our Lord, Matt. xxvi. 64, Mark xiv. 62, Luke xxii. 69, is recorded, Mark xvi. 19, Acts ii. 34, Rom. viii. 34, Eph. i. 20, Col. iii. 1, Heb. i. 3, 13, 1 Pet. iii. 22. It is hardly necessary to observe, that, when the Scriptures speak of the Right Hand of God, they mean thereby, not that God has hands like a man, but that as the right hand among men is the place of honour, of power, and of joy,² so to be by the Right Hand of God is to have the place of highest glory, power, and pleasure in the presence of God in Heaven; and *to sit* has no reference to posture, but implies dignity, sovereignty, and judgment.

Christ has ascended into Heaven, and there He abides. He now occupies that Mediatorial throne, where He is to sit, till all enemies be made His footstool (Ps. cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25). He had been anointed to His kingly office, when the Holy Ghost descended on Him at His baptism (Matt. iii. 16. Acts x. 38). He vindicated His title to the throne, when by "death He overcame him who had the power of death, even the devil." He made a farther advance to the assumption of His dominion, when

¹ Heb. viii. ix. x. *passim*.

² 1 Kings ii. 19. Matt. xxvi. 64. Ps. xvi. 11

He rose victorious from the grave, and thereupon declared to His disciples, that "all power was given Him in Heaven and earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18). But it was not until His final exaltation, when God, having "raised Him from the dead, set Him at His own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," that "all things having been put under His feet," He was "given to be Head over all things to the Church" (Eph. i. 20, 21, 22); "set upon the throne of His father David" (Luke i. 32); and "there was given to Him dominion and glory and a kingdom," "an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 14).

3. The next point for our consideration is, that Christ is said "to have taken again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things belonging to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven."

It has been seen, in the former Section, what the fathers appear to have taught on this subject. That our Lord arose from the grave in the same Body in which He was buried, that the same Body, with flesh and bones, which was laid in the sepulchre a lifeless corpse, was reanimated and rose again to life on the third day, is plainly and unquestionably the statement of the Evangelists. It was on this fact that their preaching and their faith rested. It was the assurance of this fact that convinced St. Thomas of the Divinity of Christ. He had declared that he would not believe the resurrection until he had seen in our Lord's hands the print of the nails, and had thrust his hand into His side (John xx. 25). That is to say, he required proof that our Lord's Body, which had risen, was the same Body which had been crucified; and when our Lord vouchsafed him this proof, then, and not till then, he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!" (John xx. 25-28).

But farther, when, on one occasion, the disciples were assembled, and our Lord suddenly appeared among them, "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit; but He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have. And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet" (Luke xxiv. 36-40). Thus it is clear that our Lord's Body, after He rose from the

grave, was that Body in which He was buried, having hands and feet, and flesh and bones, capable of being handled, and in which He spoke and ate and drank (Luke xxiv. 42, 43). Moreover, it appears that our Lord thus showed His hands and feet to His disciples at that very interview with them in which He was parted from them and received up into Heaven. This will be seen by reading the last chapter of St. Luke, from verse 36 to the end, and comparing it with the first chapter of the Acts, ver. 4-9; especially comparing Luke xxiv. 49, 50, with Acts i. 4, 8, 9. In that Body, then, which the disciples felt and handled, and which was proved to them to have flesh and bones, these disciples saw our Lord ascend into Heaven; and immediately after His ascent, angels came and declared to them, that that "same Jesus whom they had seen taken up into Heaven, should so come in like manner as they had seen Him go into Heaven" (Acts i. 11). All this connected together seems to prove the identity of our Lord's Body after His resurrection, at His ascension, and so on, even till His coming to Judgment, with the Body in which He suffered, and in which He was buried; and so fully justifies the language used in the Article of our Church.

But because we maintain that the Body of Christ, even after His resurrection and ascension, is a true human Body, with all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature (to deny which would be to deny the important truth that Christ is still perfect Man as well as perfect God); it by no means therefore follows that we should deny that His risen Body is now a glorified, and as St. Paul calls it, a *spiritual* Body. Nay! we have the strongest proofs that so it is.

Even before His ascension, He is said to have come and stood in the midst of His disciples, where the doors were shut for fear of the Jews (John xx. 19). On another occasion, He is said to have vanished out of their sight (Luke xxiv. 31). Again, His appearing to them "in another form" (Mark xvi. 12), and the disciples going to Emmaus not at once knowing Him (Luke xxiv. 16), seem to show that there was some change in the appearance, as well as in the properties of His Body. Though His Body had not ceased to be the same Body which it was before His death, it yet appears to have received some degree of glorification, and to have been invested with some supernatural qualities.

But, after His ascension, we have St. Paul's distinct assurance that the Body of Christ is a glorious, is a spiritual Body. In 1 Cor. xv. we have St. Paul's assertion, that, in the resurrection of all

men, the body shall rise again, but that it shall no longer be a natural body, but a spiritual body; no longer a corruptible and vile, but an incorruptible and glorious body. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. xv. 42-53). And this change of our bodies, from natural to spiritual, is expressly stated to be bearing the image of our glorified Lord,—the image of that heavenly man, the Lord from Heaven (vv. 47-49).

So again, the glorified state of the saints' bodies after the Resurrection, which in 1 Cor. xv. had been called the receiving a spiritual body, is, in Phil. iii. 21, said to be a fashioning of their bodies to the likeness of Christ's glorious Body; "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious Body."¹

We must therefore conclude, that, though Christ rose with the same Body in which He died, and that Body neither did, nor shall cease to be a human Body, still it acquired, either at His Resurrection or at His Ascension, the qualities and attributes of a spiritual, as distinguished by the Apostle from a natural body, of an incorruptible as distinguished from a corruptible body.

It is not perhaps given us to know the exact meaning of the term "a spiritual body." "We know not yet what we shall be;" and so we do not exactly know what He is, whom we shall be like. It may be better to leave in the obscurity in which Scripture has left it, this great and glorious mystery. And we shall err on neither side, if we maintain that our blessed Saviour still continues our Mediator in Heaven, perfect in His nature of God, and perfect in His nature of Man; but with His human nature, which on earth, though sinless, was mortal and corruptible, now raised to glory and immortality and incorruptibility; His natural having become a spiritual, His corruptible an incorruptible body.²

¹ "Non ita dictum est, quasi corpus vertatur in spiritum, et spiritus fiat; quia et nunc corpus nostrum, quod animale dicitur, non in animam verum est et anima factum. Sed spirituale corpus intelligitur, quod ita spiritui subditum est, ut cœlesti habitationi conveniat, omni

fragilitate ac labe terrena in cœlestem puritatem et stabilitatem mutata atque conversa."—August. *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. vi. Tom. vi. p. 157.

² There may be a difficulty in reconciling this doctrine, which is the plain doctrine of Scripture and the primitive

III. The third head of the Article is on the Judgment; in which we may consider, —

1. The Agent or Person who shall judge, Christ.
2. The object to be judged, namely, all men.
3. The action, judgment.
4. The time, the last day.

1. As regards the Agent; it is, in the first place, clear that God shall be “the Judge of all the earth” (Gen. xviii. 25. Ps. lviii. 11). Hence the day of Judgment is called “the day of God” (2 Peter iii. 12), — “the great day of Almighty God” (Rev. xvi. 14). Daniel saw “the thrones cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit” (Dan. vii. 9); and St. John saw “the dead great and small stand before God,” for judgment (Rev. xx. 12).

Now, when God is thus generally spoken of, we must either understand God the Father, or the whole blessed Trinity. And in the general, it is true to say that God shall judge the earth, or, that God the Father shall judge the earth. But then, as God made the worlds, but it was by God the Son; as God hath purchased the Church, but it was by the death of His Son; so the Father Himself “judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son” (John v. 22). “He hath given Him authority to execute judgment, because He is the Son of Man” (John v. 27); “He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained” (Acts xvii. 31); “He will judge the secrets of all men by Jesus Christ” (Rom. ii. 16).

Accordingly, the Judgment, when fully described, is ever represented as the coming of the Lord Jesus. It is called the “day of Christ” (2 Thess. ii. 2). “We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ” (2 Cor. v. 10). “The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, with His angels” (Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 37; xxv. 31; xxvi. 64). The “same Jesus which was taken up into Heaven, shall come again in like manner as he went

Christians, with the language of the rubric at the end of the Communion Service quoted above. If they be at variance, the language of a not very carefully worded rubric, adopted not without some hesitation by the reformers, ought not to be pressed; but it is plain, that the writers of the rubric did not mean by the words “natural body” to convey the same idea as St. Paul attaches to the term in 1 Cor. xv. The doctrine which they meant to teach was only, that we

must not consider the manhood of Christ changed into His Godhead. So St. Augustine: “Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est; . . . in eadem carnis forma atque substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus.” — *Ad Dard Epist.* 187. Tom. II. p. 681.

into Heaven" (Acts i. 11). "He has been ordained of God to be Judge of quick and dead" (Acts x. 42). He says of Himself, "Behold! I come quickly, and my reward is with me" (Rev. xxii. 12).

2. The objects of the Judgment are all men, whether those living at the time of Christ's coming, or those already fallen asleep,—“the quick and the dead.”

In the first Epistle to the Thessalonians (iv. 15–17), the Apostle describes the awful scene of our Lord's coming to save His people: “The Lord Himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain” (*i. e.*, whoever of Christ's servants may then remain alive on the earth) “shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.” In the like manner, he says (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52), “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” Accordingly it is said (2 Tim. iv. 1) that “the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing;” that He “was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead” (Acts x. 42. Compare Matt. xxv. throughout, John v. 25, 28, &c.)

3. The Judgment itself, which is the action the great Judge is to perform, is fully described in several of the passages already quoted or referred to. The twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew especially, under a variety of images, sets forth the terrors of the great day of the Lord: the ten virgins that meet the Bridegroom—the servants with their various talents—the Lord with all nations brought before Him, dividing them as a Shepherd the sheep from the goats.

In all these passages, and many besides, it is expressly said that the Judgment itself shall be “*according to works.*” On this subject the following references may be consulted, and will be found full and express. Job xxxiv. 11. Ps. lxii. 12. Prov. xxiv. 12. Jer. xvii. 10; xxxii. 19. Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 31–46. John v. 29. Rom. ii. 6. 2 Cor. v. 10. Col. iii. 24, 25. Rev. xx. 12; xxii. 12.

It need only be added, that Judgment according to works is a doctrine of Scripture not opposed to justification by faith. That we cannot be justified by the merits of our own works is a plain

statement of St. Paul (Rom. iii. 20 ; viii. 3. Gal. ii. 16. Eph. ii. 9, &c.) But if we be renewed by the Spirit of God, and transformed in the spirit of our minds ; if Christ be in us, and the Spirit of God dwell in our hearts ; then, being dead to sin, we can no longer live therein (Rom. vi. 2). Sin will not reign in our mortal bodies (Rom. vi. 12) ; but “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus will have made us free from that law of sin” (Rom. viii. 2) which would naturally reign in us ; and so “the righteousness of the law will be fulfilled in all who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (Rom. viii. 4). We are specially warned not to be deceived on this head ; for “he that doeth righteousness is righteous ;” and “he who committeth sin is of the devil.” “He that doeth not righteousness is not of God” (1 John iii. 7-10). Thus, then, the mark of distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil is this,—that righteousness is practised by the one party, sin by the other. And hence it is but likely that Judgment, which is to distinguish Christ’s servants from His enemies, should be conducted according to the works of every man, which shall “be brought to light, whether they be good or evil.” The just indeed shall be rewarded, not because of the merit of their works, but because of the atonement and righteousness of Christ. Yet still their own good works will be the test of their sanctification, and the proof before men and angels that they are living members of Christ and regenerated by His Spirit ; whereas the wicked works of wicked men will justly consign them to death and damnation.

4. It remains but to speak of the time of Christ’s coming to Judgment,—the last day.

The general descriptions of the Judgment already referred to (*e. g.* Matt. xxv. Rev. xx. 11-13, &c.) sufficiently show that it will not take place until the time when all present things shall pass away. All mankind, quick and dead, are represented as brought before the judgment-seat, and the just are sent to an everlasting reward, the wicked to an everlasting punishment. Accordingly, St. Paul says it shall be “at the last trump” (1 Cor. xv. 52), and St. Peter represents “the heavens and the earth which are now” as “reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment.” The heavens shall be dissolved, and the elements shall “melt with fervent heat ;” yet there shall be for the redeemed “a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (2 Pet. iii. 7-13).

But though the time is thus accurately marked, as "the last day," the close and consummation of the present state of things, yet we are continually told that it is utterly impossible for us to know how soon that day may come or how long it may tarry. It was not for our Lord's most favoured disciples "to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i. 7). They and we are bid to "watch, for we know not what hour our Lord cometh" (Matt. xxiv. 42: compare also Matt. xxv. 13. Mark xiii. 33. Luke xii. 40. 2 Pet. iii. 9-10). The disciples were taught to be constantly expecting our Lord; and accordingly they spoke and wrote as though they thought that He might come at any time. (See Rom. xiii. 11. Phil. iv. 5. 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17. Heb. x. 25. James v. 7, 8, &c.) Yet still they were fully aware that He might delay His coming, they knew not how long; and the importance of this uncertainty St. Paul earnestly impresses on the Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 1-3); and St. Peter still more fully inculcates on all men (2 Pet. iii. 4, 8-10).

There is one passage, however, especially remarkable on this subject. After our Lord had foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, and assured His disciples that the generation then alive should not pass away till that His prediction was accomplished (Matt. xxiv. 34. Mark xiii. 30), He goes on to tell them that though He thus gave them to know the time when He would execute His judgment on Jerusalem, yet the day of His final judgment (which they had confounded with the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv. 36), was unknown to men and angels. Nay, according to the record of St. Mark, our Lord said, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, *neither the Son, but the Father*" (Mark xiii. 32).

It has been seen that in His human nature our Lord was capable of knowledge and of ignorance. He was perfect Man, as well as perfect God, and He grew in wisdom, as well as in stature (Luke ii. 52). In that nature, then, in which He was capable of ignorance, He, when He was on earth, knew not the coming of the day of God. Though He is Himself to come, yet as Man He knew not the day of His own coming. This is indeed a great mystery, that that Manhood, which is taken into one Person with the Godhead of the Son, should be capable of not knowing everything, seeing that God the Son is omniscient. But it is scarcely more inexplicable than that God the Son in His Manhood should

be weak, passible, and mortal, who in His Godhead is omnipotent, impassible, and immortal.¹ If we believe the one, we can admit the other.

¹ The explanation of Mark xiii. 32, given in the text, is both consonant with sound principles of interpretation and with sound theology, and has been the explanation of the most ancient Christian fathers.

² Ἀνθρωπίνως εἶρηκε· καὶ τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ σῶ-
τως εἰσηκέναι ἔχει τὸ εἰλογον· ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἄν-

θρώπος γέγονεν, ὡς γέγραπται, ἀνθρώπων δὲ
ἴδιον τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, ὡπερ καὶ τὸ πεινᾶν, καὶ τὸ
ἄλλα· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῶν ἀνθρώ-
πων, ὡς ἀνθρώπος γεγούσ, ἐπιδείκνυται·
πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα δείξη, ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπι-
νον ἔχει σῶμα, κ. τ. λ. — Athanas. *Epist.* 11.
ad Serapion. Tom. 1. p. 172. See Suicer,
s. v. κρίσις, γ. 4, f.

[It seems desirable to add a few words concerning the difficulty spoken of in note 2, p. 113. The word used by St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. is ψυχικόν (soul-ish), and this can hardly be supposed to be the meaning of "natural," in the rubric at the end of the Communion Service. Had this latter word been written in Greek, it would have been φυσικόν.

It does so read in a Greek translation of the Book of Common Prayer, printed at Cambridge in 1665, and published with the Apocrypha and New Testament. The concluding words of the rubric are καὶ τὸ φυσικὸν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ οὐκ ἐνθάδε ἐστὶ· τῇ τῶν φυσικῶν Χριστοῦ σώματος ἀληθείᾳ ἐνά-
τιον ὄν, ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἐν πλείοσι τόποις πλὴν ἐνός ὑπάρχον.

There can, therefore, be no contradiction between St. Paul's words and the rubric, unless it can be proved that ψυχὴ and φύσις are synonymes. I am indebted for the above extract to the Rev. Mr. Hart, of Trinity College. — *J. W.*]

[It seems impossible to understand St. Luke xxiv. 36-49, of any other time than the evening after the Resurrection, consequently not *immediately* before the Ascension. The argument on page 112, though becoming in consequence less striking, is not materially weakened. — *J. W.*]

ARTICLE V.

Of the Holy Ghost.

THE Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

De Spiritu Sancto.

SPIRITUS Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiæ, majestatis et gloriæ, verus et æternus Deus.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THE subjects of this Article to be treated on are — I. The Divinity; II. The Personality; III. The Procession, of the Holy Ghost.

Those early heretics who denied the Divinity of the Son of God, seem generally to have disbelieved the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and to have looked on Him not as a Person, but as an efficacy, power, or emanation from God.

This heresy appears to have been as early as Simon Magus himself, and his immediate followers, the Gnostics. The like opinion would, of course, naturally prevail among those speculators who afterwards acquired the name of Sabellians, such as Praxeas, Noetus, Sabellius, Beryllus, Paulus Samosatenus.¹

The Arians, on the contrary, appear to have taught that the Spirit was a separate Person from the Father and the Son, but that He was, as they held the Son to be, but a creature. Nay, as they held the Son to be a creature created by the Father, so they are said to have taught that the Spirit was created by the Son, and hence called Him *κτίσμα κτίσματος*, the creature of a creature.²

¹ See the account of these heretics, Art. I. § 1.; and the authorities referred to in the notes. See also Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. VIII. p. 322, note. Suicer, II. p. 774.

² Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα κτίσμα κτίσματος φέσθαι εἶναι. Epiphanius. *Her.* LXIX. 56, p. 778, Colon.; Suicer, II. p. 775. A synod

held under Damasus at Rome decreed *εἰ τις εἶποι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποιῆμα ἢ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεγενῆσθαι ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* Apud Theodor. I. v. c. 11. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 316, note. Suicer, as above; and the account given, Art. I. § 1. See also Lardner's *Works*, IV. pp. 113, 114.

Macedonius especially was considered the head of the Pneumatomachi, or impugners of the Divinity of the Spirit, being reckoned among the semi-Arians, orthodox about the person of the Son, but a believer in the creation of the Holy Ghost. He is said to have called the Holy Spirit the servant or minister of God.¹ This heresy of Macedonius was condemned by the second general council held at Constantinople, A. D. 381, which added to the Nicene Creed after the words, "And in the Holy Ghost," the following, viz.: "The Lord, and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets."

Of the fathers, Origen and Lactantius have been charged with unsound doctrines concerning the Holy Ghost.

It is not easy to arrive at a just conclusion concerning the statements of Origen, owing to the fierce disputes which arose concerning them, the obscurity, and the mutilated condition of his writings. He has been accused of questioning whether, as "all things were made by" the Son, so the Holy Spirit may have been included in "all things," and therefore created by the Son. The accusation, however, appears to be unjust, and to have been grounded on some inaccuracy of language and obscurity of reasoning, not on really heretical statements.²

Jerome more than once charges Lactantius with virtually denying the Personality of the Holy Spirit by referring His operation, through a Jewish error, to the Person of the Father or of the Son;³ an heretical belief, which, he says, prevailed among many.

¹ Suicer, II. p. 774.

² The book in which Origen is especially accused of having spoken blasphemy concerning the Spirit of God is the first book of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν (*De Principiis*), ἐν ᾧ πλείστα βλασφημεῖ, τὸν μὲν Υἱὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς πεποιησθαι λέγων, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Photius, *Biblioth.* cod. viij. We have this book only in the translation of Rufinus, who in his prologue to it says that he has omitted parts of the book, which had been foisted into it by heretics, and supplied the omissions from other portions of the genuine works of Origen. Jerome (*Lib. 1. Adv. Rufinum*) accuses Rufinus of having mistranslated Origen, and he himself undertook to give a new translation. All but fragments of the latter are lost. If Rufinus has given at all a fair representation of his author, the following would show that Origen cannot have been very heretical concerning the Holy Ghost: "Ne quis sane existimet nos ex eo quod diximus Spiritum Sanctum solis sanctis præstari, Patris vero et Filii bene-

ficia vel inoperationes pervenire ad bonos et malos, justos et injustos, prætulisse per hoc Patri et Filio Spiritum Sanctum, vel majorem ejus per hoc asserere dignitatem: quod utique valde inconsequens est. Proprietatem namque gratiæ ejus operisque descripsimus. Porro autem nihil in Trinitate majus minusve dicendum est, quum unius Divinitatis Fons Verbo ac Ratione sua teneat universa, Spiritu vero oris sui quæ digna sunt sanctificatione sanctificet, sicut in Psalmo Scriptum est. *Verbo Domini cæli firmati sunt et Spiritu Oris Ejus omnis virtus eorum.*" — Origen. *De Principiis*, Lib. 1. cap. 3, num. 7. Comp. num. 2.

³ "Hoc ideo quia multi per imperitiam Scripturarum, quod et Firmilianus in oratio ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro facit, asserunt Spiritum Sanctum sæpe Patrem sæpe Filium nominari; et cum perspicue in Trinitate credamus, tertiam Personam auferentes non substantiam Ejus esse volunt, sed nomen." — Hieron. *In Epist. ad Galatas*, cap. iv. Tom. iv. part 1. p. 268. See also Lardner, iv. p. 60.

One of the strange forms which heresy is said to have assumed was that which is attributed to Montanus, namely, that he gave himself out to be the Paraclete, *i. e.* the Spirit of God. Nay, it is even said that he had his disciples baptized in his own name, as the third Person of the blessed Trinity;¹ though it appears to be doubtful whether Montanus really meant that he was an incarnation of the Spirit, or only that the Spirit dwelt more fully in him than in any former man.² Indeed, to some it appears that the Montanists were in their creed Sabellians, and that they thought that the Spirit which animated Montanus was but an emanation from God.³

A denial of the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and a belief that He was but an influence or energy, seem to have been general in later times with the Socinians, and may be considered as a necessary consequence of a denial of the doctrine of the Trinity in general.

But the most celebrated controversy which has ever arisen concerning the Holy Ghost was that which had reference to His Procession, and which led to the famous schism between the Eastern and Western churches.

The Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) had inserted in the Creed of the Council of Nice (A. D. 325) the words "proceeding from the Father" (τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον); and the Council of Ephesus (A. D. 431) had decreed that no addition should be made to that creed thenceforth. Accordingly, the Greek fathers uniformly declared their belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father.

The Latin Fathers, on the other hand, having regard to those passages of Scripture which speak of the Spirit of Christ, and of the Spirit as sent by the Son, continually spoke of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son.⁴ The Greek fathers, indeed, were willing to use language approximating to the words of

¹ See Bingham, *E. A.* Book XI. ch. III. § 7.

² Mosheim, Cent. II. pt. II. ch. v. § 23; also, *De Rebus ante Constantinum M. Sec.* I. § 67; Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 2d Edit. p. 22; Lardner's *Heretics*, Book II. ch. 19.

Manes, Mohammed, and others beside them, have professed to be the Paraclete promised by Christ to His disciples. Whether by the Paraclete they meant the Holy Ghost is questionable.

³ See Bingham, as above.

⁴ " Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum pro-

cedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio." — Ambros. *De Sp. S.* c. x. " Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur." — August. *De Trin.* Lib. IV. cap. 20. See Pearson, p. 324, note. St. Augustine, more clearly and fully than any before him, asserted the procession from the Son. Hence the modern Greeks charge him with having invented it. See Waterland, *Works*, IV. p. 246. Oxf. 1823.

the Latin Fathers, but shrink from directly asserting the procession from the Son. Thus they spoke of the Holy Ghost as "the Spirit of Christ, proceeding from the Father, and receiving of the Son."¹ And it has been inferred that many of the earlier Greek writers held, as did the Latins, a real procession from both the Father and the Son, although they were not willing to express themselves otherwise than in the words of the Creed.

Theodoret, in the fifth century, appears to have been the first of the Greeks who brought the question out into bold relief; for, taking offence at some expressions of Cyril, who speaking of the Spirit had used the words ἴδιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, he declares, that, if by such an expression he meant "that the Spirit derived His Being either from or through the Son, then the saying was to be rejected as blasphemous and profane; for we believe the Lord when He saith, 'the Spirit which proceedeth from the Father,' and we believe St. Paul in like manner saying, 'we have not received the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.'"² St. Cyril, not directly replying to Theodoret, at least not entering fully upon the doctrine of the Procession, there appears to have been little controversy about it in the East, until attention was roused to the subject by the conduct of some portions of the Western Church. The question having been for some time discussed, whether or not the Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, the Churches of France and Spain not only asserted such to be the case, but actually added to the Creed of Constantinople the words *Filioque* ("and the Son"), and so chanted the Creed in their Liturgies with the clause *Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem*.³ In the early part of the ninth century Pope Leo III. was appealed to, and decreed in a Synod held at Aquisgranum, that no

¹ Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, Πνεῦμα Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λάμβανον. Eriphan. *Hæres.* LXXIX. Tom. I. p. 788. Colon. 1682. See Suicer, i. 1070; Pearson, p. 324, note. Similar or stronger language used on this subject may be seen in the following: Εἰ τοίνυν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, φησι ὁ Κύριος, λήφεται, ὅν τρόπον οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ· οὕτως τολμῶσι λέγειν (κ. τολμῶ συλλέγειν) οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐξ οὗ λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐξ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται. Eriphan. *Hæres.* LXXIV. 10, Tom. I. p. 898. Colon. — ζωὴ δὲ ὅλος ὁ Θεὸς, οὐκ οὖν ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς ὁ Υἱὸς, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πνεύματος. *Hæres.* LXXIV. 7, Tom. I. p. 895.

² Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 325, note. Suicer, i. 1070.

³ In very early Latin Councils this addition of the *Filioque* is made: as in the first Council of Bracara, A. D. 411, and in the third Council of Toledo, A. D. 589, where the Constantinopolitan Creed is recited. (Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iv. § 16.) The Council of Toledo was that which first ordered the Constantinopolitan Creed to be used in the Liturgy of the Spanish Church. (Bingham, *ibid.* § 7.) With regard to the insertion of the words *Filioque* in the Confession of the Council of Bracara, it now appears that they are not genuine, but foisted into it in later times. See Waterland, *Hist. of Athan. Creed*, Works, iv. p. 133, note.

such addition ought to be made to the creeds of the Church. Nay, so important did he deem a strict adherence to the symbols in their original form, that he caused the Constantinopolitan Creed, in the very words in which it had been penned at the council, to be graven on silver plates, both in Latin and Greek, and so to be publicly set forth in the Church.¹

Afterwards, however, Pope Nicolas the First had a violent controversy with Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. Ignatius, who had been deposed from that see, and succeeded by Photius, appealed to Pope Nicolas, who took the part of Ignatius, and excommunicated Photius; who in his turn assembled a council at Constantinople, in 866, and excommunicated Nicolas. Subsequently Ignatius having been recalled by Basilus the Macedonian, and Photius degraded, a council was held at Constantinople (A. D. 869), which is called by the Latins the eighth Œcumenical Council, in which the controversies between the Eastern and Western Churches were hushed for the time. Among the subjects which had been introduced into this unhappy discussion, the most prominent was the question concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost; Photius charging the Latins with having adulterated the Creed of Constantinople by the addition of *Filioque*, and the Latins vigorously defending themselves concerning this and other charges.²

On the death of Ignatius, A. D. 878, Photius was again restored to the patriarchal see, when John the Eighth was Bishop of Rome. On his accession he again renewed the controversies with the West; and in a council held at Constantinople, A. D. 879 (owned by the Greeks as the eighth Œcumenical), it was declared that the addition of *Filioque* should be taken away. Leo the Philosopher afterwards again deposed Photius, and confined him in an Armenian convent, where he died in the year 891.³

The contest between the Churches, now suspended for a time, was revived in the year 1053, by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople. Between him and Leo IX., Bishop of Rome, a violent contest arose, both on the subject of their respective jurisdictions and concerning the doctrines in dispute between the two great branches of the Church. Cerularius wrote, in his own name and that of Leo Bishop of Achrida, a strong letter to John Bishop of Trani in Apulia, charging the Latins with various errors. Leo

¹ Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 325; Mosheim, Cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. iii. § 18.

² The famous Ratramn, whose book on the Eucharist exercised so important an influence on the English Reformation,

was a principal champion of the Latins in this dispute.

³ Mosheim, Cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. iii. §§ 27-32; Pearson, as above.

therefore summoned a Council at Rome, and excommunicated the Greek Churches. Constantine Monomachus, the emperor, in vain strove to quench the flame of discord; and though legates were sent from Rome to Constantinople, instead of endeavouring to allay the strife, they solemnly excommunicated Cerularius, Leo of Achrida, and their adherents, who, in their turn, in a public council excommunicated them.¹ Thus arose the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, which has never since been healed.

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE first I. and second II. heads of this Article concern the Divinity and the Personality of the Holy Ghost.

Both these were treated under the First Article, and it is not necessary to repeat the arguments here. It may be enough to add that among the strongest passages of Scripture in proof of these doctrines will be found the following:—

Divinity. Matt. xii. 32. Acts v. 3, 4. 1 Cor. iii. 16; compare 1 Cor. vi. 19.

Personality. Matt. xii. 32; xxviii. 19. John xiv. 16, 26; xvi. 8, 13. Acts v. 3, 4. Rom. viii. 26. 1 Cor. xii. 11. Eph. iv. 30. 1 John v. 7.

III. The third division of the subject is concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost; the Article, after the Latin versions of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Creed of St. Athanasius, asserting that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.

The distinction between the three Persons in the Godhead was set forth in treating on the First Article. The relation of God the Son to God the Father, how that from all eternity God the Son derived His being from God the Father, by a proper but ineffable generation, was set forth in the FIRST part of the Second Article.

Now, whereas it is certain that the Scriptures ever speak of the Second Person of the Trinity as the Son of God, and as *begotten* of the Father, so it is equally certain that they speak of the Spirit as *coming* forth or *proceeding* from the Father, but never as *begotten* of Him. The early Christians, observing this distinc-

¹ Mosheim, Cent. XI. pt. II. ch. III. §§ 9–11.

tion, cautiously adhering to the language of inspiration, and striving to imbibe the notions conveyed by it, ever taught that it was peculiar to the Father to be underived and unbegotten; to the Son, to be begotten; to the Holy Ghost, to be proceeding.¹

1. That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father scarcely needs to be proved.

In Matt. x. 20, He is called “the Spirit of the Father.” In Rom. viii. 11, He is called “the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead.” In John xiv. 26, “the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost,” is promised, as to be sent “by the Father in Christ’s name.” In John xv. 26, we read of the “Comforter . . . even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father.” Compare also Matt. iii. 16. Acts v. 9. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, 14; iii. 16; vi. 19, &c. Accordingly, there never has been any doubt, among those who admit the doctrine of the Trinity, that as the Son is begotten of the Father, so the Spirit proceeds from the Father.

2. But though the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father is thus unquestionable, it has been seen, that the Greeks doubted the propriety of saying that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father. They doubted it, as it seems, merely because in John xv. 26, it is said “that the Spirit of truth proceedeth from the Father,” and there is no passage of Scripture, which, in the same express terms, says that the Spirit proceedeth from the Son.

Yet if we except this one expression of John xv. 26, every other expression whatsoever, from which we infer that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, is used in like manner concerning His relation to the Son. For example:—

(1) Is He called “the Spirit of God,” “the Spirit of the Father,” “the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus?” In like manner He is called “the Spirit of Christ,” “the Spirit of the Son,” “the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” Thus we read, Rom. viii. 9, “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ;” where it is evident the Apostle means the Holy Spirit of God spoken of in the preceding sentence. Gal. iv. 6, “God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son.” Phil. i. 19, “The supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” 1 Pet. i. 11, “The Spirit of Christ,” which was in the prophets.

And so surely is this the case, that the Greeks themselves were even willing to call the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Son; confessing that “He proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit of

¹ Ἴδιον Πατρὸς μὲν ἢ ὑγεννησίᾳ, Υἱοῦ δὲ Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxiiii. Tom. i. p. 422
γέννησις, Πνεύματος δὲ ἢ ἔκπεμψις. — Colon. Suicer, i. p. 1069.

the Son." And hence many of our divines, and even divines of the Church of Rome, have concluded that their difference on this point from the Western Church was but *in modo loquendi*, in manner of speech, not in fundamental truth.¹

(2) But, again, do we infer that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, because He is sent by the Father, and is breathed forth into the prophets by the Father? Still, in like manner, we read that the same Spirit is sent by the Son, and was by Him breathed upon His Apostles. Thus He says Himself, John xv. 26, "The Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father." John xvi. 7, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." And in John xx. 22, after He had risen from the dead, "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

Now, our principal reasons for concluding that the Spirit of God proceeds from God the Father are these: namely, that He is called the Spirit of the Father; that as the Father sends the Son, who is begotten of Him, so He sends the Spirit; and that He sends Him especially in that manner which in Scripture is called inspiring or breathing forth. From all this we conclude that, like as the Son is begotten, so the Spirit proceedeth of the Father. Yet the Scriptures set forth the relation of the Spirit to the Son, in all these respects, in the very same language in which they set forth the relation of the Spirit to the Father. Hence we conclude, that, as the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so He proceeds from the Son.² And though we may question the wisdom of adding the words *Filioque* to a Creed drawn up by a General Council, without

¹ Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, p. 19 (Oxf. 1839), Sect. 9, who quotes Damascene (Lib. i. *Fid. Orth.* c. 11) as saying, "Non ex Filio, sed Spiritum Filii esse dicimus."

² "Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat: neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video quid aliud significare voluerit, cum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum*. Neque enim flatus ille corporeus, cum sensu corporaliter tangendi procedens ex corpore, substantia Spiritus Sancti fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum," &c. — August. *De Trinitate*, Lib. iv. cap. xx. Tom. viii. p. 829. "De utroque autem procedere sic docetur, quia ipse Filius ait, *De Patre procedit*. Et cum resurrexit a mortuis et apparuisset

discipulis suis, insufflavit et ait, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum*, ut Eum etiam de Se procedere ostenderet. Et ipsa est *Virtus quæ de Illo exibat*, sicut legitur in Evangelio, et sanabat omnes." — Ibid. Lib. xv. cap. xxvi. p. 998. See also, *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xi. c. xxiv. Tom. vii. p. 290; where S. Augustine, showing that the Holy Spirit is a *Person*, doubts if He can be called the *goodness* of the Father and the Son; but observing that the Father is a Spirit and holy, and the Son is a Spirit and holy, and yet the Third Person of the Trinity is called the *Holy Spirit* of the Father and of the Son, he supposes that that Third Person may be called the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son, and the Holiness both of the Father and of the Son, but yet a substantial Holiness, consubstantial with both.

the authority of a General Council; we yet do not question the truth of the doctrine conveyed by these words, and which, we believe, was implicitly held by the divines of the Eastern Church, though they shrank from explicit exposition of it in terms.¹

¹ The great objection which the Eastern Church makes to the *Filioque*, is, that it implies the existence of two ἀρχαὶ in the Godhead: and, if we believe in δύο ἀναρχοί, we, in effect, believe in two Gods. The unity of the Godhead can only be maintained by acknowledging the Father to be the sole Ἀρχὴ or Πηγὴ ἐτεσῆτος, who from all eternity has communicated His own Godhead to His eternal and consubstantial Son and Spirit. This reasoning is generally true. But, as the doctrine of the Procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son presupposes the eternal Generation of the Son from the Father, it does not follow that that doctrine impugns the Catholic belief in the Μία Ἀρχή.