

ARTICLE I

*De Fide in Sacrosanctam
Trinitatem.*

Unus est vivus et verus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensæ potentæ, sapientiæ, ac bonitatis: Creator et conservator omnium tum visibilium tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinæ naturæ tres sunt Personæ, ejusdem essentiæ, potentæ, ac æternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

*Of Faith in the Holy
Trinity.*

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

THIS first Article has remained without any alteration since the publication of the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI. in 1553, in which series it occupied the same position as it does in our own set. Its language may be traced ultimately to the Confession of Augsburg,¹ the terms of which on this subject were adopted almost verbatim in the Thirteen Articles of 1538, agreed upon by a joint-committee of Anglican and Lutheran Divines. The same language re-appears also in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, cap. 2.

¹ Art. 1. "*De Deo.*—Ecclesiæ magno consensu apud nos docent decretum Nicenæ Synodi, de unitate essentiæ, et de tribus personis, verum et sine ulla dubitatione credendum esse. Videlicet, quod sit una essentia divina, quæ appellatur et est *Deus æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensa potentia, sapientia, bonitate, Creator et Conservator omnium rerum visibilium et invisibilium, et tamen tres sint personæ ejusdem essentiæ et potentæ, et coeternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus*: et nomine personæ utuntur ea significatione qui usi sunt in hac causa scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit." The words in italics are repeated almost verbatim in our own article.

The need of such an Article as this is shown by the formidable spread of Anabaptism in this country as well as on the Continent. Contemporary documents show how very many of the Anabaptists had lost all faith in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Some were reviving the Sabellian heresy, and denying that there was more than one Person in the Godhead; others were teaching a form of Arianism, denying the Divinity of the Second Person, while others again maintained that Christ was "a mere man."¹

The Article falls into two main divisions. The first part treats of the existence of God, and the "necessary"² doctrine of the divine unity. The second speaks of the mode of God's existence, and the distinctions within the divine nature.

The statement in the first part, that **there is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible**, expresses a belief which is not peculiar to Christianity, but is common to both natural and revealed religion, and is held by every serious Theist, as well as every believer in the Christian revelation. It is not therefore a doctrine

¹ The reality of the danger and the character of the heresies prevalent is shown by the closing words of the Article in the Confession of Augsburg: "*Damnant omnes hæreses, contra hunc Articulum exortas, ut Manichæos, qui duo principia ponebant, bonum et malum. Item Valentinianos, Arianos, Eunomianos, Mahometistas, et omnes horum similes. Damnant et Samosatenos, veteres et neotericos, qui, cum tantum unam personam esse contendant, de verbo et de Spiritu Sancto astute et impie rhetoricantur, quod non sint personæ distinctæ, sed quod Verbum significet verbum vocale, et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum.*"

² By saying that the unity of God is "necessary" it is meant that the contrary is inconceivable. "Two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings than one is a clear contradiction."—Pearson *On the Creed*, Article 1, ch. ii. § 13.

for which "Scripture proof" will be sought. The existence and unity of God is assumed and taken for granted throughout Scripture. Indeed, Scripture will have no force or weight to anyone who has not first on other grounds accepted this truth. Thus the consideration of the several "proofs" of God's existence belongs to the study of "evidences," and would be out of place in a commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles. It is therefore not considered necessary to enter into it here, but the reader will find in the foot-note reference to a few recent works in which the whole subject is discussed.¹

The second part of the Article, **And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost**, states in the briefest possible terms the great truth taught us by Revelation concerning the nature of God, the acceptance of which distinguishes Christianity from Judaism, Mohammedanism, Unitarianism, and all other forms of religious belief.

The subject will be best considered under the following heads:—

1. The grounds on which the doctrine is accepted.
2. The history of the doctrine in the Church, and the growth of technical phraseology in connection with it.
3. The explanation of the doctrine.

I. *The Grounds on which the Doctrine is accepted.*

Our belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity rests entirely on the revelation made by God in Holy Scripture.

¹ Flint's *Theism and Anti-Theistic Theories*. Bishop Ellicott's *Being of God*. See also Mozley's *Essays, Historical and Theological*, vol. ii.; *Essays on The Argument of Design and The Principle of Causation*; and Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iv.

Intimations that distinctions of some sort exist in the divine nature may be discerned in the Old Testament, but the proof of the doctrine can only be sought in the teaching of the Gospels. Without a direct revelation from God man could never by his reason have discovered that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, but when once this is disclosed man can see that it is not merely not contrary to reason, but rather that it satisfies the demands of his reason, and fits in with his deepest thoughts on the nature of God. Though "not discoverable by reason," it is yet "agreeable to reason."¹

(a) *The preparation for the revelation of the mystery under the Old Covenant.*—To guard the truth of the unity of God, and to bear a never-failing witness to it in the midst of idolatry and polytheism, was the special function of the Jewish Church. "Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut. vi. 4) forms the central declaration of the Old Covenant, standing to it in much the same relation that the command to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost stands in to the Christian Church. It is, therefore, not to be expected that the doctrine of *Personal* distinctions within the Godhead will be prominently brought forward in the Old Testament. The unity must first be established and firmly fixed in the minds of God's chosen people before the further revelation can be safely made and the existence of distinct persons within the Godhead be disclosed without fear of leading men to polytheism. And yet throughout the Old Testament the thoughtful reader will from time to time discern the presence of hints, suggestions, and anticipations of the truth subsequently made known in its fulness through the incarnate Son. There are three verses in the early chapters of Genesis in which devout

¹ Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 134.

minds have often found an adumbration of the doctrine of the Trinity, namely, Gen. i. 26, "And God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"; iii. 22, "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as *one of us*, to know good and evil"; xi. 7, "And the Lord said . . . go to, let *us* go down, and there confound their language." So also in Isaiah vi. 8, we read, "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us*." Various interpretations of these passages have been proposed. Some have explained the plural as that used by monarchs in speaking of themselves in decrees, etc., but this explanation is now generally rejected, as not in accordance with Hebrew usage. The majority of modern commentators prefer the view which refers the plural to the angels, as if God announced to them His resolve to create man. It is, however, difficult to hold this view without supposing that a co-ordinate share in the act of creation is granted to the angels, which is quite inadmissible,¹ and it is by no means clear that the patristic interpretation of these passages which sees in them an adumbration of the doctrine of the Trinity is incorrect. Again, the believer, who reads the Old Testament in the light of the New, may well see a foreshadowing of the doctrine in the threefold repetition of the divine name in Aaron's blessing, Num. vi. 24-26, "The LORD bless thee and keep thee; the LORD make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the LORD lift up His countenance upon thee and give thee peace"; as well as in the song of the seraphim in Isaiah vi. 3, "Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of Hosts"—an utterance which has become the "Tersanctus" of the Christian Church (cf. Rev. iv. 8).²

¹ See, however, Spurrell's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis*, p. 14.

² Cf. the thrice-repeated refrain in Ps. xcix. 3, 5, 9, which is really an echo of the song of the seraphim. "Holy is He . . . Holy is He . . . Holy is the Lord our God." See the R.V. Nothing is said in the

All these passages, however, though they may appeal forcibly to those who have already accepted the doctrine can scarcely serve for proof of the doctrine to the unbeliever. For purposes of controversy no high value can be attached to them. The real line of preparation for the disclosure of the mystery must be sought elsewhere. It will be found in a study of those passages in which God is spoken of in His covenant relation to man, acting upon him, and revealing Himself to him, in a twofold manner.

There is first that which may be called the "external" manifestation, by means of the messenger or "angel of the LORD," who speaks now as God, and now as one sent by God, so that the angel is in part identified with Jehovah, and in part distinguished from Him. Thus we read that "the LORD appeared" to Abraham, and "lo, three men stood over against him." Then follows the account of the manifestation, and then we read that "the men turned from thence, and went towards Sodom; and Abraham stood yet before the LORD . . . And the LORD went His way, as soon as He had left communing with Abraham: and Abraham returned to his place. And the two angels came to Sodom" (Gen. xviii. 1; xix. 1). Plainly, then, one of the three was a more exalted Being than "the two angels," and represented "the LORD." Again in Joshua v. 14, a mysterious being

text of the name *Elohim*, a plural form in which some would see a reference to the doctrine, because it is now generally agreed that it is simply the plural of majesty or intensity. It has been truly pointed out that "those who adduce it as an anticipation of the doctrine of the Trinity appear to forget that this use of the plural *does not stand alone* in Hebrew; the words אֱלֹהִים and בָּרַעַל meaning *lord, master*, are often used in the plural with reference to a single human superior (e.g. Ex. xxi. 4, 6, 8, 29); and Isaiah (xix. 4) describes the conqueror of Egypt as אֱלֹהֵי קֵשֶׁת, where the adjective is singular, but the substantive is plural."—S. R. Driver, in the *Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. iii. p. 42.

appears to Joshua, and announces himself as "Captain of the LORD's host," and immediately afterwards we read of Him as "the LORD"; for "the LORD said to Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, etc." (See also Gen. xvi. 7 *seq.*; xxii. 11, 14; xxiv. 7, 40; xxxi. 11-13; Ex. iii. 2 *seq.*; xiii. 21; xiv. 19; xxxii., xxxiii.) There is no need to consider here the oft-discussed question which of the two views of the "Angel of the LORD" is correct—(1) That which has the support of most of the Greek Fathers, from Justin Martyr onwards, and of some of the Latins, namely, that the angel is actually the Logos, or Second Person of the Holy Trinity, thus manifesting Himself before the Incarnation; or (2) that which was advocated by St. Augustine, and is adopted by most moderns, namely, that he is a created angel, acting as the direct representative of Jehovah. In either case God's presence is specially manifested through him, and thus there is a real preparation for the revelation of God in Christ, and the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.¹ In this connection reference must also be made to those numerous passages from which the Jews of Palestine constructed their doctrine of the Logos, the Word, or "Memra," which represents the personal action of God, and which is found in the Targums in many places where the communion of God and man has to be expressed. For instance, in the oldest Targum, that of Onkelos, Adam is represented as hearing the voice of the *word* of the Lord in the garden (Gen. iii. 8); the Lord protects Noah by His *word* when he enters the ark (vii. 16), and at Sinai, Moses brings forth the people to meet the *word* of God (Ex. xix. 17). In all such passages we can see that "the Palestinian instinct seized upon the concrete idea of "the word

¹ On the "Angel of the Lord," see Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 188 *seq.*, and Medd's *Bampton Lectures*, Note vii. p. 426.

of God,' as representing His personal action, and unconsciously prepared the way for a gospel of the Incarnation.¹"

But, further, there was, under the Old Covenant, yet another mode in which God disclosed Himself to man, through what may be termed an "internal" revelation. God is frequently spoken of as acting or working *in* man by means of His Spirit, a power proceeding from Him, not yet revealed as a distinct person, though in some passages there is an approximation to this, which must have led men's minds in the direction of the revelation afterwards made. Thus, throughout the Old Testament, the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Jehovah, is represented as the principle of the life of man's soul, and every natural and intellectual gift in man is traced back to it. (See Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4; Gen. xli. 38; Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31.) It is the Spirit which is the source of inspiration (Numb. xi. 25; Isa. lxi. 1), and the principle of sanctification (Ps. li. 10-12, cxliii. 10). Even the special title given to the Third Person of the blessed Trinity under the New Dispensation is prepared for under the Old Covenant, for in two passages the Spirit of God is spoken of under the name of God's Holy Spirit.

"Cast me not away from Thy presence, and take not *Thy holy Spirit* (LXX. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν σου) from me" (Ps. li. 11). "But they rebelled, and grieved *His holy Spirit* (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ): therefore He was turned to be their enemy, and Himself fought against them. Then He remembered the days of old, Moses, and His people, saying, Where is He that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of His flock? where is He that put *His holy Spirit* (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) in the midst of them" (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11).²

¹ Westcott on *S. John*, p. xvii.

² Outside the canonical books the title occurs again in *Wisdom ix. 17*.

Thus, although it would be an error to read the complete doctrine of the New Testament into the Old, yet it is undeniable that the way was prepared for it under the Old Covenant, and that the teaching of Holy Scripture on the Angel of the Lord and God's Holy Spirit foreshadows distinctions within the Godhead, which were subsequently revealed as *Personal*.

(b) *The revelation of the mystery in the New Testament.*

—When we pass from the Old Testament to the New we find that we no longer have to content ourselves with faint adumbrations of the doctrine, but that it is clearly indicated that the distinctions within the Godhead are personal. And yet, as it has been truly said, “there is no moment when Jesus Christ expressly reveals this doctrine. It was overheard rather than heard. It was simply that in the gradual process of intercourse with Him, His disciples came to recognise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as included in their deepening and enlarging thought of God.”¹ Almost the earliest intimation was that made at our Lord's baptism, when there came from heaven the voice of the *Father*, testifying to the beloved *Son*, upon whom *the Spirit* descended like a dove (S. Matt. iii. 13–17). And from this time onwards we can trace the gradual disclosure of the truth throughout our Lord's teaching. All through His ministry He taught His disciples to regard His relation to His heavenly Father as unique, showing that His Sonship was something peculiar, different from the sonship which they themselves could claim. His language implied that, though personally distinct from the Father, He was yet one with Him, and so Himself divine. So with increasing clearness,

“And Thy counsel who hath known, except Thou give wisdom, and send Thy Holy Spirit from above.” See also Wisdom i. 5 and Eccles. xlvi. 12, where Codex A reads, Ἐλίσαιε ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου.

¹ Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 131.

towards the close of His ministry, He spoke much of the Holy Spirit, and in terms which can only be satisfied if the Spirit be a divine Person. This is seen above all in the discourses spoken in the upper chamber on the eve of the Passion (S. John xiii.–xvi.), where the fullest revelation of the Person and work of the Spirit is given. And, finally, the doctrine is summed up and handed on to the Church in the great commission given after the resurrection, “Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost” (S. Matt. xxviii. 19). The passage forms the central declaration,¹ and contains our Lord's complete revelation of the doctrine. The first two titles, the *Father* and the *Son*, are plainly personal titles; they speak of a personal relation, and would be misleading did they not imply that those to whom they are applied are personally distinct. And if the first two titles are personal, it will be felt that the third must be personal too.² Again, it is inconceivable that any but divine titles could be so joined with the title of the everlasting Father, while the fact that baptism is into the *name*, not *names*, implies the unity of the Three. Thus in this text are involved these three great truths—(1) The unity of God, (2) the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and (3) their distinct personality; and these three truths go to make up the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

It is impossible to give an adequate summary of the

¹ The removal of 1 John v. 7 from the Revised Version makes it unnecessary to refer further to this text, the spuriousness of which is now almost universally acknowledged.

² The force of this will be easily estimated by substituting the name of an *attribute* of God for one or other of the words used by our Lord. It is inconceivable that we should be bidden to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the *providence* of God. A *personal* title is a necessity.

scriptural evidence for the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit without anticipating what properly belongs to the commentary on Articles II. and V. It will, therefore, not be attempted here. Nor does it seem necessary to prove that the apostles were not Tritheists. The unity of God is assumed throughout the New, as throughout the Old Testament.¹ All, therefore, that it will be needful to do in this place is to indicate various passages where the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned together as personal agents, performing distinct offices, leaving the reader to gather the full scriptural proof of the doctrine from what is said later on concerning the Second and Third Persons of the Holy Trinity.

Reference has already been made to S. Matt. iii. 13-17; xxviii. 19, and the discourses in S. John xiii.-xvi. Besides these, attention should be drawn to the closing benediction of 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." Such language seems quite inconsistent with any belief save that which the Church has always held. Again, S. Paul writes to the Romans: "I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me" (Rom. xv. 30). To the Ephesians he declares: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv. 4). Passages such as these—and they might easily be multiplied to a great extent—are sufficient to show not merely that there are distinctions of some sort in the divine nature, but that

¹ See S. Mark xii. 32; 1 Cor. viii. 4; Gal. iii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; S. James ii. 19; S. Jude, 4, 25.

these distinctions are personal. The Spirit whose "love" and "communion" and "fellowship" are spoken of can only be a person; and of none but *divine* Persons could the language just cited be used. It finds its only adequate explanation in the belief that "in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

To conclude this part of our subject. The witness of Scripture to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity has never perhaps been better summed up in a short compass than in the opening words of the prayer with which St. Augustine concludes his great treatise "On the Trinity." "O Lord our God, we believe in Thee, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. For the truth would not say, 'Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' unless Thou wast a Trinity. Nor wouldest Thou, O Lord God, bid us be baptized in the name of Him who is not the Lord God. Nor would the divine voice have said, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,' unless Thou wert so a Trinity as to be one Lord God. And if Thou, O God, wert Thyself the Father, and wert Thyself the Son, Thy Word, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit your gift, we should not read in the book of truth, 'God sent His Son'; nor wouldest Thou, O only-begotten Son, say of the Holy Spirit, 'Whom the Father will send in My name'; and 'whom I will send to you from the Father.'"¹

(c) *The doctrine agreeable to reason.*—The doctrine of the Holy Trinity must always be based on the teaching of Holy Scripture. The only questions we are at liberty to ask relate to the evidence for the

¹ S. Aug. *De Trinitate*, bk. xv. ch. xxviii.

revelation. If it is clear that the doctrine is contained in Holy Scripture, and that the Holy Scripture is a revelation from God, then the doctrine must be received, not as "reasonable" nor as "unreasonable," but simply as scriptural. It is only from what God has disclosed to us of Himself and His eternal Being that we are entitled to affirm the existence of personal distinctions within the divine nature. But, still, when once the doctrine has been revealed it can be shown to be "agreeable to reason," and to harmonise with and throw fresh light upon man's deepest thoughts of God. Our whole conception of God is an unworthy and impoverished one unless we regard Him as in His essence love. But if He be indeed essentially and eternally love, it would seem to follow of necessity that there must be a plurality within the Godhead. Love requires an object on which to spend itself. It is only conceivable as "a personal relationship of a lover and a loved"; and unless God only *became* love when His creative work was begun, He must have found within His divine Being one toward whom His love could eternally flow forth. And that which reason is thus seen to demand is supplied in the Christian doctrine of "the Word" which "was in the beginning with God," and which "was God." In the only-begotten Son, who is revealed to us as from all eternity "in the bosom of the Father," is found the eternal object of the divine love.

Whether we can go further than this, and say that reason suggests that there are more than two Persons within the Godhead may be doubtful. It has appeared indeed to many thoughtful minds that certain considerations almost necessitate a Trinity. It has been pointed out that our own personality is necessarily triune, and that if we are to think of God as personal, we must regard Him as possessing in transcendent perfection

the same attributes which are imperfectly possessed by man, and as therefore triune.¹ Again, where there is a subject and an object there must be that which unites them. So some have felt that reason points not only to the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son, but to the Eternal Spirit, the bond of love that unites them. But there is no need to press such considerations as these. They will probably never appeal forcibly to any but the few who are philosophically trained. Without laying stress on them we may well be content to find that reason is so far in harmony with revelation as to suggest that at least there are personal distinctions of some sort within the Godhead, and that our God is no "monotonous unity," no "lonely" God, but one who is eternal love.²

II. *The History of the Doctrine in the Church and the growth of Technical Phraseology in connection with it.*

When we pass from Holy Scripture to the writers of the early Christian Church we find ample proof that from the very first the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was held and believed, although the belief was what may be called an *implicit* and informal one. The Church was content to believe without defining. Nor did she at first feel the need of technical phraseology, or terms to express with accuracy the relation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the exact character of the unity. In the earliest days, therefore, we hear nothing of such terms as "Trinity," "Three Persons," or "One Substance." But still we can clearly see not only that the faith of the Church was monotheistic, but also that the Son and Holy Spirit were believed in as God, and yet were

¹ Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 74.

² See on the whole subject Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 67 *seq.* and Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 134 *seq.*

not confused with or merged in the Person of the Father. Thus Clement of Rome, the earliest of the Fathers, writing before the close of the first century, says: "As God liveth and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Ghost, who are the faith and hope of the elect."¹ The language of Ignatius more especially on the Divinity of the Christ is most emphatic,² while in some passages of his epistles the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned together in such a way as to show that Ignatius recognised real distinctions within the Godhead.³

During the latter half of the second century the language of the Fathers begins to be somewhat more precise and formal,⁴ and recognised terms now make their appearance. The word Trinity is the earliest. The

¹ Clem. Rom., *Ad Cor.* i. ch. lviii.; cf. ch. xlvi., "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that is shed forth upon us?"

² *E.g.*, "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto her that hath found mercy in the bountifulness of the Father most high, and of Jesus Christ His only Son; to the Church that is beloved and enlightened through the will of Him who willed all things that are, by faith and love towards Jesus Christ our God." *Ad Rom.* ch. i.; cf. ch. vi., "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God."

³ Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* ch. ix., "Ye are stones of a temple, which were prepared beforehand for a building of God the Father, being hoisted up to the heights through the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, and using for a rope the Holy Spirit." *Ad Magnes.* ch. xiii., "Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and of the Apostles, that ye may prosper in all things whatsoever ye do in flesh and spirit, by faith and by love, in the Son and Father and in the Spirit."

⁴ Nothing is said in the text of the well-known passage in Justin Martyr's first Apology (ch. vi.) in which he appears to include the angels as objects of the Christian's worship, placing them *before* the Holy Ghost, because there is evidently some error connected with it; cf. Otto's note, *in loc.* As Professor Swete observes: "Certainly no writer, catholic or heretical, would have intentionally represented the Holy Spirit as *inferior* to angels; so that the passage, if pressed against S. Justin's orthodoxy, proves too much."—*Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost*, p. 17.

Greek *Τριάς* is found for the first time in the works of Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 180), who speaks of the first three days of creation as "Types of the Trinity, of God, and of His word, and of His wisdom."¹ The Latin word *Trinitas* occurs a few years later in the writings of Tertullian, himself the first *Latin* writer of the Church,² and from his days onwards it is used as a well-known term.³

Athenagoras, one of the Greek apologists who wrote about 176, uses language which shows that the relation of the three Persons of the Godhead was beginning to attract attention. "Who would not marvel to hear men call us atheists, although we speak of God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and set forth at once their power in unity (*τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν*), and their distinction in order" (*τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν*).⁴ But it was not till the rise of false teaching forced the orthodox to say what they meant by their belief that the terms Person and Substance came into use. During the last quarter of the second century two formidable heresies arose, in meeting which the Church was compelled to enlarge her vocabulary, and make use of more precise and definite language with regard to the Godhead than she had hitherto done. When Theodotus and Artemon⁵ taught that Christ was "a mere man" (*ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον*), it became necessary to bring into even greater

¹ *Ad Autolyicum.* ii. sec. 15, *τύποι τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ.*

² *Adv. Praxeam*, ch. iii.

³ So S. Cyprian speaks of the Jews as having observed three hours of prayer, "Sacramento Trinitatis."—*De Dom. Orat.* ch. 34.

⁴ *Legat.* x.

⁵ On the heresy of the Artemonites, see *Eusebius*, V. ch. xxviii. Artemon taught at Rome at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. He was excommunicated by Pope Zephyrinus (A.D. 198-217).

prominence than before the truth which had been held all along that He is essentially divine. When, on the other hand, Praxeas¹ taught that Christ was *personally* one with the Father, so that it was actually the Father who suffered on the cross in the *character* of the Son, the Church in denying this was compelled to say *what* she held the distinctions within the Godhead to be. The particular form of heresy of which Praxeas appears to have been the originator is sometimes called Patripassianism, from the fact that its advocates asserted that the person of the Father suffered in Christ; and sometimes Sabellianism, from a teacher who refined somewhat on the teaching of Praxeas. Its essential feature consists in the denial that the distinctions in the Godhead are personal, and the assertion that they are merely distinctions of character, phenomenal rather than real.

It is only after the rise of these two heresies that the terms Person and Substance begin to come into prominence. The teaching of Artemon was characterised as a "God-denying apostasy." It was met by a threefold appeal, to Holy Scripture, to the traditional teaching, and to the worship of the Church; and it was shown that the essential Divinity of Christ had been believed in by the Church from the beginning.² But then, as the orthodox thus met the teaching of Artemon, they were confronted with the assertions of the Sabellians, who, accepting the truth of Christ's Divinity, erred in denying His personal distinction from the Father, and charged those who maintained it with Tritheism, or belief in three Gods. To meet this charge it became necessary not only to dwell on the unity, but also to explain of what kind the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was

¹ Our knowledge of Praxeas is chiefly due to Tertullian's work against him. For the character of his teaching see especially ch. i.

² See *Eusebius*, V. xxviii.

held to be. So, in order to defend himself from anything like Tritheism, Tertullian lays down that the Son is of *one substance* (*unius substantiæ*, with the Father.¹ By early Greek Fathers the nature or essence of the Godhead which is communicated to the Son and Holy Spirit from all eternity was expressed by two words—*ousia* (*οὐσία*), and *hypostasis* (*ὑπόστασις*). Some among the Alexandrians especially have employed the former word to denote the "essence" or "substance" of the Godhead, while elsewhere among the Greeks hypostasis was sometimes used with *the same meaning*.² But while the unity was thus established, it was also necessary to define more closely in what the distinctions within the Godhead consist. The Sabellians taught that they were merely distinctions of character. In opposition to this erroneous teaching the Church was driven to enlarge her terminology. She was compelled to explain what she meant by her Creed, and forced to say what was to be understood by her assertion that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were "three." Three *what*? This question was persistently asked, though it is clear that the Church at first shrank from answering, feeling that no one human term was adequate to express exactly what she under-

¹ *Adv Praxeam*, ch. ii.: "Nihilominus custodiatur *οικονομίας* sacramentum, quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, *unius* autem *substantiæ* et *unius* status et *unius* potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur."

² Clement of Alexandria has *οὐσία*, *Strom.* ii. 2, 5; iv. 25, 163; v. 10, 66. Still earlier, Justin Martyr had spoken of the Son as not being separated from the *οὐσία* of the Father, *Dial.* ch. 128. Origen also has *οὐσία*. In *Joann.* x. 21, *De Orat.* 23, and so have the Alexandrian Dionysius, and Alexander. *ὑπόστασις* is used by Dionysius of Rome (*Routh, Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iii. p. 373), as well as by Gregory Thaumaturgus (cf. *Basil, Ep.* 210, 5). It is also the term generally employed by Athanasius himself for "substance," though in one of his earlier works he speaks of "three Hypostases."—See Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 90.

stood the language of Scripture to teach. She would have preferred to remain content with expressing the unity by the neuter of the pronoun, saying that the Father and the Son were *unum*, not *unus*, and the distinction by the masculine; yet Tertullian, in writing against Praxeas, is at last compelled to use the word *Persons, Personæ*.¹ Hippolytus, a little later, uses *πρόσωπα*, its true Greek equivalent.² Origen, however, employing hypostasis in a different sense from that in which it had been generally used by the Church, speaks of there being more hypostases than one in the Godhead,³ thus making it the equivalent of Person, and using it to express the distinction. It will be seen from what has now been said that a door was opened to confusion of thought, the word hypostasis being taken in two different senses, in one of which it expressed an entirely different conception from the Latin *substantia*, its true etymological equivalent. Hence, in the fourth century, two questions arose with regard to *ὑπόστασις*.

(a) Is there one, or are there three in the Godhead?

(b) What is its Latin equivalent?

(a) The use of the word *Ousia* for "Substance" was naturally brought more into prominence by the language formally adopted at Nicæa (325) against the Arian

¹ *Adv Praxeam*, ch. vii.; cf. ch. xii.: "Alium autem quomodo accipere debeas jam professus sum, *personæ*, non *substantiæ*, nomine, ad distinctionem non ad divisionem. Caterum ubique teneam *unam substantiam* in tribus coherentibus, etc."

² *Contra Hæresim Noeti*, ch. vii. xiv.; *Philosoph.* ix. 12.

³ In *Joann.* ii. 6, ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις παιθόμενοι τυγχάνειν. *Contra Celsum*, viii. 12. Cf. Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 163. "The word for Person in Origen is commonly *Hypostasis*, that for the divine nature is less determinate, but is frequently *ousia*." Yet Origen also uses *οὐσία* to express the distinctions: *De Orat.* 15, ἕρεπος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκειμένην ἔστιν ὁ Ἰδιὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, as also did Pierius of Alexandria (see Photius, Codex 119).

heresy, which denied the eternal Divinity of the Son. In the Creed which was there promulgated, it was stated that the Son was "Only-Begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father" (*μονογενῆ τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς*), and again that He is "of one substance with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ*). But in the anathemas appended to the Creed, the use of *ὑπόστασις* as an equivalent for *οὐσία* was recognised, for those were condemned who said that the Son was of "a different substance or essence" from the Father (*ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας*). Consequently, this older use of the word hypostasis for Substance lingered on side by side with the more recent use, in which it was taken as meaning Person. It is obvious that such a double use of a single term might lead to misconception and misunderstanding. Those who took hypostasis as identical in meaning with *ousia*, would charge anyone who spoke of "three Hypostases" with Arianism or Tritheism, and might fairly appeal to the Nicene anathema in support of their views; while, on the other hand, those who were familiar with the use of the word in the sense of Person would regard the assertion that there was but "one Hypostasis" in the Godhead as pure Sabellianism. And this is, in fact, what actually happened. The trouble arose at Antioch in connection with the Meletian schism. And, together with other questions raised by that schism, it was brought before the Council of Alexandria in 362. There the question of terminology was inquired into, and, by the wise moderation of Athanasius, the trouble was set at rest. Both parties stated their views before the Council, and were cross-examined as to the meaning of the terms they employed. The result was, that it was speedily made manifest that both were perfectly orthodox. "One Hypostasis" was not intended to be Sabellian, nor was "three Hypostases" meant to express Arian views. Ac-

cordingly, it was agreed that each party might retain its own usage, since questions of words must not be suffered to divide those who think alike.¹ By this wise decision any danger of a schism on account of the varying terminology was avoided. But still some inconvenience could not but be felt at this double use of the term hypostasis now as "Person," and now as "Substance." This was gradually removed by the general adoption of the phraseology first employed by Origen. *Πρόσωπα* gradually dropped out of use, *ousia* was universally employed to denote the substance, and hypostasis was restricted to mean the distinctions,² and thus in the end all the Greeks united in the formula, *μὰ οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*.³

(b) Meanwhile, in the west, some difficulty had arisen with regard to the word to be used to express the distinctions within the Godhead. *Substantia* was, of course, the true etymological equivalent of hypostasis; and, indeed, hypostasis, in the sense of substance or essence, seems to have been originally adopted by the Greeks as its translation. When, then, the Greek hypostasis had had a new meaning stamped upon it, and was used as equivalent to Person, what were the Latins to do? Were they to alter their terminology as the Greeks had done, or to continue to use the expression which had come down to them with the authority of the earlier Fathers, such as Tertullian? Some few Latin writers, such as Hilary of Poitiers, attempted to assimilate their

¹ See Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, sec. 5 seq., in Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 484.

² Although at Sardica (343), as at Nicæa, *ousia* and *ὑπόστασις* had been treated as identical, yet they are carefully distinguished in the synodal letter sent from Constantinople in 382, which speaks of *ousia* *μὴ . . . ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν, ἤτοι τρισὶ τελείῳσιν προσώποις*.

³ *Οὐσία* signifying *τὴν φύσιν τῆς Θεότητος*, and *ὑποστάσεις* expressing *τὰς τῶν τριῶν ἰδιότητας*.—Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xxi. 46, with which cf. Hooker, V. li. § 1.

terminology to that of the Eastern Church, and spoke of "*tres substantiæ*,"¹ but such language never found favour in the west. It could not safely be used without a great deal of explanation, and to most minds would be immediately suggestive of Arianism. Consequently it soon dropped out of use. It is vehemently rejected by Jerome² and Augustine, the latter of whom speaks as if the phraseology was firmly fixed as *una essentia* or *substantia*, and *tres personæ*, by the time when he wrote his great work on the Trinity (A.D. 416).³ And in the use of these terms the Western Church since then has never varied.

There is no need to pursue the history of the doctrine further. There have, it is true, from time to time been serious controversies within the Church as to its exact meaning, and incautious language has sometimes been used, that was perilously near to Tritheism on the one hand and Sabellianism on the other.⁴ But there has been no change or wavering on the part of the Church

¹ Hilary, *De Synodis*. He is, however, very careful to explain his language. "Idcirco tres substantias esse dixerunt, subsistentium personas per substantias edocentes, non substantiam Patris et Filii diversitate dissimilis essentia separantes."—Vol. ii. p. 480.

² *Ep. ad Damasum*, xv., where he gives an account of the trouble in which he was involved in Syria, because of his refusal to speak of "three Hypostases," a refusal which he bases on the ground that, "in the whole range of secular learning, hypostasis never means anything but essence."

³ S. Aug. *De Trinitate*, V. ix.

⁴ For the later history of the doctrine reference may be made to Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii. p. 209, and vol. iii. p. 327. In the eleventh century the nominalist of Roscellinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while Abelard's teaching drew upon him the charge of Sabellianism. For the controversy in the seventeenth century between Dr. South and Dean Sherlock, in which charges of Sabellianism were again raised, see Perry's *English Church History*, pt. ii. p. 564; and on Waterland's masterly vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity, in opposition to the Arianism of Dr. Clarke and others, see Abbey and Overton's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, ch. viii.

as to the terms to be used in the expression of her faith. We pass therefore to the last subject to be considered in connection with this Article.

III. *The Explanation of the Doctrine.*

In considering what is to be said in explanation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity it must ever be borne in mind that the terms used by the Church, *μία οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, *una substantia tres personæ*, "one substance, three persons," are simply chosen by her in order to express as accurately as possible what she believes to be the real meaning of the statements of the Holy Scripture, in which our Lord revealed all that can be known by man of the divine nature. As we study the language in which our Lord speaks of Himself, and His relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit, it becomes clear that there are two principal dangers to be guarded against—(1) that of *exaggerating* the distinctions and so separating the "Persons," and (2) that of *explaining away* the distinctions, so as ultimately to deny their reality. In other words, we are exposed on the one hand to the danger of 'confounding the Persons,' as the Sabellians did; on the other to that of "dividing the substance," as did the Arians and Socinians of a later day. The sketch given above of the growth of technical phraseology will have shown that the term Persons was only fixed upon to express the doctrine after much hesitation; because it became absolutely necessary, in the face of heresy, to use *some* term to describe what the Church meant by her teaching on "the Three in the Godhead"; and this term, though not altogether satisfactory, came nearer than any other to express what she understood Holy Scripture to teach. The matter is well put by Augustine in the following passage in his work on the Trinity:—

"Many writers in Latin who treat of these things, and are of authority, have said that they could not find any other more suitable way by which to enunciate in words that which they understood without words. For, in truth, as the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father, and that Holy Spirit, who is also called the gift of God, is neither the Father nor the Son, certainly they are three. And so it is said in the plural, 'I and the Father are one.' For He did not say, 'is one,' as the Sabellians say, but 'are one.' Yet, when the question is asked, *what* are the three? human language labours altogether under great poverty of speech. The answer, however, is given, 'three *Persons*,' not that that might be spoken, but lest nothing should be said."¹

It is clear, then, from this confession that the term "cannot be employed without considerable intellectual caution."² We must guard against taking it in the sense of *character*,³ and also against thinking of three *separate* existences, such as we think of when the ex-

¹ "Non audemus dicere unam essentiam, tres substantias; sed unam essentiam vel substantiam; tres autem personas, quemadmodum multi Latini ista tractantes et digni auctoritate dixerunt, cum alium modum aptiorem non invenirent quo enunciarent verbis quod sine verbis intelligebant. Re vera enim cum Pater non sit Filius, et Filius non sit Pater, et Spiritus Sanctus ille qui etiam donum Dei vocatur, nec Pater sit nec Filius, tres utique sunt. Ideoque pluraliter dictum est, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*. Non enim dixit, unum est, quod Sabelliani dicunt; sed, *unum sumus*. Tamen cum quaeritur quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dictum est tamen tres personæ non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur."—*De Trinitate*, V. ix.; cf. VII. vi. And S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*. 1a, Q. 29 a, 3, "Conveniens est ut hoc nomen (*persona*) de Deo dicatur; non tamen eodem modo quo dicitur de creaturis, sed excellentiori modo."

² Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 32.

³ It was probably for this reason that the Greek Church discouraged and finally altogether discarded the use of the term *πρόσωπον* as the equivalent of *persona*.

pression is applied to three men. "The word Person, used in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, would on first hearing suggest Tritheism to one who made the word synonymous with *individual*; and Unitarianism to another, who accepted it in the classical sense of a *mask* or *character*."¹ The Church, it is needless to say, means neither of these. All that she intends to express by the use of the term "three Persons" is that which she understands Holy Scripture to teach, namely, that there are *three eternal distinctions in the divine nature, anterior to, and independent of any relation to created life*.²

1. That the distinctions are eternal is clearly taught in such a passage as S. John i. 1. "The Word," which was "in the beginning with God" (*πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*) must have been distinct from God (*ὁ Θεός*), and yet "the Word was God" (*Θεός*). And were there no other passages bearing on the subject the saying of our Lord recorded in S. John xvii. 5 ("the glory which I had with Thee before the world was") would of itself be sufficient to show that the Trinity is not merely "economic"—*i.e.* God did not *become* a Trinity when He manifested Himself to mankind as Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier—but that it is "immanent," *i.e.* an eternal fact in the divine nature, altogether independent of relation to creation. The Son must have been a distinct Person "before the world was," if He then possessed a "glory" of His own "with the Father."

2. But while it is thus taught in Scripture that the Persons are eternally distinct, it is implied with equal clearness that though distinct they are not "separate." Our Lord's own deliberate utterance maintained His unity with the Father. "I and the Father are one." *Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ εἰν ἕσμεν* (S. John x. 30). "Every

¹ Newman's *Arians*, p. 442.

² See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, *ubi supra*.

word," says Bishop Westcott, "in this pregnant clause is full of meaning. It is *I*, not *the Son*; *the Father*, not *my Father*; one essence (*ἐν*, Vulgate *unum*), not one person (*εἰς*, *unus*); *are*, not *am* . . . It seems clear that the unity here spoken of cannot fall short of unity of essence. The thought springs from the equality of power (*My hand, the Father's hand* [see vers. 28, 29]); but infinite power is an essential attribute of God; and it is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power."¹ Here then, in the compass of this brief utterance, we find a full and satisfactory refutation of both Arianism and Sabellianism. "Per *unum* Arius, per *sumus* Sabellius refutatur."² The plural verb emphasises the distinction of Persons, while the neuter, *ἐν* (*unum*), brings out the truth which the Church has expressed in saying that the Son is "of one substance with the Father," that is, partaker of His eternal and essential nature.

3. But, further, while Holy Scripture in this way reveals to us the unity of the divine nature, there is another truth also taught in it which requires to be carefully kept before the mind, if the full teaching of the Church is to be realised. This is the truth that the Father is alone unoriginate, the fount of Deity in the eternal life of the Trinity. There is perhaps a danger lest we should represent to ourselves a sort of abstract "God-head," behind the three Persons, and think that of it all three equally partake, so that in it is to be found their source and origin. Against any such erroneous notion the Church has guarded by the doctrine of the *Monarchia*, which teaches that the Father is the only source or *ἀρχή*, the sole Fount of Deity (*πηγὴ θεότητος*) from which the Son and Holy Ghost from all eternity derive their divine

¹ *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, *in loc.*

² Bengel.

being.¹ "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself" (S. John, v. 26). "The living Father hath sent Me, and I live because of the Father" (*διὰ τὸν πατέρα*, ch. vi. 57). In virtue of this the Father is rightly said to be the First Person of the Holy Trinity, by a priority, not of time, but of order. To quote Bishop Pearson on this subject:

"As there is a number in the Trinity by which the Persons are neither more nor less than Three, so there is also an order by which of these Persons the Father is the First, the Son the Second, and the Holy Ghost the Third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the Second unto the First, and of the Third unto the First and Second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though, therefore, this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father is First, and the Son Second. Again the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son; though, therefore, this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father, who is the First Person, cannot be the First; receiving the same from the Son, who is the Second, cannot be the Second, but, being from the First and Second, must be of the Three the Third."²

¹ Cf. Athanasius, *Orat. Contr. Arian.* iv. ch. i. *μία ἀρχὴ θεότητος καὶ οὐ δύο ἀρχαὶ θεὸν κυρίως καὶ μοναρχία εἶσιν.*

² Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Article VIII. § 22; cf. Article I. ch. iii. § 11.

To this divine "subordination" it is probable that our Lord referred when He said to His disciples, "The Father is greater than I" (S. John, xiv. 28). In one sense it is, of course, true that if the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, "none is greater or less than another," for the Godhead does not admit of degrees, and of "more" or "less." And accordingly many divines have understood the words of our Lord just cited to refer to Him as incarnate, as they are apparently taken in the Athanasian Creed: "Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood." But it is also true that there is a sense in which the Father, as the Source of all the Divinity of both Son and Spirit, is "greater" than either. "The Son is the Father's equal, as partaker of His nature. He is His 'Subordinate' in that this equality is eternally derived."¹

4. There is one other truth taught in Holy Scripture, which the Church has summarised in a definite theological term, in order to guard fully the unity of the Holy Trinity. It is the doctrine of the *Περιχώρησις*, or *Coinherence*, the mutual indwelling of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity. The doctrine is based on the words of our Lord in S. John xiv. 10, 11, "The Father abiding in Me (*ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων*) . . . I am in the Father and the Father in Me"; with which should be compared S. Paul's words of the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor. ii. 11, "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." The meaning of the doctrine is well stated by Bishop Bull, from whose words it will be clearly seen that it

¹ Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 234. See Westcott, *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, detached note on ch. xiv. 28, for a full summary of Patristic references to this text

effectually guards the faith of the Church from any approach to Tritheism, and secures her belief in the unity of the Godhead:—

“The Father is the principle of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and both are propagated from Him ‘by an internal, not by an external, production,’ from which it results that they are not only of the Father, but *in* the Father, and the Father in them; and that in the Holy Trinity one Person cannot be separated from the other, as three human persons are divided from one another; for they who hold that the three Hypostases of the Godhead are in this way separate are rightly called Tritheists . . . The Father and the Son are in such sense One, as that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; and that the one cannot be separated from the other. This mode of union the Greek theologians call *περιχώρησις*, and the Latins, *i.e.* the schoolmen, *circuminsession* . . . *περιχώρησις* and *circuminsession* may be said to be that union by which one thing exists in another, not only by participation of its nature, but also by a full and intimate presence. This kind of inexistence, so to speak, our divines call *circuminsession*; because by it certain things, however much they may be mutually distinguished from each other without being separated, do yet exist in each other without confusion, and as it were flow into each other.”¹

¹ Bull's *Ante-Nicene Faith*, bk. iv. ch. iv. § 9; cf. Newman's *Arians*, p. 178 *seq.*; and Athanasius, *Arian Orations*, iii. ch. xxiii., with Newman's Notes.

ARTICLE II

*De Verbo, sive Filio Dei, qui
verus homo factus est.*¹

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

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 hostia² non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

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

THE original Article in the series of 1553 was identical with our present one, except that in it the clause on the eternal generation and Divinity of the Son (“Begotten . . . of one substance with the Father”) was wanting. It was drawn almost word for word from the third of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which, in

¹ The title in the editions of 1553 and 1563 was *Verbum Dei verum hominem esse factum*, “that the Word or Son of God was made very man.”

² This word is wanting in the Latin edition published by Wolfe in 1563, by the express authority of the Queen. It is, however, found in the editions of 1553, in the Parker MS. of 1563, and in the editions of 1571. The omission was therefore probably due to an accidental error of the press.

its turn, was taken entirely from the Confession of Augsburg.¹

The clause on the eternal generation and Divinity of the Son was inserted in the edition of 1563 by Archbishop Parker, being suggested by the corresponding article in the Confession of Württemberg.

This Article, like the previous one, was aimed against the Anabaptists, many of whom were unsound on the cardinal doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, reviving the Arian heresy, while others had adopted peculiar and heretical notions of the Incarnation,² and others again rejected altogether the doctrine of the Atonement, denying that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, and actually venturing to speak of Him as "a mischievous fellow and deceiver of the world."³

So early as 1535 we find that fourteen Anabaptists were condemned to the stake, for maintaining, among other things, that "in Christ is not two natures, God and man; and that Christ took neither flesh nor blood of the Virgin Mary";⁴ and as late as 1579, one Matthew Hamant was burnt at Norwich for teaching that "Christ is not God nor the Saviour of the world, but a mere man, a sinful man, and an abominable idol."⁵

¹ *Conf. August.* iii., "*De Filio Dei.* Item docent quod Verbum, hoc est Filius Dei, assumpserit humanam naturam in utero beatæ Mariæ Virginis, ut sint duæ naturæ, divina et humana, in unitate personæ inseparabiliter conjunctæ, unus Christus, vere Deus et vere homo, natus ex Virgine Maria, vere passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, ut reconciliaret nobis Patrem, et hostia esset non tantum pro culpa originis sed etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis. Item descendit ad inferos," etc.

² See the passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, "*De hæresibus*," ch. 5, quoted below on Article IV. p. 182.

³ See the striking letter of Bishop Hooper, quoted above in the Introduction, p. 22.

⁴ *Stow's Chronicle.*

⁵ Hollinshed, and cf. Strype, *Annals*, vol. iii. p. 557, for a similar case a few years later.

There are three principal subjects considered in this Article, which falls accordingly into three principal clauses—

1. The Divinity and eternal generation of the Son.
2. The Incarnation.
3. The Atonement.

I. *The Divinity and eternal generation of the Son.*

"The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father." Each expression in this clause requires careful consideration.

The Son. Bishop Pearson¹ points out that there are four subordinate senses in which this title is given to our Lord. He is the Son—

(a) As born of the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary. See S. Luke i. 35: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God."

(b) As designed by God's special will to His high office. See S. John x. 34–36: "If He called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), say ye of Him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

(c) As raised by God from the dead. See Rom. i. 4: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." Cf. Acts xiii. 33.

(d) As appointed heir of all things. See Heb. i. 2–5: "His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things . . ."

¹ Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. II. ch. iii.

having become by so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they."

But though in all these senses it may be said that the title Son belongs to Him, they are, however, but inferior and improper senses; for the title is properly given to Him, not for anyone of the reasons just given, but *because He has the divine essence communicated to Him by the Father from all eternity*. In this sense He is God's "own Son," and God is His "own Father."¹ The title belongs to Him, therefore, in His divine nature. Prior to the Incarnation, prior to the creation, He has from all eternity been the Son in this sense, in that He derives His Divinity from the Father, who, as was shown under the last Article, is alone unoriginate (*ἀναρχος*), the Son being indeed God, but (as the Nicene Creed reminds us) by proceeding from God. "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God" (*Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φῶτος, Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ*).

Which is the Word of the Father. The personal title of Word, or Logos, is given to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity only in S. John i. 1, 14, and Rev. xix. 13 ("the Word of God," cf. however Heb. iv. 12 and 1 John i. 1). The reader will scarcely expect a discussion of its meaning and significance here. For this he will naturally turn to the Commentaries on S. John's Gospel.² It will be sufficient for our purpose here to point out how this title at once suggests the *eternity* of Him to whom it is applied, for it is impossible to conceive of the Father as ever *ἀλογος*, without that eternal Thought or Reason, which is the Son. Thus the two titles, Son and Word, as it has often been pointed out, supplement and reinforce each other; and, taken

¹ See S. John v. 18: Πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν, and Rom. viii. 32: τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφέλατο.

² See especially Westcott on S. John's Gospel, *Intro.* p. xv,

together, guard and protect the full truth concerning the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. Either of them standing alone might have seemed to sanction error. While the title Son suggests *personal distinction*, it might, if it stood alone, have been pressed into the service of Arianism, as if it implied that the Son was of more recent origin than the Father. "The Word," on the contrary, although of necessity conveying the idea of *eternity*, does not necessarily suggest Personality, and thus might have been appealed to as sanctioning Sabellianism. But when the two titles are combined, the possible misapplication of either of them is at once avoided. The Son, who is also the Word, must be eternal. The Word, who is also the Son, must be a distinct Person.¹

Begotten from everlasting of the Father (*ab æterno a Patre genitus*). If the Second Person of the Holy Trinity is from all eternity the Son, it follows that He is "begotten from everlasting"; and thus *eternal generation* is the term used by the Church to express the manner in which the divine essence is communicated by the Father to the Son. It must never be understood as if it referred to an "event" which "once" took place, for it is intended to denote not an act but an eternal and unchangeable fact in the divine nature. The precise term is apparently due to Origen, who says *ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀεὶ γεννᾶται*, the Saviour is ever begotten;² and similarly Augustine says: "Semper gignit Pater, et semper nascitur Filius."³ Such expressions are, however, founded on the language of revelation, for Holy Scripture

See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 234, and cf. Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 472, Note 1.

² *Opera*, vol. iv.; S. Pamphili Martyris, *Apologia*, ch. iii.; cf. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iv. p. 354,

ἔρ. 233,

not only speaks of the Second Person of the Trinity as "the Son," but also applies to Him the terms "begotten" and "only begotten."¹ The latter term (*μονογενής*) is used several times by S. John (i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9), but by no other writer of the New Testament. Elsewhere S. John also speaks of Him as "begotten" (*γεννημένος* and *γεννηθείς*; see 1 John v. 1, 18.) S. Paul employs another phrase to express the same idea, when he speaks of Him as "the First-born of all creation" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15).²

The very and eternal God (*Verus et æternus Deus*). It became necessary to use such adjectives after the rise of the Arian heresy in the fourth century, for the Arians were willing to allow that in some sense Christ might be termed God, though they denied that He was of one substance with the Father, and maintained that "once" He did not exist (*ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*). Thus, on the Arian hypothesis, He is neither true (*verus*, very), nor eternal God. Hence in the Nicene Creed it was found necessary to state emphatically that He is "very God of very God," and the use of the similar phrase in the Article before us is probably due to the revival of the Arian heresy by the Anabaptists. To the same cause we may also trace the need for the next expression employed in the Article.

Of one substance with the Father (*Patri Consubstantialis* = *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ*). This is the distinctive symbol of the Catholic faith against Arianism, first inserted in the Creed at the Council of Nicæa (325). Not that the adoption of the term marked any change in the faith of the Church. The faith was "once for all

¹ The term is applied to Him, *ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς μόνως ἐγενήθη*. S. John Damascene.

² On this passage and its true meaning, see Lightfoot's Commentary, *in loc.*

delivered to the saints" (S. Jude, 3), and there can be no change in it, nor addition to it. The only "development" of which it admits is a development by *explanation*, not a development by *addition*. The old faith may need restating in new terms and a somewhat fuller definition, in order to guard against misinterpretation. But this is all; and nothing more than this was attempted at Nicæa. "The Nicene divines," says Liddon, "interpreted in a new language the belief of their first Fathers in the faith. They did not enlarge it; they vehemently protested that they were simply preserving and handing on what they had received. The very pith of their objection to Arianism was its novelty; it was false because it was of recent origin. They themselves were forced to say what they meant by their Creed, and they said it. Their explanation added to the sum of authoritative ecclesiastical language, but it did not add to the number of articles in the Christian faith: the area of the Creed was not enlarged. The Nicene Council did not vote a new honour to Jesus Christ, which He had not before possessed: it defined more closely the original and unalterable basis of that supreme place which, from the days of the apostles, He had held in the thought and heart, in the speculative and active life of Christendom."¹

After what was said under the first Article on the history and meaning of the terms *Ousia* and *Hypostasis*, there is no need to explain further the meaning of the word *Homoousios*, "of one substance." But it may be

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 429; cf. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 96. "These decisions do, it is contended, simply express in a new form, without substantial addition, the apostolic teaching as it is represented in the New Testament. They express it in a new form for protective purposes, as a legal enactment protects a moral principle. They are developments only in the sense that they represent the apostolic teaching worked out into formulas by the aid of a terminology which was supplied by Greek dialectics."

well to emphasise the fact that it was not adopted at Nicæa without anxious consideration. It was open to several objections, which the Arians were not slow to urge. The following were the principal ones:—

1. It was said to be a novelty, and not found in Scripture.

2. It was a philosophical term; as such it had been used by heretics, and it implied a divine substance distinct from God, of which the persons partook.

3. It had been rejected at the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, A.D. 268.

4. It was of a Sabellian tendency.

Of these objections the *first* was met by pointing out that, even if the term were novel, its *meaning* was not; and though it was not actually found in Scripture, yet it did but sum up the doctrine of Scripture on the nature of the Son of God. "In it," says Athanasius, "the Bishops concentrated the sense of the Scriptures."¹ As a matter of fact, however, the term was not such a novelty as the Arians tried to make out, and precedents for its use were quoted from early writers, notably Dionysius of Rome and his namesake of Alexandria in the third century.²

With regard to the *second* objection, it was made abundantly clear that the Church was not using the term in the sense in which it had been used by philosophers. She did not intend to imply that there was any substance distinct from God. She only used the term "to express the real Divinity of Christ, and that as being derived from and one with the Father's."³

¹ Athanasius, *Def. Nic. defn.* ch. v. § 20.

² Athanasius, *ubi supra*. Eusebius of Cæsarea himself confesses the antiquity of the word ("Epistola Eusebii in Socrates," *H. E.* I. viii.). Origen apparently had made use of the word (*Pamphili Apol.* 5), and so had Theognostus, while so early a writer as Tertullian has its Latin equivalent "*unius substantiæ*" (see above, p. 107).

³ Newman's *Arians*, p. 191.

The *third* objection was disposed of by showing that if the Fathers at Antioch rejected the word it was because Paul of Samosata had attempted sophistry, and taking the word in its philosophical sense had argued that it implied that there were three substances, one the previous substance, and the other two derived from it. Its rejection, if a fact, was due to the desire to guard against this. At Nicæa, on the contrary, its adoption was necessitated by the evasions of the Arians. At Antioch it would have obscured the truth and led to misconception, whereas at Nicæa it was required to protect the faith from error of a different character.¹

The *fourth* and last objection was removed by a careful explanation of the sense in which the word was really used, and by the gradual adoption of the word Hypostasis, to express the real distinctions within the Godhead, in which the Church believed.

In this manner all the objections raised to the use of the term were met, and it was insisted upon and clung to by the orthodox party, not from any feeling of obstinacy or prejudice, but simply because experience taught them that it was the one term which the subtlety and ingenuity of the Arians was unable to pervert or explain away, and which expressed without ambiguity the truth that needed to be so jealously guarded, the truth, that is, of the absolute and essential Divinity of the Son of God.

We have now considered separately each expression in the first part of the Article. Before, however, proceeding to our second subject it is necessary to give a brief summary of the *scriptural evidence of the Divinity of the Son*.

1. In the first place, it may be shown that our Lord's own claims are such that it is impossible to think of Him except as one who is God. At first, no doubt, this

¹ See Athan. *De Synodis*, 43, and cf. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 430.

would not have been realised by those around Him; but as they listened to His teaching, heard Him set His claims above those of the nearest and dearest of personal relations,¹ assume as of right a power to extend or even to abrogate the provisions of the Mosaic law,² assert Himself as "greater than Jonah," "greater than Solomon,"³ "greater than the temple,"⁴ claim Himself to give rest to the weary and heavy-laden, speak of a knowledge of the Father possessed by none other,⁵ declare that He would come again "in His glory and the glory of the holy angels," and sit on the throne of judgment,⁶ they must have wondered with an increasing wonder who it was who could make such tremendous claims.

Nor was this all. They saw Him work His miracles and as He healed the sick, or cast out devils, they heard Him *in His own name* bid the sick arise or the devils depart.⁷ Miracles had been wrought by others before. They were wrought by the apostles themselves. But it was *in their Master's name* that the devils were subject unto them.⁸ And when they bade the sick arise it was again in His name. "Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole" (Acts ix. 34). Very striking is it to contrast the Lord's words to the evil spirit, "Thou deaf and dumb spirit, I command thee (*ἐγὼ σοι ἐπιτάσσω*) come out of him" (S. Mark ix. 25), with St. Peter's disclaimer in Acts iii. 12, "Why marvel ye at this? or why look ye on us as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk." So again, they saw that He *accepted worship*, by whomsoever it was offered to Him;⁹

¹ S. Matt. ix. 37.

² S. Matt. xii. 41, 42.

³ S. Matt. xi. 27-30.

⁴ S. Mark ix. 25; S. Luke vii. 14.

⁵ S. Matt. viii. 2 (the leper); ix. 18 (the ruler of the synagogue); xiv.

² S. Matt. v. 22 *seq.*, xix. 8 *seq.*

⁴ S. Matt. xii. 6.

⁵ S. Matt. xxv. 31.

⁶ S. Luke x. 17.

though "worship" as every Jew was taught from his childhood was the prerogative of God alone, and must be rejected not only by men (see Acts x. 25, xiv. 15), but even by angels (see Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9).

Again, when He spoke of His relation to the Father, they heard Him distinctly assert His union with Him ("I and the Father are one," S. John x. 30), and speak of the "glory which" He "had with" Him "before the world was" (S. John xvii. 5). They heard Him claim a timeless pre-existence before Abraham had come into being, and in so doing appropriate as His own the special title of Jehovah under the Old Covenant "I am" (*πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι*, S. John, viii. 58). Very instructive also is the discourse in S. John v., in connection with which the Jews sought to kill Him, "because He not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God His own Father, *making Himself equal with God.*" Thus His opponents understood Him to claim Divinity, and He did not utter a single word that would lead them or His own disciples to suppose that their inference was wrong. "Intelligent Judæi quod non intelligunt Ariani" is the striking and suggestive comment of Augustine on the passage. Thus, as the apostles listened to such language, and heard such claims advanced as those which have been very briefly summarised here, it must gradually have dawned upon them that their Master was not only as one of the prophets of old; they realised at last that He was the Messiah for whom all Jews were looking, and that He was in a unique and special sense the Son of God. Peter was but the mouthpiece of them all when

33 (those with Him in the boat); xv. 25 (the Syro-Phœnician woman); xx. 20 (the mother of Zebedee's children); xxviii. 9. 17 (the women and disciples after the resurrection); St. Mark v. 6 (the Gadarene demoniac). The force of the argument is best seen by contrasting these passages with those referred to in the text where apostles and angels refuse with horror the "worship" offered to them.

he confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (S. Matt. xvi. 16). Even this confession, however, great as it is, falls short of the full acknowledgment of His eternal Godhead, for in spite of indications which may to us appear not obscure,¹ it does not seem that the Jews were looking for a *divine* Messiah.² But when the crowning proof of divine power was given by the resurrection from the dead, then there came the conviction, never afterwards lost, expressed in the words of Thomas, which were accepted by our Lord as the true expression of faith in Him, "Thomas saith unto Him, *My Lord and my God*" (S. John xx. 28).³

2. In considering the evidence for the Divinity of our Lord the first place must always be given to His own words and claims. Although, as Bishop Westcott says, "He never speaks of Himself directly as God," yet "the aim of His revelation was to lead men to see God in Him."⁴ That the apostles did thus finally apprehend the aim of His revelation is shown by the words of Thomas quoted above; but the full proof that they had grasped the bearing of His teaching and recognised His Eternal Godhead must be sought in their teaching and language concerning Him, preserved in the Acts and Epistles, as well

¹ *E.g.*, not only are such names as "Immanuel" (Isa. vii. 14), and "Jehovah is our righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 6) given to Him. These need not denote more than the fact that through Him Jehovah would manifest Himself, but in Isa. ix. 6 He is spoken of as "the mighty God," El Gibbor, a title given to Jehovah Himself, in the very next chapter (x. 21), and in Micah v. 2 it is said that "His goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

² See Ryle and James on the *Psalms of Solomon*, p. iv.

³ The argument from the claims of our Lord and His "self-assertion" is sometimes put in the form of the dilemma, "Aut Deus aut homo non bonus," a dilemma from which there appears no way of escaping. See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iv.; cf. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 9-17; and for a good popular statement of the position, *The Great Dilemma*, by the Rev. H. B. Ottley.

⁴ *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, note on S. John xx. 28.

as in the Gospels. The summary of the evidence for this will be best presented under separate heads, as follows:

(a) The great dogmatic passages in the Pauline Epistles in which the person and nature of Christ are fully dwelt upon. Three such are of special importance.

Phil. ii. 6-8: "Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God: but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea the death of the cross."

The main subject of this passage is the Incarnation; but the apostle states very clearly who He was who became incarnate. He was One who was, to begin with, in the form of God (*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*), and yet such was His humility, that He did not consider His equality with God (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*), a thing to be grasped at, to be claimed at all hazards, but he "emptied Himself." etc. The *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, as Bishop Lightfoot points out, denotes the reality, the characteristic attributes of the Godhead, exactly as the "form of a servant" (*μορφὴν δούλου*), which he "took," indicates the reality of the human nature. And the whole passage implies very clearly that He who was incarnate in time, existed before the worlds in the eternal Godhead.

Col. i. 15-18: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, . . . all things have been created through Him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*) and unto Him; and He is (*αὐτός ἐστι*) before all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence." Here the apostle is claiming for the

¹ See Lightfoot on *Philippians*, p. 108 *seq.*

Son absolute supremacy in relation to the universe (vers. 15–17), and the Church (ver. 18), and He starts by speaking of His relation to the invisible God, of whom He is the “image” (εἰκῶν), a term which implies not mere likeness, but actual representation and manifestation. He then attributes to Him the work of creation of all things, both visible and invisible, and finally claims for Him a pre-existence before all time. “HE IS before all things.”¹ Such claims could not, without blasphemy, be made on behalf of any creature, however glorious. He, of whom the apostle makes such assertions, can only be Himself God.

A similar passage, the witness of which is not less clear, is found in Hebrews i. 2 *seq.*, where the work of creation is again attributed to the Son, who is also said to be “the effulgence of the Father’s glory and the very image of His substance” (ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ), and contrasted with the angels, none of whom is ever addressed in Scripture as Lord, or God, as is the Son in Ps. xlv. 7 and cii. 25, as quoted by the writer of the epistle.

(b) The last-mentioned reference to the Old Testament (Ps. cii. 25) leads us naturally to another point, which brings out, in a most striking fashion, how completely the apostles assumed the Divinity of Christ. In Ps. cii. there is no reference to the Messiah. It is Jehovah of whom the Psalmist is speaking, and yet the writer of the epistle applies his words to Christ. Nor does the passage stand alone, for it will be found that several passages, which in the Old Testament are directly spoken of Jehovah, are in the New Testament cited as referring to Christ, a fact which implies that the writers who thus cited them identified Christ with Jehovah. *E.g.* Isaiah (ch. vi.) saw the glory of Jehovah. S. John, after speaking of Christ, says definitely, “These things

¹ Lightfoot on *Colossians*, p. 209 *seq.*

said Isaiah, when he saw *His* (viz. Christ’s) glory, and spake of Him” (xii. 41). Zech. xii. 10 is quoted in S. John xix. 37 of the crucifixion of Jesus, but on turning to the prophet we discover that Jehovah is the speaker, who says, “They shall look unto *Me*, whom they have pierced.”¹ And once more S. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 15) takes up the words of Isaiah viii. 13 (“Sanctify the LORD of Hosts”), and says directly, “Sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts” (κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν), where LORD is, without the shadow of a doubt, intended to represent the sacred name of Jehovah, of the Old Testament.² It has been said, not without truth, that if the word Lord had been written in capital letters in the New Testament, wherever it represents Jehovah, as it is written in the Old Testament, Socinianism would have been an impossibility.

(c) Further, an appeal may be made to those passages in which Christ is directly termed God. Foremost among these will stand the opening verses of S. John’s Gospel. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν), and the Word was God (Θεός) . . . the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.” Here He who was incarnate is expressly identified with that “Word” which “was God,” and a few verses lower down, according to a very probable reading (noted in the margin of the Revised Version), S. John calls Him God again, for in the 18th verse, where we read, “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him,” many very ancient authorities read “God only begotten” for “only begotten Son.”³ Next to this

¹ It is possible, however, that with many Hebrew MSS. we ought to read “Him,” and not “Me.”

² Cf. Rom. x. 9–13 with Isa. xxviii. 16 and Joel ii. 32.

³ See Westcott’s *Commentary*, *in loc.*, and Hort’s *Two Dissertations*.

may stand Romans ix. 5: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." For though, as the margin of the Revised Version tells us, "some modern interpreters place a full stop after flesh, and read He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever," yet such a rendering appears to be nothing but an evasion of the plain meaning of the words, for, as so careful and accurate a scholar as Dean Vaughan says, it introduces "a harsh and abrupt transition, for which there is no cause and no parallel."¹ Other passages to which reference may be made are the following: Acts xx. 28, "The Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood" (here, however, the text cannot be regarded as certain, some ancient authorities reading "the Lord" for "God"). Titus ii. 13, where the *natural* rendering of the words, τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is that of the Revised Version, "Our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," applying to Him the titles, God and Saviour. So also in 2 Pet. i. 1, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, it is difficult to think any rendering correct except that of the Revised Version, "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."²

(d) Lastly, we have the incidental witness of passing statements, in which divine attributes and actions are ascribed to Christ, and prayers and doxologies are addressed to Him. See Acts vii. 59; 2 Cor. v. 10 (where the office of judging the world is assigned to Christ); xii. 8, 9 (where St. Paul prays to Him, ὁ κύριος

The reading μονογενῆς Θεός is definitely accepted in Westcott & Hort's *Greek Testament*.

¹ *Commentary on Romans*. See also note in *Speaker's Commentary*, in *loc.*, and Sanday and Headlam's exhaustive note in *The International Commentary*.

² In 1 Tim. iii. 16 it seems quite clear that the reading Θεός is not genuine, but even so, the *pre-existence* of Christ is implied in the word ἐφανερώθη. In 1 John v. 20 the words ὁ ἀληθινός Θεός may refer to "Jesus Christ," but their reference is not certain. See Westcott's *Commentary*, in *loc.*

from the context can only be Christ whose "strength" is to "rest upon" the apostle); Eph. i. 20-23; Heb. vii. 3, xiii. 8; and the doxologies in Rev. i. 5, v. 9-14.

II. *The Incarnation.*

"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 the manhood, were joined together in One Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man."

As in the earlier part of the Article so here the exact expressions used require careful notice. They are selected so as to exclude the three principal forms of heresy which have arisen on the doctrine of the Incarnation. Of the four great "Christological" heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, the earliest, that of Arius, denying the true Divinity of Christ, has been already excluded by the opening words of the Article. The three remaining ones, those of Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches, are effectually guarded against by the section before us. Of these three heresies, that of Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, was the earliest, following close upon the Arian, and being condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381. It "maimed" the humanity of Christ. Adopting the threefold division of man's nature (body, soul, and spirit, 1 Thess. v. 23) Apollinaris admitted that Christ possessed both body and soul, by which latter term he meant the *anima animans*, the lower faculties common to man with the brute creation, but he denied to Him the *anima rationalis*, the higher "spirit," including the intellectual and spiritual powers. Of this he said He had no need, for its place was supplied by the divine Logos. Thus, on this theory, Christ could not be said to be *perfect* man, for an essential part of manhood, the

higher spiritual nature, was wanting. Such teaching obviously affects the whole conception of Christ's redemptive work. If the humanity was incomplete and imperfect, the redemption would be incomplete, and imperfect, too, for the nobler part of man's nature, although needing redemption no less than the body, should have no part nor share in it.

The heresy of Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, which was condemned at the Third General Council at Ephesus, 431, involved the assertion that there were *two persons* in Christ. According to Nestorius, the blessed Virgin could not rightly be termed *Theotocos* (mother of God), for she gave birth only to a human person, who was conjoined with the divine Son of God. "He who was formed in the womb of Mary," said Nestorius, "was not Himself God, but God 'assumed' Him, and on account of Him who assumed, He who is assumed is also called God." This heresy involves, even more than Apollinarianism, the virtual destruction of the Atonement, for if in Christ there be two persons, one divine and the other human, it was only "a man" who died on the cross, and not a divine Person, whereas it is really "the infinite worth of the Son of God," that is "the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation, by that which Christ either did or suffered as man in our behalf."¹

Eutychnianism, the last of these heresies, was condemned at the Fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon in 451. Historically it was a reaction against Nestorianism. Eutyches, from whom it takes its name, was a monk of Constantinople, who in his anxiety to avoid maintaining anything approaching to a twofold personality in Christ, was led to assert that after the Incarnation there was but *one nature* in Him, for he thought that the human nature became so merged in the divine, as to be absorbed

¹ Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. ch. lii. § 3.

by it, and no longer to remain distinct. Thus he denied that *two whole and perfect natures* remained in Christ, and so did away altogether, not only with the value of Christ's example, but also with all possibility of acknowledging the redemption of *man*, because, according to him, He who suffered and died was in no way qualified to represent man, as being in no true sense human.

It was in the course of the controversies called forth by these heresies that the Church was led to formulate the doctrine of the Incarnation, in the terms which are adopted in the Article. The Person of the Son of God is from all eternity. At the Incarnation no new person came into being. But He who as God the Son had existed from all eternity, "took man's nature upon Him in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance," and from henceforth has existed not only as God, but also as man, "two whole and perfect natures, the Godhead and manhood," being inseparably united in His single Personality. This union of the two natures in one Person is termed the *hypostatic union*, a union, that is, in a single hypostasis, or personal self. That the two natures are thus united in one Person is plainly taught in Holy Scripture, for it is solely owing to the *unity of person* in Christ that in speaking of Him divine and human titles can be freely interchanged. St. Paul speaks of "the Church of God which He purchased with *His own blood*" (Acts xx. 28), thus sanctioning by implication the phrase, "the blood of God." Our Lord Himself while on earth described Himself as "the Son of *Man*, which is *in heaven*" (St. John iii. 13),¹ and St. Paul charges the Jews with having "*crucified the Lord of Glory*" (1 Cor. ii. 8). In such expressions there is attributed to Christ, spoken of by a divine title, that which belongs only to

¹ It ought to be added that the last words, "which is in heaven," are of doubtful genuineness. They are omitted in the Revised Version.

humanity, and conversely, when a human title is employed, a divine attribute is ascribed to Him.

“A kind of mutual commutation there is, whereby these concrete names, God and man, when we speak of Christ, do take interchangeably one another’s room, so that for truth of speech it skilleth not whether we say that the Son of God hath created the world, and the Son of Man by His death has saved it, or else that the Son of Man did create, and the Son of God die to save the world. Howbeit, 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 whom both natures are. When the apostle saith of the Jews that they crucified the Lord of Glory, and when the Son of Man being on earth affirmeth that the Son of Man was in heaven at the same instant, there is in these two speeches that mutual circulation before mentioned. In the one there is attributed to God, or the Lord of Glory, death, whereof divine nature is not capable; in the other, ubiquity unto man, which human nature admitteth not. Therefore by the Lord of Glory we must needs understand the whole Person of Christ, who being Lord of Glory was indeed crucified, but not in that nature, for which He is termed the Lord of Glory. In like manner, by the Son of Man the whole Person of Christ must necessarily be meant, who, being man upon earth, filled heaven with His glorious presence, but not according to that nature for which the title of man is given Him,”¹

This interchange of titles is termed the “Communicatio Idiomatum,” and by the Greeks *ἀντίδοσις*. It is only possible because the two natures are united in one Person, for it is only the *personal* titles, God and man, that can

¹ Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. ch. liii. § 4.

be thus interchanged. The abstract terms of nature, Godhead, and manhood, cannot be interchanged, because the natures remain distinct. It is true, then, to say that “God died for man,” though the Godhead died not. If, however, Nestorianism were true, and if there were in Christ two persons, then it would be impossible to say that God died, or that the Jews “crucified the Lord of Glory.”

But while the Church thus maintains, as against Nestorianism, the unity of person, she maintains also against Apollinarianism and Eutychieanism that the two “whole and perfect natures” remain distinct, and that each retains its own essential properties. “Whatsoever is natural to deity the same remaineth in Christ uncommunicated to His manhood, and whatsoever is natural to manhood His deity thereof is incapable.” The true properties and operations of His deity are summed up by Hooker under six heads:—(1) To know that which is not possible for created natures to comprehend; (2) To be simply the highest cause of all things, the well-spring of immortality and life; (3) To have neither end nor beginning of days; (4) To be everywhere present and enclosed nowhere; (5) To be subject to no alteration nor passion; (6) To produce of itself those effects which cannot proceed but from infinite majesty and power. To assert that any of these was communicated to Christ’s manhood is practically to confuse the natures, to give to the finite nature that which belongs to the infinite, and so to destroy the *perfection* of the manhood, *i.e.* to fall into the error of Apollinaris or of Eutyches. Against such errors we may appeal to the witness of the Gospels, which set before us Christ’s manhood as real and perfect, taken indeed by Him in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, “by the operation of the Holy Ghost,” without the intervention of any human father, yet subject to those limitations which essentially belong to a finite

created nature. The evidence of Scripture for the birth from a virgin is clear and precise. Although popular language is freely used, so that Joseph and Mary are termed "His parents" (S. Luke ii. 27, 41), and "His father and His mother" (*ibid.* ver. 33), and even the blessed Virgin speaks to Him of Joseph as His "father" (*ibid.* ver. 48), yet both the Evangelists who record the nativity make it perfectly clear that it was from a *virgin* that He was born, without the intervention of any human father. The two accounts in S. Matthew and S. Luke are written from different points of view, the first evangelist giving us the narrative from Joseph's side, the third from the side of the mother; but they are capable of being easily harmonised, and there are strong grounds for thinking that S. Luke i. and ii. are based on an account which came from the blessed Virgin herself.¹ In the Epistles of S. Paul, it must be admitted that there is no *direct* reference to the birth from a Virgin, but not only is it "obviously unsafe to argue from S. Paul's silence, when he is equally silent on many other matters, which certainly formed part of the apostolic teaching," but also "there are portions of his teaching where the event may well have been in the background of his thoughts, as when he speaks of our Lord as "the heavenly man," insists on His absolute sinlessness, and describes Him as "made of a woman," in a context where it would have been at least as natural to represent Him as the son of Joseph had he believed Him to be such."²

¹ See an article on "The two Accounts of our Lord's Infancy" in the *Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. iii. p. 16. Cf. also Gore's *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, Dissert. i.; and H. S. Eck, *The Incarnation* (1901), c. iv.

² Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 54. Cf. also Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 274 *seq.* Dr. Swete fully proves (*op. cit.* p. 43 *seq.*) that the birth from a Virgin formed part of the belief of the Church from the very first, referring not only to Irenæus (i. x. 1) and Tertullian (*De Vel. Virg.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 2; *De Præscript.* 13), but also to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I. xxi. xxii. xxxii. xxxiii. lxiii.; *Dial.* xliii. xlvi. c.), Aristides, and Iguatius (*Eph.* 19, *Trall.* 9, *Smyrn.* 1). See, further, Eck (*op. cit.*) c. v.

That the humanity thus taken was real and complete is shown by numerous passages in the Gospels. He hungered and thirsted (S. Matt. xxi. 18; S. John xix. 28); He was weary (S. John iv. 6); He slept (S. Mark iv. 38); He was grieved (S. Mark iii. 5); He wept (S. Luke xix. 41; S. John xi. 35); He "increased in wisdom" as well as "in stature" (S. Luke ii. 52); His soul (*ψυχή*) was exceeding sorrowful even unto death (S. Matt. xxvi. 38); He "sighed deeply in His spirit" (*τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ*, S. Mark viii. 12); He "groaned in spirit" (S. John xi. 33); He was troubled in spirit (S. John xiii. 21); and at the moment of death He commended His spirit into the Father's hands (S. Luke xxiii. 46; cf. S. John xix. 30, *παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα*). He, of whom such terms as these are used, must have possessed a true and proper human nature, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, nor can the properties of Deity have been transferred to that nature of which these expressions are used.

It is this union of the two whole and perfect natures in the one Person, which alone enables us to explain and do justice to all the features in the representation of Christ in the Gospel narratives. On the one hand, we have to account for the fact that He acts with powers far beyond those of ordinary men, and is endowed with knowledge far exceeding that of others. In His human body He was able to walk on the water. He could turn the water into wine, multiply the loaves and fishes so as to feed the hungry crowds that followed Him, heal the sick, give sight to the blind, cast out devils, and raise the dead. He saw Nathanael under the fig-tree (S. John i. 50), read the hearts of His disciples, and knew their thoughts before they were expressed (S. Matt. xvii. 25); "needed not that any should bear witness concerning man: for He Himself knew what was in man" (S. John ii. 25); He "knows the Father as the Father knows"

Him (S. John x. 15 ; cf. S. Matt. xi. 27). This is one side of the truth concerning the Person of Christ, as disclosed in the Gospel narrative. It is explained by the fact that though the essential properties of Deity are not communicable to man's nature, yet the supernatural gifts, graces, and effects thereof are,"¹ and by what Hooker calls "the gift of unction,"² as a consequence of the close union of the two natures in a single Personality, supernatural gifts and graces flowed in from the higher upon the lower nature united to it, infinitely ennobling and exalting it, but not in any way destroying its true and perfect *human* character, nor endowing it with the properties of Deity. Thus the body of Christ was a true human body, enabled by a divine gift to walk upon the water, but not able to be in two places at once, which would be contrary to the properties of human nature. The power of working miracles was, in the same way, a supernatural effect of Deity, as was also the enlightenment of the human soul with the knowledge of "what was in man." But there is another side as well to the portrait drawn in the Gospels, and from many passages we can see that, though for all purposes of His divine mission and work our Lord's manhood was thus supernaturally enlightened and endowed with divine powers, yet in ordinary matters, outside the sphere of the special work He had come to do, He accepted the limitations common to men in general, and natural to His position as born in a particular spot, at a particular time in the world's history. Though He miraculously

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. ch. liv.

² The expression is justified by S. Peter's words in Acts x. 38: "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power ; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil : for God was with Him." Cf. also S. Luke iv. 18. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed me, etc."

fed the five thousand in the wilderness, yet when He was Himself an hungered, He was content to wait while His disciples went into the city to buy food to supply His needs (S. John iv. 8). In reference to His human intellect, it is said that He "increased in wisdom" (S. Luke ii. 52). Of the day and hour of the last judgment He Himself tells us that He did not know. "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father" (S. Mark xiii. 32). He raised the dead to life, but when His hour was come, Himself submitted to the power of death. Both classes of passages to which attention has been drawn refer to one and the same Person, and that Person the Eternal Son of God. That which explains them is the fact that in taking upon Him our nature He voluntarily limited Himself. In S. Paul's phrase, *ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν* (Phil. ii. 7), He "emptied Himself"—not of His Godhead, for that were an impossibility, but of the exercise of His divine prerogatives. He condescended "in all things to be made like unto His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17), "sin only excepted" (Heb. iv. 15 ; 2 Cor. v. 21 ; 1 Pet. ii. 22).¹

¹ Since peculiar difficulty is sometimes felt with regard to the question of the limitation of knowledge in the human soul of Christ, it may be well to add a brief note on the subject. *Infinite* knowledge, in the strictest sense of the word, can only belong to an infinite mind. It is, therefore, a "property" of the Godhead (cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. liii. § 1), and to say that the knowledge possessed by Christ's soul was infinite is practically to fall into the heresy of Apollinaris. Though, however, the finite human soul could not be possessed of infinite knowledge, yet, short of this, there is nothing of which we should be justified in saying that Christ as man "could not have known it." Each "piece of information" is finite, and, as a supernatural gift, not a property of the Godhead, might therefore have been communicated to the manhood. Had He so willed, He might have known it. Of one fact we have the express warrant of His own word for saying that He did not know it (S. Mark xiii. 32). What further limitations of knowledge there may have been beyond this can only be a matter of reasonable inference from the Gospel narrative.

III. *The Atonement.*

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.

Whatever they were, they were purely voluntary. If there were matters which He did not know, it was not because He could not have known them, but because He *condescended not to know*. Theologically, there is no greater difficulty in believing that He was ignorant of a hundred things than in believing that He was ignorant of *one*. If *one* fact was hidden from His human intellect we are forced to admit the co-existence of ignorance and infinite knowledge in a single Personality. But this, as the late Dr. Liddon has pointed out in his *Bampton Lectures*, is but one of the many contrasts which, in accepting the Incarnation at all, we are bound to admit; nor is it really more mysterious than many "other and undisputed contrasts between the divine and human natures of the incarnate Son—*e.g.* the co-existence of local presence and omnipresence—of absolute blessedness, and intense suffering" (see Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 463). Dr. Liddon urges that we have no right to infer from St. Mark xiii. 32 ignorance on Christ's part on any other subject. It is true that we are never directly told of anything else that He did not know. But there are various expressions in the Gospels which appear to indicate that there were limitations of knowledge beyond this, and that on ordinary matters He willed to be dependent on ordinary means of information. He "increased in wisdom." Seeing the fig-tree with leaves—the usual sign of fruit—He came to it, "if haply He might find anything thereon" (S. Mark xi. 13). Again and again we read that He "marvelled" at something. Moreover, His questions, though doubtless often asked to "prove" His disciples, yet sometimes appear to have been called forth by a desire for information, *e.g.*, "Where have ye laid him?" (S. John xi. 34). "How many loaves have ye?" (S. Mark vi. 38, viii. 5). "How long time is it since this hath come unto him?" (S. Mark ix. 21). See further, Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. vi., and "An Inquiry into the Nature of our Lord's knowledge as Man," by W. S. Swayne. It may be added (in order to avoid misconception) that no argument can justly be drawn from limited knowledge to error or fallibility on the part of our blessed Lord, for, as the late Bishop Harold Browne pointed out, "Ignorance does not of necessity involve error. Of course in our present state of being, with our propensity to lean on our wisdom, ignorance is extremely likely to lead to error. But ignorance is not error; and there is not one word in the Bible which could lead us to suppose that our blessed Lord was liable to error in any sense of the word, or in any department of knowledge."—*Pentateuch and Elohistie Psalms*, p. 13.

In the wording of this portion of the Article four expressions are worthy of especial notice.—

1. "Who *truly* suffered."—So in Article IV. we read, "Christ did *truly* arise again from death." There is evidently a special emphasis upon the word "truly" in each case. And there can be no doubt that it was designedly added to guard against a Docetic view of the Incarnation, which had recently been revived by some among the Anabaptists. The heresy of the Docetæ (*Δοκῆται*) appeared in very early days. Its advocates maintained that our blessed Lord's body was like ours only in appearance, and not in reality. According to S. Jerome, "while the apostles were still surviving, while Christ's blood was still fresh, in Judæa, the Lord's body was asserted to be but a phantasm."¹ This view, which it is almost needless to say, contradicts the whole tenor of Scripture, was very prevalent among the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, many of whom denied altogether that Christ really took flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin,² and thus were led on to deny the *reality* of both His passion and His resurrection. Hence the insertion of the word "truly" here, and also in Article IV.

2. *To reconcile His Father to us.*—Exception is sometimes taken to this phrase, on the ground that it is unscriptural; for the Bible speaks of the need for men to be reconciled to God, but says nothing of God being reconciled to man. As far as the mere form of expression is concerned it must be admitted that the objection can be sustained. The following are

¹ *Adv. Lucif.* 23.

² See the Preface to Bishop Hooper's *Lesson of the Incarnation*, where it is noted that this "most pestilent and dangerous" doctrine has "gotten into the hearts of many."—*Later Writings of Bishop Hooper* (Parker Society), p. 3.

the only passages in the canonical books of Scripture in which the word "reconcile" occurs in this connection, and in none of them does the phrase used in the article occur.

Rom. v. 10, 11: "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God (*κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ*), through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled (*καταλλάγέντες*), shall we be saved by His life. And not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (*καταλλαγή*). 2 Cor. v. 18-20: "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself (*τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ*) through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation (*τῆς καταλλαγῆς*); to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors, therefore, on behalf of Christ, as though God were intreating by us: we beseech you, on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." Eph. ii. 16: "That He might reconcile them (*ἀποκαταλλάξῃ*) both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Col. i. 19-22: "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fullness dwell; and through Him to reconcile (*ἀποκαταλλάξαι*) all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens. And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unproveable before Him."

The Socinians, and those who with them object to the language of our Article point to the form of expression

in all these passages, as indicating that the need for reconciliation was all on man's side, and hence they infer that there was no need for Christ "to reconcile His Father to us." The Atonement revealed God's love, and so influenced men, but it had no "objective" value. Such an objection at first sight may appear to be plausible. But it is believed that a careful examination of the teaching of Scripture will show that it is quite untenable, and that the language of the Article is perfectly justifiable. Though undoubtedly the *prominent* thought in all the passages quoted above is that of the removal of the enmity on man's part, yet the clause in 2 Cor. v. 19, "not reckoning unto them their trespasses," is sufficient to show that there is another aspect under which the Atonement may be viewed. As Bengel excellently says, "*καταλλαγή* est *δίπλευρος*, et tollit (a) indignationem Dei adversus nos (2 Cor. v. 19; (b) nostramque abalienationem a Deo (2 Cor. v. 20)."¹ This is borne out by an examination of other passages in Scripture, in which the same word, *καταλλάσσω* (or the kindred *διαλλάσσω*) is used. The word merely means "the re-establishment of friendly relations between persons who have been at variance: on which side the antagonism exists is not to be determined by the word itself, or by its grammatical construction."² So in S. Matt. v. 24, our Lord says: "If thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." The brother, who has some cause of complaint, is, according to our idiom, the one who needs reconciliation. But our Lord puts it the

¹ Bengel on Rom. iii. 24.

² Dale on the *Atonement*, Note O, where see a careful discussion of the whole question. Cf. also Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. X. § 6.

other way. Not "first reconcile thy brother," but "first *be reconciled* to thy brother."¹

But the real justification of the language of the Article lies deeper than this. Even if the particular passages in which the word "reconcile" occurs could all be shown to refer entirely to the removal of man's alienation from God, yet that the Atonement effected something which may truly be described as the reconciliation of God to man would seem to follow from those other passages in which the death of Christ is regarded as a "propitiation" and a sacrifice. Such passages are Rom. iii. 25: "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation (*ἱλαστήριον*) through faith, by His blood";² 1 John ii. 2: "He is the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins"; 1 John iv. 10: God "sent His Son to be the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins." Such language as this is amply sufficient to justify the phrase that is used in our Article, for it clearly implies that God "changed His relation of antagonism to the world into a relation of friendship, by sending His Son 'to be the propitiation for our sins.' His own love for the world moved Him to do this; but until He did it there was antagonism, which, according to the apostolic thought, would have ultimately issued in 'wrath.'"³

3. "Not only for original guilt, but also for all actual

¹ Cf. also 1 Sam. xxix. 4 and 1 Cor. vii. 11. It is noteworthy that in the Second Book of Maccabees three times God is said *to be reconciled* (*καταλλαγῆναι*) to man (2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33, viii. 29; cf. v. 20, where the remarkable phrase "the reconciliation of the great Lord" occurs. *ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλλαγή*).

² "The Greek word properly means "that which renders propitious." Here "that which renders God propitious." In some way, which is not explained at all in this passage, and imperfectly explained elsewhere, the death of Christ did act so as to render God "propitious" towards men. He became more ready to pardon as they became more anxious to be pardoned."—Dr. Sanday in Bp. Ellicott's *New Testament for English Readers* (Note on Rom. iii. 25).

³ Dale on the *Atonement*, *ubi supra*.

sins of men."—The careful specification of both "original guilt" and also "actual sins" is remarkable. We meet with it again in Article XXXI., where it is said that "the offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." It is accounted for by the fact that teachers were found within the Roman communion who, following the guidance of some among the schoolmen,¹ actually taught that, though Christ suffered on the cross for original sin, the sacrifice of the altar was daily offered for actual sin. The language of the Article, as we have already seen, is drawn from the Confession of Augsburg, which directly mentions this terrible perversion of the truth in the following passage:—

"Accessit opinio, quæ auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus."²

4. "For *all* actual sins of men."—Attention is drawn to this assertion of the universality of redemption, because in various editions of the Articles the important word "all" has been, without the slightest authority, omitted, in order to force the article into agreement with the Calvinistic theory of "particular redemption," *i.e.* the doctrine that Christ died not for *all*, but only for "the elect." According to Hardwick, the

¹ See the *Sermons on the Eucharist*, formerly attributed to Albertus Magnus. "Secunda causa institutionis hujus sacramenti est sacrificium altaris, contra quandam quotidianam delictorum nostrorum rapinam. Ut sicut corpus Domini semel oblatum est in cruce pro debito originali: sic offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari et habeat in hoc ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum."—*De SS. Euch. Sacr.* Ser. i.

² *Confessio August.* pt. ii. art. iii.

omission is found as early as 1630. It appears also in the Article as revised by the Assembly of Divines in 1643, the whole clause being there rewritten in the interests of Calvinism, and standing as follows: "Who for our sakes truly *suffered most grievous torments in His soul from God, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.*"

The special phrases of the Article which appear to require some explanation have now been noticed. But nothing has yet been said on the general subject of the Atonement. The subject is too vast to receive anything like adequate treatment in the narrow limits within which it must be confined in such a work as this. All that can be attempted here is to give in briefest form a summary of the teaching of Scripture on the sacrifice of Christ; and in connection with it to suggest a few considerations which may be found helpful in removing the objections which are sometimes raised against the doctrine.

(a) That the Article is only following the language of Scripture when it says that Christ suffered "to be a sacrifice" for sin, may be shown from numerous passages, such as the following:—

1 Cor. v. 7: "Our passover also hath been sacrificed (*ἐτύθη*), even Christ."

Eph. v. 2: "Walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice (*προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*) to God for an odour of a sweet smell."

Heb. vii. 26, 27: "For such an high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily like those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his

own sins and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all, when He offered up Himself (*ἑαυτὸν ἀνευέγκας*)."

Heb. ix. 26: "Now once at the end of the world hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (*διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ*)." Compare also Heb. x. 10 *seq.*, and the passages quoted above, concerning propitiation (Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10).

Again (*b*) the *vicarious* character of His suffering seems to be plainly implied in such passages as these:

S. Matt. xx. 28: "The Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*)."

S. John x. 11–18: See especially ver. 15, "I lay down my life for (*ὑπὲρ*) the sheep."

1 Tim. ii. 6: "Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all (*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*)."

See also 1 Pet. ii. 21–25, iii. 18; 1 John iii. 16, and Rom. viii. 3, where the Revised Version renders *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* by the words "as an offering for sin."

Elsewhere we read of the Church as *purchased* with the blood of Christ (Acts xx. 28, *ἦν περιποιήσατο*); of "redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*) through the blood" (Eph. i. 7 and 1 Pet. i. 18 (*ἐλυτρώθητε*)).

(c) For the *universal* character of redemption and the fact that it was for *all* men that Christ died, appeal may be made to S. John iii. 16: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life." The breadth of such language is quite inconsistent with narrower theories that would limit the saving work of Christ to "the elect." So in 1 John ii. 2 we read "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world," while in the words of S. Paul quoted above we are expressly told that "He gave himself a ransom for *all*" (1 Tim. ii. 6), as elsewhere the

same apostle states that He is "the Saviour of *all* men, especially of them that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10).¹

Language such as that quoted under the two former heads (*a* and *b*) is surely incompatible with any theory that denies the objective value of the Atonement. To maintain that the *whole* value of the death of Christ lies in its effect upon the minds and hearts of men by the supreme revelation which it makes of the love of God is to evacuate the words of Scripture of their plain meaning, and to introduce a method of interpretation which, if permitted, will enable men to evade the force of the clearest declarations. That grave difficulties can be raised with regard to the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice cannot be denied. But they are largely due, not to the doctrine itself as set forth in Scripture, but to the way in which it has been presented by divines.

It is a fact to which everyday experience bears witness that mediation is a law of this life, that repentance and amendment are of themselves often wholly insufficient to prevent the penal consequences of misconduct, and that vicarious suffering does contribute largely to the relief of others. The argument, as stated by Butler in the fifth chapter of the second part of the *Analogy* is unanswerable; and therefore to a theist, who accepts the order of nature and the existing constitution of things as coming from the hand of God, there will be no difficulty in admitting that the same method holds good in regard to man's salvation, which he finds to obtain in regard to his temporal welfare. Difficulties concerning *details* may fairly be raised; but to the *general principle* no exception can fairly be taken.

Nor must it be forgotten that while vicarious suffering in the natural order of things is often compulsory and involuntary, the sacrifice of Christ was purely voluntary.

¹ Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 4.

He gave Himself, *Oblatus est quia ipse voluit*.¹ This does away altogether with any "injustice" as against the victim. There can be no injustice in laying on one that which He Himself wills to undertake. And, on the other hand, it must be carefully borne in mind that Holy Scripture is in no way responsible for those coarse and crude forms of presenting the doctrine, which give colour to the notion that it was an act of arbitrary substitution, the innocent suffering, and the guilty being let off scot-free. Throughout, Holy Scripture ever insists on the need of repentance on the part of the sinner, if he is to obtain the benefit of Christ's redemptive work. It teaches also that it was not merely "a man" who suffered. Had this been the case there might have been some ground for the notion that it was a purely arbitrary substitution of the innocent for the guilty. But the sufferer was "*the man*," the "Second Adam," the Head and Representative of the whole race, for which He is thereby qualified to become the sponsor (*ἑγγυος*). In the words of S. Irenæus: "As a man caused the fall, so a man must cause the restoration. He must be a man able to *sum up* (*recapitulare*) all the human species in Himself, so as to bear the punishment of all, and to render an obedience that will compensate for their innumerable acts of disobedience."²

¹ Isa. liiii. 7, in the Vulgate. As a *translation* the words cannot be defended, but they give grand expression to a truth of Scripture.

² Irenæus, v. i. 1; cf. Norris, *Rudiments of Theology*, p. 59: "When the mystery of the Redeemer's Person is borne in mind, it almost ceases to be a mystery that His death should affect the whole human race. Every act of Christ *must* vibrate through humanity! If, in a plant, an injury to the root is felt in every branch; if in an army, it is not the captain only who conquers or is conquered, but every soldier with him; if in all organic societies, when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if in the great family of mankind, the fall of one entailed the fall of all—then is it a strange thing that S. Paul thus judged, that if Christ died for all, then all died in Him?" See also Wilberforce on the *Incarnation*, ch. ii.

Again, objections of another kind, which are frequently raised, are only valid against an entire perversion of the scriptural doctrine. The Atonement has sometimes been represented as if it involved a discordance of will between the First and Second Persons of the blessed Trinity. Christian preachers have not always been careful in their language, and their teaching has sometimes given countenance to the idea that the Father was vengeful and longing to punish, while the Son was all mercy and tenderness; whereas Holy Scripture consistently represents the Atonement as an act of love on the part of the *Father* equally with the Son. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life" (S. John iii. 16). God "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all" (Rom. viii. 32). And while we read of the "wrath" of God, we read also of "the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. vi. 16).

These considerations may prove helpful in meeting some of the most obvious objections which are brought against the doctrine. It may not be possible out of the various notices of the Atonement in Scripture to form a complete and consistent theory that shall be entirely free from all difficulty. Nor is it necessary that the attempt to form such a theory should be made. From time to time various "schemes" have been advanced, and explanations offered which have been more or less widely accepted by divines. But none of them can claim the formal sanction of the Church as a whole. That which perhaps has been the most widely held of all is the patristic theory that by the fall Satan gained a "right" over man, and that man could therefore only be released by a satisfaction of Satan's just claim. According to this view the death of Christ was regarded as the "price" or "ransom" paid to Satan to satisfy his claim. It has

been said that S. Irenæus was the first to suggest this view, which is further developed by Origen, and that it is the common explanation of the necessity for the death of Christ, which prevailed for nearly a thousand years in the Church, till the days of S. Anselm, in whose work *Cur Deus Homo*, it is for the first time expressly and unreservedly rejected.¹ There is, perhaps, some exaggeration in this statement,² but there can be no doubt that at one time the theory was very widely held. It rests, however, on an entire misunderstanding of the scriptural use of such figurative expressions as "ransom" and "purchase." It is quite certain from numerous passages in the Old Testament that to the Jew these terms would never have suggested the question "To *whom* was the ransom paid?" as they suggested it in later days to Greek and Latin writers. The great event in their national history, which fixed for the Jews once for all their conception of redemption or ransom, was the exodus from Egypt. Then it was that God *redeemed* His people, delivered them from the house of bondage, *purchased* them, *ransomed* them. All these terms are freely used in Holy Scripture of the event. So in the Song of Moses we read:

"Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth Thy people whom Thou hast redeemed רָדַמְתָּ ; LXX., *ἐλυτρόσω*. . . . All the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away. Fear and dread shall fall upon them; by the greatness of Thine arm they shall be still as a stone; till Thy people pass over, O Lord; till the people pass over which Thou hast purchased, קָנִיתָ ; LXX., *ἐκτήσω* (Ex. xv. 13-16).³

¹ See Oxenham's *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 126, and cf. p. 167.

² See Norris's *Rudiments of Theology*, p. 274 *seq.*

³ In the LXX. *λυτρόσω* occurs about seventy times of God's *redemption* of His people collectively or individually, occurring first in Ex. vi. 6. "I will *redeem* you with a stretched-out arm"; and representing the two Hebrew words לָמַד and קָנָה . *Κτάομαι* is of much rarer occurrence. Besides

This was the deliverance which fixed decisively the idea of redemption. God redeemed, ransomed, purchased His people; but there was nothing paid to Pharaoh or to the Egyptian taskmaster. Any thought of a sum of money or ransom, received by the power from which the captive is delivered, is wholly absent from the Old Testament conception of redemption. "It cannot be said," writes Bishop Westcott, "that God paid to the Egyptian oppressor any price for the redemption of His people. On the other hand, the idea of the exertion of a mighty force, the idea that the redemption *costs* much is everywhere present."¹ Though there was no compensation of any kind paid to the Egyptian bondmaster there was clearly the interposition of something as a condition of deliverance—the people were *redeemed*. Thus, when we remember how, all through the Old Testament, this great act of deliverance is spoken of as God's redemption or ransom of His people, we see at once that writers of the New Testament would naturally use similar language of its "perfect spiritual Antitype," the great act of deliverance from Satan's bondage which they connected with the cross of Jesus Christ; and that they would speak of the Church as redeemed or ransomed, by the precious blood of Christ, without any thought occurring to them of the question which disturbed men's minds in later times, to whom was the ransom paid—a question which has only arisen from a misconception, and from bringing in to the interpretation of Holy Scripture ideas which are totally foreign to it.

We shall be right, then, if we dismiss from our minds once for all the notion of a ransom paid to Satan. Nor need we shrink from resting content without attempting

Ex. xv. 16 (where Codex A has *ἐλυτρώσω*) it is used of God in Ps. lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 2, and lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 54 = *נִלְוֶה*.

¹ On the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 296.

to construct a complete theory of the Atonement. The subject is best left where Scripture leaves it. While, on the one hand, we refuse to explain it away, or to do violence to the passages quoted above which attribute an atoning value to the suffering of Christ, and regard it as a "sacrifice" and "propitiation," on the other hand we may well decline to speculate too closely on the precise manner in which it was efficacious. The fact that it *was* efficacious is clearly taught in Scripture, and that is enough for us. The conclusion which forced itself on the mind of Bishop Butler in the eighteenth century is one which we shall do well to make our own.

"How and in what particular way it had this efficacy, there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain, but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it. . . . And if the Scripture has, as surely it has, left this matter of the satisfaction of Christ mysterious, left somewhat in it unrevealed, all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, yet at least uncertain. Nor has anyone reason to complain for want of farther information, unless he can show his claim to it.

"Some have endeavoured to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, beyond what the Scripture has authorised; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away, and confining His office as Redeemer of the world to His instruction, example, and government of the Church. Whereas the doctrine of the gospel appears to be, not only that He taught the efficacy of repentance, but rendered it of the efficacy which it is by what He did and suffered for us; that He obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life; not only that He revealed to sinners that they were in a capacity of salvation, and how they might obtain it, but,

moreover, that He put them into this capacity of salvation by what He did and suffered for them, put us into a capacity of escaping future punishment and obtaining future happiness. And it is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit, by performing the conditions upon which it is offered on our part, without disputing how it was procured on His.”¹

¹ *Analogy*, pt. ii. ch. v.

ARTICLE III

De descensu Christi ad inferos. *Of the going down of Christ into hell.*

Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad Inferos descendisse. As Christ died for us, and was buried: so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell.

IN the Confession of Augsburg there was merely a single clause on the descent into hell in the article, *De Filio Dei*, “Item, descendit ad inferos.” Our own Article, as it now stands, is considerably shorter than the corresponding one in the series of 1553. As originally drawn up by Cranmer it went more fully into the explanation of what was meant by the descent into hell, and contained these words: “Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit, quemadmodem testatur Petri locus. At suo ad inferos descensu nullos a carceribus aut tormentis liberavit Christus Dominus.” In this form the Article was signed by the six royal chaplains, but prior to publication the last clause (At suo . . . Dominus) was omitted, and the Article, as published in 1553, stands in the English copy as follows:—

“As Christ died, and was buried for us: so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell. For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection: but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.”

At the revision in Elizabeth's reign the bishops in Convocation struck out the last clause which refers to St. Peter's language,¹ and the Article was thus brought into its present form, in which it simply states the fact of the descent, but attempts no explanation of it, and brings forward no scriptural proof of it. The reason for the alteration is probably to be sought for in the controversies which were agitating the country at the time. The subject is one which has always had a special attraction for many minds, and in the sixteenth century there were many and various theories held concerning it; and the violent controversies which had been raised in some parts of the country are quite sufficient to account for the excision of the allusion to St. Peter's language. The following extract from a paper of Bishop Alley of Exeter, drawn up in preparation for the Convocation of 1553, admirably illustrates the wisdom of the Elizabethan divines in their treatment of this Article:

"First, for matters of Scripture, namely, for this place which is written in the Epistle of S. Peter, that *Christ in Spirit went down to Hell, and preached to the souls that were in Prison*. There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers, one against the other, and also partakers with them; some holding that the going down of Christ, His soul to Hell, was nothing else but the virtue and strength of Christ, His death, to be made manifest and known to them that were dead before. Others say that *Descendit ad inferna* is nothing else but that Christ did sustain upon the

¹ The clause was untouched by Parker in his preliminary revision, and is therefore found in the MS. which the archbishop submitted to the bishops (now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). It is, however, marked in this for excision, a line being drawn through it with the archbishop's red pencil.

cross the infernal pains of hell, when He called *Pater, quare me dereliquisti*, i.e. *Father, why hast Thou forsaken me?* Finally, others preach that this article is not contained in other symbols, neither in the symbol of *Cyprian*, or rather *Rufine*. And all these sayings they ground upon *Erasmus* and the *Germans*, and especially upon the authority of Mr. *Calvin* and Mr. *Bullinger*. The contrary side bring for them the universal consent, and all the Fathers of both churches, both of the *Greeks* and the *Latines*. For of the *Latine* Fathers, they bring in *S. Austin*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Jerom*, *Gregory the Great*, *Cassiodore*, *Sedulius*, *Virgilius*, *Primasius*, *Leo*, with others, as it may appear in the places by them alledged. Of the *Greek* Fathers, they alledge *Chrysostom*, *Eusebius*, *Emissenus*, *Damascen*, *Basil the Great*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Epiphanius*, *Athanasius*, with others. Which all, both *Latines* and *Grecians*, do plainly affirm, *Quod anima Christi fuit vere per se in inferno*, i.e. that the soul of Christ was truly of itself in hell; which they all with one universal consent have assertively written from time to time, by the space of 1100 years, not one of them varying from another.

"Thus, my Right Honourable good Lords, your wisdoms may perceive what tragedies and dissensions may arise for consenting to, or dissenting from this article. Wherefore, your grave, wise, and godly learning might do well and charitably, to set some certainty concerning this doctrine; and chiefly because all dissensions, contentions, and strifes may be removed from the godly affected preachers."¹

¹ Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. p. 348. At an earlier date the subject was causing trouble, for in May 1550 Micronius writes to Bullinger, and tells him that "they are disputing about the descent of Christ into hell" (*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 561). It is also worth noticing that among Parker's books there exists a volume with the following title, *A Treatise concerning the immediate Going to Heaven of the souls of the faithful*

We shall probably not be far wrong if we attribute to this appeal from the Bishop of Exeter the alteration introduced into the Article.¹

Three subjects require to be considered in connection with this Article.

1. The meaning of the word Hell.

fathers before Christ; and that Christ did not descend into Hell, by Christopher Carile. Appended to this is a memorandum: "This book exhibited and delivered the 20th day of August 1563, to the most Reverend Father in God, the Lord Matthu, Archbishop of Cant., by me, Thomas Tailor, etc. . . . the doctrine whereof I neither allow nor approve." See Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ix. p. 510.

Was the dispute, referred to by Micronius, caused by Bishop Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*, which was published in the year 1550! The following extraordinary passage may well have given rise to any amount of discussion:—"I believe also that while He was upon the said cross dying, and giving up His spirit unto God His Father, He descended into hell; that is to say, He did verily taste and feel the great distress and heaviness of death, and likewise the pains and torments of hell, that is to say, the great wrath and severe judgment of God upon Him, even as if God had utterly forsaken Him, yea, as though God had been His extreme enemy; so that He was constrained with loud voice to cry, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' This is simply my understanding of Christ, His descending into hell. And besides, I know well that this article hath not from the beginning been in the creed, and that many others have otherwise both understood and interpreted it; which esteem that Christ verily and indeed descended into hell, to the place of the damned, alleging the text of S. Peter; the which I confess is yet covered and hid from me. The Lord vouchsafe to open the gate unto us, and to give us an entrance into such mysteries."—*Later Writings of Bishop Hooper* (P.S.), p. 30.

¹ Even so the article remained a subject of bitter controversy in some quarters. See Strype's *Parker*, bk. iii. ch. xviii., where there is a notice of a controversy which arose at Cambridge in 1567, "what the true sense of Christ's descent into hell was; whether it were a local descent, as it was then commonly taken, or to be understood in some other meaning. This dispute was managed with so much heat, that it came to the secretary, who was that universities' Chancellor. And he sent unto the archbishop for his advice in this matter; who gave him his thoughts for the better stilling, and composing this difference. But what that was, I find not."

2. The scriptural grounds for the doctrine, and the object of the descent.

3. The history of the doctrine in the Church and of the clause in the creed referring to it.

I. *The Meaning of the word Hell.*

The word used in the Latin of the Article is *Inferi*, which is also used in the Athanasian Creed, and in most of the later copies of the Apostles' Creed. The older ones usually have *Inferna*,¹ a few the singular *Infernum*.² The difference in meaning is but slight. If the distinction of genders is to be pressed, we should have to say that while the neuter referred only to the *place*, the masculine was suggestive of the *persons* to whom He descended; and we actually find that in an Anglo-Saxon Psalter the clause is rendered, "He nither astah to hel-warum"³—*i.e.* to the inhabitants of hell. But it is not clear that any such distinction is intended to be drawn, for the words *Inferi*, *Infernus*, and *Inferna* are apparently used indiscriminately in the Vulgate, as the equivalents of the Hebrew Sheol (שְׁאוֹל) and the Greek Hades (Ἅιδης), while they are never used to represent Gehenna or the place of torment. In order, therefore, to see the meaning of the word Hell in this Article, it is necessary to examine the belief of the Hebrews concerning the invisible world. Sheol occurs more than sixty times in the Old Testament, being in almost every instance rendered in the LXX. by Ἅιδης. The word itself is a "neutral" word,⁴ meaning the under-world or state of the departed in general—the "meeting-place for

¹ So the Creed of Aquileia as given by Rufinus. There is some evidence that this was also the original reading in the Athanasian Creed.

² The singular is found in the Creed of Venantius Fortunatus.

³ Lambeth Library, No. 427, of the ninth century.

⁴ The word שְׁאוֹל is softened from שָׁוַע, a root meaning to be hollow.

all living" (Job xxx. 23), where were the souls of the righteous, Jacob (Gen. xxxvii. 35), Samuel (1 Sam. xxviii. 15),¹ David (2 Sam. xii. 23), as well as tyrants such as the King of Babylon (Isa. xiii. 9). In course of time, as Jewish belief developed, and the hope of a future life became clearer, it was recognised that there was a difference in the condition of the souls of the departed in the under-world, though there are but the faintest traces of this in the canonical books of the Old Testament.² Our "main pre-Christian authority" for the belief of the Jews, shortly before the days of our Lord's ministry, is the Book of Enoch, dating from the first and second centuries, B.C. In this we read of a vision shown to Enoch by an angel, who showed him "beautiful places intended for this, that upon these may be assembled the spirits, the souls of the dead."³ These are the resting-places of the souls of the just, and elsewhere we read of a Garden of Righteousness and Garden of Life,⁴ which "appears to be the prototype of what was afterwards known as the Garden of Eden, or Paradise," though its "relation to the abodes just described is not distinctly indicated."⁵ Enoch is also shown other places not far from the abodes of the righteous, where the souls of the wicked are separated in great affliction until the great day of judgment.⁶ While later on he is granted a vision of a "cursed valley" which "is for those who will be cursed to eternity,"⁷ namely, the valley of Hinnóm, better known in this connection in the Græcised form of the word, Gehenna (= גֵּהֶנְנוֹם).⁸

¹ שָׁמַיִם is not actually mentioned in this passage, but Josephus definitely speaks of "Αἰθέρας as the place from which the soul of Samuel was evoked. *Antiq.* VI. xiv. § 2.

² See on the whole subject R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (1899).

³ Book of Enoch, ch. xxii.

⁴ Ch. xxxii. lx. lxi. lxxvii.

⁵ Driver's *Sermons on the Old Testament*, p. 79.

⁶ Ch. xxii.

⁷ Ch. xxvii.

⁸ גֵּהֶנְנוֹם is used frequently in the Targums and the Talmud, e.g. Pirque

Sheol, then, according to the belief of the Jews, is the place where the souls of the departed await their final judgment, and is divided into two parts, in one of which are the souls of the faithful in peace and rest, in the other the souls of sinners, already in torment, though apparently not yet in Gehenna. And this is the belief which seems to have the direct sanction of the New Testament. Thus our Lord promises to the penitent thief that he shall be with Him "to-day in Paradise" (= the garden of Eden, S. Luke xxiii. 43); and in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Lazarus is carried by the angels to "Abraham's bosom," seemingly another name for Paradise,¹ while Dives is described as being "in Hades," and "in torments" (S. Luke xvi. 22, 23). To Sheol or Hades, then, the English word Hell² in this Article corresponds, and like the Hebrew word it is a "neutral" term, in itself conveying no notion of the condition of the spirits detained in it, whether it be one of blessedness or the reverse. Both the Greek and Latin terms, Hades and Inferi, are entirely free from the associations which have unfortunately grown up round our English word Hell, owing to the unfortunate accident that it has been adopted as the translation for Gehenna.³

Aboth v. 29, where גֵּהֶנְנוֹם also occurs. See Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, div. ii. vol. ii. p. 183, and cf. Charles, *op. cit.* p. 188, etc.

¹ See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on S. Luke xvi., where instances are quoted of the use of this term by Jewish writers.

² Hell comes from the Anglo-Saxon *Helan* (German, *Hüllen*), to cover. It is, therefore, the unseen and covered place. "It is properly used both in the Old and New Testament to render the Hebrew word in the one and the Greek word in the other, which describe the invisible mansions of the disembodied souls, without any reference to sufferings."—Bishop Horsley's *Works*, vol. ii. Sermon. 20.

³ Hell is in the Authorised Version used as the translation of γέεννα in S. Matt. v. 22, 29, 30, x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33; S. Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; S. Luke xii. 5; S. James iii. 6. It represents "Αἰθέρας in S. Matt. xi. 23, xvi. 18; S. Luke x. 15, xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 55 (marg.); Rev. i. 18, iii. 7, vi. 8, xx. 13, 14.

as well as Hades, and thus denotes definitely the place of torments, as well as the intermediate state.

II. *The Scriptural Grounds for the Doctrine and the Object of the Descent.*

The passages of Scripture which require to be considered in connection with the subject of our Lord's descent into hell are four in number: (a) St. Luke xxiii. 43; (b) Acts ii. 24-31, including the quotation of Ps. xvi. 10; (c) Eph. iv. 9; and (d) 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6.

(a) St. Luke xxiii. 43. This verse gives us our Lord's promise to the penitent thief, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise." The words assume and sanction the current belief that Paradise, or the Garden of Eden, was the part of that unseen region to which the name of Sheol was given, in which the souls of the faithful departed were preserved. And thus the passage appeals to us with the weight of a direct statement from our Lord Himself that after His death He would pass into the region of departed souls, i.e. would "descend into hell."

It would seem, then, that on scriptural grounds, and apart from all historical considerations, we are justified in referring to these words in connection with the descent into hell. But it does not appear that they were ever appealed to by the Fathers as proof or illustration of the fact of the descent, and those who first inserted the clause into the creed can hardly be supposed to have had in view the promise to the penitent thief. Although it would seem that Jewish belief inclined to the inclusion of Paradise in Sheol, or Hades, yet some of the Christian Fathers, as Tertullian,¹ expressly distinguish between the

¹ Tertullian (*De Anima*, 55) mentions a treatise that he had written, *De Paradiso*, in which he says that he had proved "omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini." He carefully distinguishes between

two; and the general opinion among them, to which the clause in the creed must have been intended to give expression, most certainly was that Christ descended into some region which they never speak of as Paradise, where were the souls of the faithful who had died under the Old Covenant, that He announced to them the accomplishment of His work of redemption, and then transferred them to Paradise. Something more will have to be said on this subject later on. For the present we pass on to the consideration of the next passage of Scripture alleged as proof of the doctrine.

(b) Acts ii. 24-31. In these verses S. Peter quotes and applies the language of David in Psalm xvi.: "I beheld the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope: because Thou wilt not

Paradise and Inferi, holding that the martyrs, and they alone, go direct to Paradise. All others, including the souls of the faithful generally, are *apud inferos*. But this region is divided into two parts, "Sinus Abrahamæ" (which is thus distinguished from Paradise), and the place assigned to the wicked. The patriarchs and prophets were *apud inferos*, and to them Christ descended to make them *compotes sui*. Cf. *Adv. Marcion*. iv. 34. In *Apol.* 47, Paradise is the place of heavenly bliss, appointed to receive the spirits of the saints, apparently after the last judgment. Irenæus (V. xxxi.) has much about the "place where the souls of the dead were," the "invisible place allotted by God," where souls "remain till the resurrection," but nowhere identifies it with Paradise. According to Origen there is an upper and a lower Paradise. To the lower one (= Abraham's bosom) go the souls of the righteous, and thither Christ transferred the souls of the patriarchs and prophets. See *hom. in Num.* xxvi. 4, and *hom. ii. in 1 Reg.* In Augustine, *De Genesi ad Literam*, bk. xii. ch. xxxiii, the reader will find a very interesting discussion of the meaning of the terms Inferi, Sinus Abrahamæ, and Paradise. Augustine admits that the place where the souls of the just are is sometimes called Inferi, but points out that Lazarus is not said to be *apud inferos*, whereas Dives is. Cf. also *Ep. ad Dardanum*, clxxxvii., where Augustine admits that the explanation of our Lord's saying to the penitent thief, which refers it to the descent into hell, is a possible one, though, as he thinks, involving considerable difficulties.

leave my soul in Hades (*εἰς ᾗδην*), neither wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou madest known unto me the ways of life; Thou shalt make me full of gladness with Thy countenance." These words, the apostle proceeds to show, received no adequate fulfilment in the person of David. They could not, therefore, find their ultimate realisation in his experience. "He both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day." They look forward beyond the life and death of the patriarch, and find their complete realisation in the person of the Messiah. David, "being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins He would set one upon his throne, he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was He left in Hades (*εἰς ᾗδην*) nor did His flesh see corruption." The witness of this passage to the *fact* of the descent is equally clear with that of the one previously cited, though it says nothing of the *object* of the descent, or of the nature of the region visited.

(c) Eph. iv. 9: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth (*εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*, Vulg. *in inferiores partes terræ*)? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things."

This passage cannot be appealed to without some hesitation, for the interpretation of it is not absolutely certain. Two different views have been taken of its meaning. *First*, that which takes it of the descent into hell; a view which finds large support among both ancient and modern commentators, and which can claim in its favour the use of the term *τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς* in the LXX. rendering of Psalm lxii. (lxiii) 10, and of the kindred phrase *ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτω (κατωτάτοις, & ART) τῆς*

γῆς in cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 15. Indeed, as Bishop Pearson says, "This exposition must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it." But though it is the most probable, yet it is not the only possible interpretation of the apostle's words; for, *secondly*, they may be taken as contrasting the *earth beneath* with the *heaven above*, and thus allude not to the *descensus in inferna*, but simply to the fact of the Incarnation, when Christ "came down" or "descended into" the earth beneath.¹

(d) The last passage to be considered brings us face to face with the whole question of the *object* of the descent. Were it not for the language of S. Peter in his First Epistle (1 Pet. iii. 18-iv. 6) there would be no grounds for looking for any further object of the descent into hell than this: that Christ might fulfil the conditions of *death* as really and truly as of *life*. If Hell or Hades merely means the unseen world of departed spirits, then death in the case of every human being, consisting as it does of the separation of the soul and body, *ipso facto* involves a "descent into hell" on the part of everyone who is subject to it. If, then, our Lord really died upon the cross, it was a necessity that His human soul should pass into the world of spirits, and "descend into hell." "Christ in dying shared to the full our lot. His body was laid in the tomb. His soul passed into that state on which we conceive that our souls shall enter. He has won for God, and hallowed every condition of human existence. We cannot be where He has not been. He bore our nature as living; he bore our nature as dead."² This, then, namely, to fulfil the conditions of death, may

¹ For a full discussion of this passage see the Commentaries of Meyer and Ellicott, *in loc.* Both these writers decide in favour of its reference to the descent into hell.

² Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 76.

unhesitatingly be set down as one object of the descent. It remains to consider whether the language of S. Peter compels us to maintain that there was a yet further object of it, namely, the preaching of the gospel to them who were sometime disobedient.

1 Pet. iii. 18 *seq.*: "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit (*θανατωθείς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιήθεις δὲ πνεύματι*): in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison (*ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν*), which aforetime were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. . . . [ch. iv. 6] For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit (*εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι*)."

It has been already mentioned that the direct reference to this passage was struck out of the Article in its passage through Convocation in 1563, owing to the controversies which were then agitating the country. But although there was manifested an unwillingness to bind a particular interpretation of what is confessedly a very difficult passage upon the consciences of the clergy, yet the judgment of the English Church as to the meaning of S. Peter's words is not obscurely indicated by the retention of the passage as the epistle for Easter Eve, an occasion for which it is obviously appropriate only if it be taken as referring to the descent into hell.

In the early Church it would appear that there was no doubt whatever concerning the reference of the apostle's words. The first writer who directly connects the passage with the descent is believed to be Clement of

Alexandria. In this he is followed by Origen.¹ Nor is there a trace of any other interpretation till the days of Augustine. He, however, in a letter to Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, enters fully into the exegesis of the words, and concludes his discussion by deciding that they have nothing whatever to do with the descent into hell, but refer to the teaching of Christ—in the spirit not in the flesh—to the unbelieving in the days of Noah.² Augustine's authority was naturally of great weight in the Western Church. His view on this subject is adopted by Bede, by S. Thomas Aquinas,³ and, as might be expected, found favour with many of the Reformers; and it must be admitted that "the dominant exegesis of 1 Pet. iii. 19, among the English theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has been that which disconnects it altogether from the descent into Hades."⁴

In spite, however, of this, there is little doubt that Augustine and those who followed his lead in this matter are wrong. They have often failed to see clearly the distinction between Hades and Gehenna, and have sometimes been misled by the erroneous reading, *τῷ πνεύματι*, as, for instance, was Bishop Pearson, who interprets the clause not of the human soul of Christ, but of the power of His Divinity; an explanation which can hardly be maintained when the definite article is deleted, for the phrase *θανατωθείς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθείς δὲ πνεύματι* can point

¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, VI. vi.; Origen, *In Matt.* 132.

² The whole letter (No. clxiv.) is worth careful study. "The spirits in prison" are explained by Augustine as "souls which were at the time still in the bodies of men, and which being shut up in the darkness of ignorance were, so to speak, 'in prison'—a prison such as that from which the Psalmist sought deliverance in the prayer, 'Bring my soul out of prison that I may praise Thy name.'"

³ *Summa*, 3a Q. 52, 2, 3m.

⁴ Plumtre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 97.

to nothing but the contrast between flesh and spirit,¹ or (as the terms are popularly used) body and soul. Taking the words of the apostle, then, as they stand, it would appear that they speak directly of what happened after the death of Christ. "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened (*i.e.* endowed with a new power of life) in the spirit" He "went and preached to the spirits in prison." The spirits to whom the announcement was made are further described as those "which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." If the interpretation here given be correct, these words definitely teach us that *the* or at any rate *an* object of the descent was the proclamation of the gospel to that generation which had been cut off by the flood. Two questions immediately present themselves: (1) What was the effect of the preaching, *i.e.* did it bring about any alteration in the condition of those to whom it was made? and (2) Was it confined to the generation actually specified by S. Peter, or were its benefits (if any) extended to others also?

1. With regard to the first of these questions, it has been pointed out that the word used by the apostle is *ἐκήρυξε*, proclaimed as a herald. Hence it has been inferred that the preaching was "a mere proclamation 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."² This view is unsatisfactory for two reasons—*first*, the words of Scripture cannot be said to imply that the recipients of the preaching had "already repented when on earth." S. Peter speaks of them as having been "aforetime disobedient," but says not one word of any

¹ Cf. Rom. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

² Bishop Browne on *The Articles*, p. 96.

subsequent repentance; *secondly*, 1 Pet. iii. 19 does not stand alone. It cannot be fairly isolated or considered apart from ch. iv. 6, which speaks of the gospel being preached—using the word *εὐαγγελίζω* *not* *κηρύσσειν*—to the dead (*νεκροῖς*), and states further the object of the preaching: "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."¹ These words are admittedly difficult, but they certainly seem to imply that the preaching was attended with some beneficial result. On the whole, the best interpretation of them appears to be that which takes the first clause immediately following *ἵνα* (that they might be judged, etc.) as a subordinate one, of the state which the *εὐαγγελισθη* left remaining, and thus makes the last words "that they might live, etc.," as the true result and end of the preaching.² But whatever be the details of interpretation, the passage as a whole is surely a sufficient warrant for holding (*a*) that there was a *second* object of the descent into hell, namely, to preach to the spirits in prison; and (*b*) that this preaching of the gospel to the dead was in some way instrumental in changing their condition for the better.

If this view be correct it follows that the descent into hell should be regarded not only as the *last* step in the humiliation of Christ, but also as the first step in His triumph. It witnessed the initial fulfilment of that acknowledgment of Him, of which S. Paul speaks in Phil. ii. 10, "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth (*καταχθονίων*), and that every tongue

¹ It is remarkable that neither Horsley in his celebrated sermon on 1 Pet. iii. 19 (*Works*, vol. ii. Sermon. 20) nor Bishop Browne (*On the Thirty-Nine Articles*) makes the slightest allusion to this text.

² Cf. Alford, *in loc.*; the construction may be illustrated by Rom. vi. 17, viii. 10. See also on the whole passage C. Bigg in the *International Critical Commentary*.

should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," where it should be noticed that the word used for "things under the earth" is rendered in the Vulgate, *Inferna*, which, as we have already seen, is one of the terms most frequently employed to describe the place to which Christ "descended" after His death.

2. The second question, Was the preaching confined to the generation specified by S. Peter, or were its benefits extended to others as well, is one to which it is perhaps impossible to return a definite and certain answer. One generation, and one generation alone, is specified by the apostle; and that just the generation of which it might be said that it received exceptional treatment on earth. It may, therefore, have been the subject of a special extension of mercy in the unseen world of Hades. But, as will be shown immediately, there is an extraordinarily strong tradition among the Fathers that Christ descended to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Dispensation, and preached to them, and bettered their condition. There is no other passage of Holy Scripture from which such a tradition can have originated; and it would therefore seem that the Fathers took it that those mentioned by S. Peter were but specimens, so to speak, of a class—of those, that is, who had lived and died under the Old Covenant. It *may* be so. But this is all that can be said. Where Scripture is silent, such an inference must be more or less precarious, and though the opinion may appear a probable one, it can only be held (if at all) as a "pious opinion," which cannot be pressed upon any as a part of the faith. In any case, it would be rash in the extreme to infer from this passage the possibility of an extension of the day of grace, or an opportunity of repentance beyond the grave, for Christians, whose case is wholly different. It cannot be said that the apostle's words afford the slightest grounds for

expecting a second offer of salvation to any of those who have slighted or misused God's revelation made "in His Son."

III. *The History of the Doctrine in the Church, and of the clause in the Creed referring to it.*

Although the clause "He descended into hell," has never formed part of the creed of the Eastern Church, and only made its way into that of the West in comparatively late times, it is remarkable how prominent a position the fact of the descent occupied in the belief of the early Christians, and how very general was the belief that it was instrumental in changing for the better the condition of the faithful who had died before the coming of Christ. It meets us from the very first. Ignatius (A.D. 115), in his *Epistle to the Magnesians*, speaks of it: "Even the prophets, being His disciples, were expecting Him as their teacher, through the Spirit. And for this cause He, whom they rightly awaited, when He came, raised them from the dead."¹ Justin Martyr (140) and Irenæus (180) both quote the following passage as from Jeremiah or Isaiah, and apply it to the descent into hell. "The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and descended to preach to them His own salvation."² Irenæus also quotes a certain presbyter "who had heard it from those who had seen the apostles and from those who had been their disciples,"

¹ Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* ch. ix.

² Justin Martyr's *Dial. with Trypho*, ch. lxxii. Justin Martyr here (probably without sufficient justification) accuses the Jews of having cut out the passage from the sayings of Jeremiah. There is no trace of any such words in existing copies of the LXX. Irenæus says nothing of any such charge against the Jews, but cites the passage several times; in III. xxii. as from Isaiah, in IV. xxxvi. as from Jeremiah, and in IV. lv., without giving the name of the author.

as having said that the Lord "descended in *ca quæ sunt sub terra*, preaching His advent there also, and declaring remission of sins received by those who believe in Him. But all those believed in Him, whose hope was set on Him—that is, who foretold His advent and submitted to His dispensations, just men and prophets and patriarchs, etc."¹ Similarly, Tertullian (200) says that Christ "in Hades (*apud inferos*) underwent the law of human death, nor did He ascend to the heights of heaven, until He descended to the lower parts of the earth (*in inferiora terrarum*) that there He might make patriarchs and prophets sharers of His life (*compotes sui*)."² To a still earlier date, perhaps,³ belongs the recently discovered fragment of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, which refers to the descent into hell in the following words:—"They see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven; but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Thou didst preach (*ἐκήρυξας*) to them that sleep; and a response was heard from the cross, yea." It would be easy to multiply quotations from later Fathers. References to some of them are appended in a note.⁴ But those just

¹ Irenæus, IV. xlii.

² *De Anima*, ch. 55.

³ "About A.D. 165." See Swete, *Gospel of Peter*, p. xlv. The passage quoted in the text occurs in ch. ix.

⁴ The descent into hell is a prominent feature in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, which perhaps dates from the second century (ch. xxxi.-xvii.). The doctrine was accepted by the heretic Marcion (see Irenæus, I. xxv.). It also appears in the apocryphal correspondence between Abgar of Edessar and our Lord, preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* I. xiii. Of the third century the following Christian Fathers among others refer to it:—Hippolytus, *De Antichristo*, 45; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, vi. 6; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 43; cf. in *Lucam*, Hom. iv.; in *Joann.* ii. 30; Cyprian, *Testim. adv. Jud.* ii. ch. xxiv. In the fourth century reference may be made to Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* iv. 11; xiv. 18, 19. Athanasius, *Orat. contr. Arian.* iii. 23, 29; *Epist. ad Epict.* 6; Hilary of

cited from writers of the second century are sufficient to establish the early and widespread belief of the Church in the fact of the descent into hell. They also give evidence of the belief that the descent brought with it some benefit to those of the Old Covenant to whom Christ preached.

Turning now to the creeds of the Church it is to be noticed that the clause, "He descended into hell," is not found in a single Eastern one. It is therefore wanting in the Nicene Creed. Nor is it to be found in the earlier creeds of the West. The first creed of any kind to contain the clause is that which was apparently drawn up at Sirmium and accepted at Ariminum in 359. This creed, although a Latin one, is only known to us through the Greek translation of it preserved by Socrates in his *Ecclesiastical History* (bk. ii. ch. xxxvii.). In it we find the words: "Was crucified and died and descended into hell (*εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα*), and disposed matters there; at the sight of whom the door-keepers of Hades (*πυλωροὶ ἄδου*) trembled."¹ It has been suggested with some probability that the clause may have been thus prominently placed in this creed "the more effectually to blind the eyes of the orthodox."² The fact of the descent was important in connection with the views which were afterwards developed into the Apollinarian heresy. If admitted, it was a direct proof of the existence of the human soul in Christ, for this alone could have been the subject of the descent. It may be, therefore, that the

of Poitiers, *Tract. in Ps.* cxxxviii. 22; Basil, *In Ps.* xlvi. 9; Ambrose, *De Ecc. Fratris.* ii. 103. At the close of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth century there are allusions in Jerome, *In Dan.* ch. iii.; *In Esai.* bk. vi. ch. xiv., *In Ezech.* bk. iii. ch. xii., *In Osee*, bk. iii. ch. xiii.; Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, xii. 53, *Epist. ad Evod.*; and, later, see Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. Pasch.* xx.

¹ The last phrase is clearly suggested by the LXX. in Job. xxxviii. 17, *πυλωροὶ δὲ ἄδου ἰδόντες σε ἐπτήξαν.*

² Cf. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 134.

Arians hoped that by this ostentatious profession of a belief, which by implication overthrew their own heretical denial of the human soul in Christ, they might draw off attention from their inadequate statements on the real point at issue between them and the orthodox party, and thus secure the acceptance of their creed. However this may be, the occurrence of the clause in this creed of theirs is to be noticed as being historically its first appearance in any formal creed of any sort. Some forty years later we meet with it for the first time in a *Baptismal* creed, namely, in that of the Church of Aquileia, in which it occurs in the form, *descendit in inferna*. Our knowledge of this is due to Rufinus (A.D. 400), who expressly informs us that at that time the clause was not in the creed of the Church of Rome.¹ We come across it next in the creed given by Venantius Fortunatus (570), which is clearly based on the Aquileian Creed of Rufinus. Here it is given in the form, *descendit ad infernum*.² The plural (*inferna*) is found in the form given in the Gallican service books.³ In Spain it is met with in the creed given by Ildefonsus of Toledo, and Etherius and Beatus in the seventh and eighth centuries (*descendit ad inferna*),⁴ although it is wanting in the creed given in the printed Mozarabic Missal.⁵ In Ireland it is found in the creed contained in the Bangor Antiphonary, which dates from the seventh century (680–691).⁶ Here it occurs

¹ Rufinus, *In Symb.* 18. Dr. Swete thinks that the clause cannot have been of recent introduction in the days of Rufinus, and is inclined to assign it to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, as a protest against the Docetic heresy. See his work on *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 61.

² Expos. xi.

³ "Missale Gallicanum," *Migne*, vol. lxxii. p. 349. "Sacramentarium Gallicanum," *ibid.* p. 489.

⁴ See Hahn, *Bibl. der Symbole*, p. 66.

⁵ *Migne*, vol. lxxxv., p. 395.

⁶ *The Antiphonary of Bangor*, fol. 19 (H. Bradshaw Soc.)

perhaps for the first time in the form *descendit ad inferos*; and after this it is generally met with in one or other of its forms.

NOTE.—It has not been thought necessary in considering this Article to say anything of the various interpretations which have sometimes been put upon the words, but which really evacuate them of their plain meaning, e.g. that of Durandus, which explains them of a "virtual motion and efficacious presence," or that of Calvin, that the descent into hell consisted in suffering the torments of Gehenna. A refutation of these and some other strange and fanciful interpretations may be found in Pearson's work *On the Creed*. But at the same time it may be well to warn the readers that in his section on this article of the creed Pearson has written "less lucidly than is his wont." (1) He begins with an erroneous statement concerning the Creed of Aquileia, in which he asserts (contrary to fact) that the word *sepultus* was wanting. Rufinus clearly shows that it contained both *sepultus* and *descendit in inferna*. (2) He mistakes the meaning of Rufinus, from whose language he infers that "the first intention of putting these words in the creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour," whereas all that Rufinus intends to say is that the clause *sepultus* in the Roman and Oriental Creeds includes the notion of the descent of the soul into Hades, as well as the committal of the body to the grave. (3) He is misled by the erroneous reading, τῷ πνεύματι, in 1 Pet. iii. 18, and gives what can only be called a forced and non-natural interpretation of the whole passage, denying its reference to the descent into hell at all. (4) He nowhere distinguishes clearly between Hades and Gehenna, and ends by confusing the two, and directly asserting that Christ descended into Gehenna. "By the descent into hell, all

those which believe in Him are secured from descending thither. He went into those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there." An excellent study of the whole subject of this article may be found in Dean Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, No. iii. See also C. Clemen's *Niedergefahren zu den Toten* (1900).

ARTICLE IV

De Resurrectione Christi.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

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

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

THIS Article has remained practically unchanged since the publication of the Edwardian series in 1553.¹ Its language differs considerably from that of the corresponding Article in the Confession of Augsburg, as well as from that in the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which was taken almost word for word from the Third Article of that formulary.² The emphatic assertion of the *truth* of the resurrection and of the *reality* of the human nature of the risen Lord indicates that the special object of the Article was to guard against the Docetic views adopted

¹ In 1553 and 1563 the title in the Latin was "Resurrectio Christi," for which "De resurrectione Christi" was substituted in 1571 as harmonising better with the English. In the last clause the word "all" appears for the first time in the *English* edition published in 1563. The corresponding word *omnes* in the Latin found in modern texts is wanting not only in the published editions of 1553 and 1563, but also in that of 1571 by John Daye, *auctoritate serenissimæ reginæ*.

² "Item descendit ad inferos et vere surrexit tertia die, deinde ascendit ad cælos, ut sedeat ad dexteram Patris, et perpetuo regnet et dominetur omnibus creaturis, sanctificet credentes in ipsum, misso in corde eorum Spiritu Sancto, qui regat, consoletur, ac vivificet eos, ac defendat adversus Diabolum et vim peccati. Item Christus palam est rediturus ut judicet vivos et mortuos etc. juxta symbolum apostolorum. Article III. of 1538. Cf. *Conf. August.* Art. iii. "De Filio Dei."

by some of the Anabaptists, which was associated with a further error as to the nature of the risen body, practically amounting to a denial of the existence of the humanity of Christ since the resurrection. This error is described and condemned in the following passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which illustrates the meaning and shows the intention of this article.

“Circa duplicem Christi naturam perniciosus est et varius error: ex quibus alii sunt ex Arianorum secta, Christum ita ponentes hominem ut Deum negent. Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cœlo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam præterfluxerit. *Quidam verbum in carnis naturam conversum asserunt, quam, quamprimum a morte in cœlum fuit recepta, rursus volunt in naturam divinam reversam et absorptam esse.* Quorum illi delirium imitantur, qui corpori Christi tam latos fines dant, ut illo credant aut omnes locos simul, aut innumeros obsideri. Quod si confiteremur, humanam e Christo naturam eximeremus. Quemadmodum enim Dei natura sibi hoc assumit, ut per omnia permeet, sic humanæ semper illud attributum est, ut certis locorum finibus circumscripta sit. *Quidam corpus ipsum sæpe dicunt, et subinde factum esse. Qui errores omnes Sacrarum Scripturarum autoritate sic corrigendi sunt, ut Christus meliore natura Deus sempiternus accipiatur, et quidem æqualis sit Dei Patris; humana vero corpus habeat ex tempore factum, neque sæpius quam semel, neque ex alia materia quam ex Mariæ virginis vera et sola substantia ac quemadmodum reliqua humana corpora suis loci finibus circumscriptum.*”¹

This extract—and particularly the portion of it in italics—makes it quite clear that when this Article was

¹ *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, “De Hæres.” ch. 5.

first drawn up there was much erroneous teaching on the nature of our Lord's humanity, and that there was in some quarters an inclination to deny that after the resurrection it continued to be in any sense true human nature. Hence the need for this Article asserting not only that Christ *truly* arose, but also that He took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended, etc.”

The three principal subjects which require consideration are the following:—

1. The resurrection of Christ.
2. The ascension and session (at the right hand of the Father).
3. The return to judgment.

I. *The Resurrection of Christ.*

The Article is concerned with this simply as an historical fact. Questions, therefore, of its significance, its bearing upon our Lord's claims, its position as the central fact round which other doctrines group themselves, its witness to our acceptance with God, its revelation of the unseen world and our relation to it—important as all these are—do not directly come before us here.¹ The points to be considered in connection with the statements of the Article are two—

- (a) The evidence for the fact of the resurrection; and
- (b) The nature of the resurrection body.

(a) *The evidence for the fact of the resurrection.* In the forefront must always be placed the witness of S. Paul. His epistles were all—or nearly all—written some time before the gospel narratives were committed to writing. Doubts have, it is true, been freely cast

¹ Reference may be made on all these subjects to Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, or Milligan's *Lectures on the Resurrection*.

on the genuineness of some of them. But all except the most sceptical of critics will admit that First and Second Corinthians, Romans and Galatians, were written between the years A.D. 52 and 60, by the apostle whose name they bear. And these epistles alone are amply sufficient to prove not merely that the fact of the resurrection was believed in by the whole Church at the time when they were written, but that the belief in it grew up at the time of the alleged event, on the spot, and that the Church was immediately reconstructed on the basis of the resurrection. The most striking passage of all is that in 1 Cor. xv., where S. Paul enumerates the appearances of the risen Jesus, and stakes everything on the truth of the resurrection. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ." But apart from this the belief is bound up with the apostle's whole life, and underlies his whole teaching. There is scarcely an epistle in which he does not allude to it. "The literal fact of the resurrection is the implied and acknowledged groundwork of the apostle's teaching."¹ S. Paul's conversion is generally dated A.D. 35 or 36. The crucifixion probably took place in A.D. 30. Thus we see from the witness of S. Paul that, within six years of the alleged event, the belief in it was universally held by Christians, for the witness of his epistles is of such a character as entirely to exclude the notion that the belief can have grown up or come to be widely accepted after his conversion. The belief is thus pushed back to an earlier date, which leaves no time for the gradual growth of legend or myth.

¹ Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 105. The only epistles of S. Paul in which there is no direct reference to the resurrection are Second Thessalonians, Titus, and Philemon.

Next to the witness of the Apostle of the Gentiles may be placed that of the Apostle of the Circumcision. S. Peter's First Epistle begins with the doctrine of "the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. i. 3), which is referred to as a known and acknowledged fact again in ch. i. 21 and iii. 21.

Reference may also be made to the early preaching of the apostles as preserved in the Acts of the Apostles. The tendency of modern criticism is on the whole to confirm more and more S. Luke's accuracy as an historian, and we cannot doubt that in these early chapters we have a faithful representation of the history of the first days of the Christian Church, and of the character of the apostolic preaching. We find, then, not only that Matthias was elected at S. Peter's suggestion, in the place of the traitor Judas, to be "a witness of the resurrection" (Acts i. 22), but that the literal fact of the resurrection occupies the foremost position in S. Peter's own speeches on the day of Pentecost (ii. 24-36); in Solomon's Porch (iii. 15; cf. iv. 33); before the Council (v. 30); and in the house of Cornelius (x. 40).

The evidence, thus summarised, is independent of that in the Gospels. Much, if not all of it, would still remain, even if they could be shown to be comparatively late compilations. But the fact that there is such a wealth of testimony to the truth of the resurrection affords a striking confirmation of the veracity of the evangelists' accounts of it. The fact is, of course, stated by all four evangelists. On some details their narratives may be hard to harmonise, but on the main fact their witness is clear and precise, and leaves no room for doubt that they at least believed the resurrection as a true and literal fact. "Indeed," says Bishop Westcott, "taking all the evidence together, it is not too much to say that there is no single historic incident better or more variously

supported than the resurrection of Christ. Nothing but the antecedent assumption that it must be false could have suggested the idea of deficiency in the proof of it."¹

One minor point deserves a brief notice before leaving the subject of the witness of Scripture to the resurrection. It will be observed that the Article asserts that "Christ did truly *arise*." It is sometimes stated that this is not the way in which the fact is represented in Scripture, as there the action is ascribed to the Father, who is said to have *raised* Christ from the dead. Certainly, it is true that in the vast majority of instances the Father is spoken of as the agent, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ is regarded as an awakening effected by His power (see Acts iii. 15, iv. 10, v. 30, x. 40; Rom. iv. 24, viii. 11, etc.). But there are other passages in which it is spoken of definitely as a rising again on the part of the Son.² In S. John ii. 19 our Lord Himself says distinctly "of the temple of His body" "I will raise it up," while in x. 18 He expressly asserts His right not only to "lay down" His life, but to "take it again." And if He could thus claim the action as His own, it will surely be felt that no further justification is required for the use of the active voice "arise" in this Article as in the creeds of the Church.³

(b) *The nature of the resurrection body.*—The state-

¹ *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 133. Fuller consideration of the evidence of the resurrection is not attempted here, because it seems to belong more properly to the subject of Christian evidences. For a careful statement of it, and a criticism of the theory of visions, reference may be made to Row's *Bampton Lectures*, vi. and vii.

² Cf. Westcott on S. John ii. 22.

³ In the Western Creeds the word used is always *resurrexit*. In those of the East it is as regularly *ἀναστάντα*. *Ἐγέρθη*, the passive, is the word more commonly used in Scripture, but *ἀναστῆναι* and *ἀπέστη* occur in S. Mark viii. 31, ix. 9, xvi. 9; S. Luke xxiv. 7, 46; S. John xx. 9; Acts x. 41, xvii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 14.

ment of the Article that **Christ . . . took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature**, is one which very closely follows the language of Holy Scripture. That it was the crucified body which our Lord took again is plainly taught by the evangelists. It still bore the marks of the passion, for "He showed unto them His hands and His side" (S. John xx. 20). The reality of His body is evidenced by the fact that He ate before the disciples (S. Luke xxiv. 43; cf. Acts x. 41). When "they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit," He reassures them with the words, "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" (St. Luke xxiv. 36-40). All these passages mark very clearly the reality and identity of the resurrection body. Yet there are other passages which indicate with equal clearness that a change has passed over it. It was the same, and yet different. The body has not been left in the grave, but it has been transfigured and endowed with new powers. He appears in their midst when "the doors were shut" (S. John xx. 19). He vanishes out of the sight of the two at Emmaus as suddenly and mysteriously as He appears in the midst of the ten (S. Luke xxiv. 31). And finally, in the last scene on the Mount of Olives, "as they were looking He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight" (Acts i. 10). Thus are taught the two lessons of the *reality* of the resurrection body, and its *glorification*. "There is sown a natural body; there is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 44). Of the actual nature of the resurrection body we know but little, and that little is drawn entirely from the statements of Scripture. It is perhaps impossible for us in our present condition to form any distinct conception of it, or to understand the

laws which regulate its presence and action. We can do little more than note the indications of its nature to be found in Holy Scripture. And the passages referred to above make it perfectly clear that while personal identity is preserved and bodily structure remains, yet its presence and appearance is governed by laws which are entirely different from those to which the "natural body" is subject. It is a glorified, and a "spiritual" body. Further, S. Paul expressly tells us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 50), in connection with which statement we cannot fail to see a deep significance in the fact that when our Lord would describe His risen body to the disciples He speaks of it not in the familiar phrase "flesh and blood," but makes use of the unique expression "flesh and bones" (S. Luke xxiv. 39). This language is carefully repeated in our own Article ("took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature"), and without venturing to assert that the resurrection body was bloodless, we may safely say that the unique phrase employed by our Lord was designedly chosen to convey a different idea from the ordinary term "flesh and blood." This latter expression occurs in S. Matthew xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14. In the last of these passages it is used of our Lord's incarnate life before the crucifixion. "Since the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same." It is here used to denote that He took upon Him man's nature *under its present conditions*,¹ "flesh and blood" being, as will be

¹ See Bishop Westcott's notes on the passage, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 52, where it is pointed out that by the use of the phrase *αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ* "stress is laid on the element which is the symbol of life as subject to corruption."

seen from the other passages where it occurs, a term with earthly associations connected with it, suggestive rather of the lower animal life than of the higher spiritual existence. "Flesh and bones" is altogether a nobler expression. Its meaning may be gathered from such passages as Gen. ii. 23, xxix. 14; Judges ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 12, 13. These may suggest that it denotes "community, kinship, close personal union and relationship"; and thus it is indicative of the change that has passed over the body of the risen Saviour, that though in His incarnate life before the crucifixion He "partook" of "flesh and blood," yet after the resurrection He claims not this, but "flesh and bones." He would teach His disciples that He was not formless spirit. But to have said that He was "flesh and blood" would have misled them into the idea that He was exactly what He had been. He therefore says that He has "flesh and bones," in proof that, while He had undergone a change, that change still left Him truly human.¹

II. *The Ascension and Session (at the Right Hand of the Father).*

(a) The fact of the Ascension, though clearly stated, has comparatively little stress laid upon it in Holy Scripture. Of the four evangelists, neither S. Matthew nor S. John relate it, although the latter has preserved words of our Lord which directly refer to it, and so may be said to assume it as a well-known fact (See S. John iii. 13, vi. 62; xx. 17). It is just mentioned—but nothing more—at the close of S. Mark's Gospel, in the section the authorship of which is disputed (S. Mark xvi. 19). In St. Luke's Gospel, accord-

¹ Milligan *On the Resurrection*, p. 242. The whole note is suggestive, and on the nature of the resurrection body reference may be further made to the first lecture in the same volume.

ing to the received text, a brief notice of it is given, but the words referring to it are marked in Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament* as a "western non-interpolation," being omitted in an important group of early authorities.¹ S. Luke has, however, preserved a full account of it in the Acts of the Apostles (i. 9-11), to which it forms the proper introduction as the preparation for the day of Pentecost.

In S. Paul's Epistles there are but two direct references to it, namely, in Eph. iv. 8-10: "Wherefore He saith, when He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now this, He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things." 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Received up in glory" (*ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ*). S. Peter in his First Epistle (iii. 22), speaks of Christ as having "gone into heaven." But though direct notices of the actual Ascension are but few, the fact is implied and assumed not only in all those passages referred to below, which speak of the session at the right hand of the Father, but also in the whole conception of the priestly work of Christ as described in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in the representation of the glorified Christ in the Apocalypse.

The mystery of the Ascension is one which it is peculiarly difficult for finite minds such as ours to grasp. We have to guard against thinking of it as a mere change of position from one place to another. As heaven is a state rather than a place, so the Ascension involves a change of the mode of existence rather than

¹ The words *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, S. Luke xxiv. 51, are omitted in *κ D, a b c ff rhe*. The recently discovered Old Syriac Version, however, which generally agrees with the "Western" group reads the verse as follows: "And while He blessed them, He was lifted up from them."

a change of position. And yet we are not to think of it as if it brought about the destruction of our Lord's manhood or its absorption into Deity. The Mediator between God and man is still "Himself man" (1 Tim. ii. 5). By the Ascension He "has entered upon the completeness of spiritual being, without lessening in any degree the completeness of His humanity. . . . We cannot indeed unite the two sides [of the thought] in one conception, but we can hold both firmly without allowing the one truth to infringe upon the other."¹ This we can do, and with this we must rest content. And so with regard to that "heaven" into which He passed when "a cloud received Him out of their sight"; the following words of a thoughtful and devout theologian seem to state very exactly the two sides of the truth which, if we are loyal to scriptural truth, we find ourselves compelled to maintain concerning it:

"We cannot conceive of heaven as any distinct place—some sphere, some distant world, or the like—some distinct 'where,' according to the ideas of our present sensible perceptions; because heaven is everywhere that God is. Yet we must persuade ourselves of some more definite place in heaven where the cosmical, the created life, is perfectly realised; where God Himself is all in all, where the fragmentary, the imperfect, inseparable from existence in time, is lifted up into the fulness of eternity."²

(b) As in the Apostles' Creed, the words, "He ascended into heaven," are immediately followed by the clause, "And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty," so in the Article after, **wherewith He ascended into heaven**, we read, **and there sitteth**. The phrase employed once more is entirely scriptural.

¹ Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 81.

² Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (E. T.), p. 321.

In the Old Testament it is used of the Messianic King in Ps. cx. 1: "The Lord said unto My Lord, sit thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." Its occurrence in this passage evidently suggested its use in the New Testament, in which it may be fairly said to be the regular phrase employed to describe the condition of the risen and glorified Saviour. So in [S. Mark] xvi. 19 we read that "the Lord Jesus . . . was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God." In Rom. viii. 32 it is said that "Christ Jesus," who was raised from the dead, "is at the right hand of God." In Col. iii. 1, He is spoken of as "seated on the right hand of God." Heb. x. 12: "He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."¹ In all these passages, wherever the position is indicated, it is that of *sitting*. One exception to this there is in the New Testament. In Acts vii. 55 S. Stephen says: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man *standing* on the right hand of God." It is remarkable that the phrase should occur here and here only; and there can be little doubt that S. Chrysostom is right in the interpretation which he puts upon the unusual expression. "Why standing, and not sitting? To show that He is ready to succour His martyr. For thus it is said also of the Father, 'Stand up, O God,' and 'now will I up, saith the Lord, I will set him in safety.'"²

It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to point out that the expression, "Sitteth at the right hand of God," is to be taken metaphorically, and that, as Bishop Pearson says, "we must not look upon it as determining any posture

¹In Acts ii. 33, it is doubtful whether the words should be rendered, "Being *by* the right hand of God exalted," or "Being *at* the right hand of God exalted."

²Hom. vi. in *Ascens.*

of His body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs."¹ Both parts of the expression are valuable for the ideas and thoughts which they are intended to bring before us. *Sitting* is suggestive of continuance, of rest after labour, of the king upon his throne, and the judge upon the judgment-seat. The *right hand* is the symbol of strength and power. It is the position of honour and dignity; and, as Pearson adds, "the right hand of God is the place of celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the psalmist, 'In Thy presence is fulness of joy, at Thy right hand pleasures for evermore.'"

(c) Before leaving the subject of the Ascension and session at the right hand of God, there is one question arising in connection with it which demands a brief consideration: How far can the risen and ascended Lord be said to be present everywhere *as man*? At the time when the Articles were drawn up the subject had been brought prominently forward on the continent, owing to the unfortunate teaching of some of the Lutheran divines, following Luther himself who, in the course of the controversy on the Lord's Supper, endeavoured to support his doctrine on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist by a theory of the ubiquity or omnipresence of the human nature of the Lord, of which theory it can only be said that it is altogether destructive of the reality of the manhood, and endows it with some, at least, of the essential properties of Deity, namely, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience.

That the subject was definitely present to the minds of those who compiled our Articles is plainly indicated by the passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, which has been already quoted as illustrative of this Article. And the terms used in the Article itself are

¹On the *Creed*, Art. VI. ch. ii.

quite sufficient to show that those who drew it up had no sympathy with "Ubiquitarianism,"¹ but intended to attribute what can only be called a "local" presence to the body of Christ in heaven. He "took again His body . . . *wherewith* He ascended into heaven, and *there sitteth* until He return, etc." But while it is necessary to repudiate any teaching which would destroy the perfection of our Lord's humanity, and practically involve us in Eutychianism, it is at the same time equally needful to guard against imagining that there are in Christ two centres of personality, and that the two natures are in any way separated from each other, a view which would implicate us in something like Nestorianism. The subject is carefully discussed by Hooker, whose guidance we may thankfully follow. In the fifty-fifth chapter of the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* he points out—(1) That "the substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have but only local"; (2) That "there is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body, but by the true and natural properties of His body, amongst which properties definite or local presence is chief"; (3) That "if his majestical body have now any such new property, by force whereof it may everywhere really, even *in substance*, present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of his estate extinguished the verity of His nature." Consequently he holds it "a most infallible truth that Christ as man is not everywhere present." But, having said this, he proceeds at once to add that *in some sense* it may be granted that even as man He is everywhere present. "His human substance in itself is naturally absent from

¹ The "Ubiquitarians" are frequently alluded to by Bishop Jewel in his letters. See his *Works* (Parker Soc.) vol. iv. pp. 1258, 1261, 1264.

the earth, His soul and body not on earth but in heaven only. Yet because the substance is inseparably joined to that personal Word which, by His very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort*, by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present. . . . Wheresoever the Word is, it hath with it manhood, else should the Word be in part or somewhere God only and not man, which is impossible." Thus there results (a) a *sort of presence* of the manhood by *conjunction*.

Again, there is a second way in which a kind of universal presence may be attributed to the manhood. It has (b) a *presence of co-operation*, for "that Deity of Christ which, before our Lord's Incarnation wrought all things without man, doth now work nothing wherein the nature which it hath assumed is either absent from it or idle." "Touching the manner how He worketh as man in all things, the principal powers of the soul of man are the will and the understanding, the one of which two in Christ assenteth unto all things, and from the other nothing which Deity doth work is hid;¹ so that by knowledge and assent the soul of Christ is present with all things which the Deity of Christ worketh." Further, of the body of Christ it may be said, that "although the definite limitation thereof be most sensible," yet in some sort it, too, admits of a "kind of infinite and unlimited presence." It is an integral part of that human nature which is nowhere severed from Deity, and thus a

¹ Lest it should be said that this gives to the manhood an essential property of Deity, namely, "omniscience," it will be well for the reader to refer back to what Hooker has said in a previous chapter on the illumination of the human soul of Christ, "which being so inward unto God cannot choose but be privy unto all things which God worketh, and must therefore of necessity be endued with knowledge so far forth universal, though not with infinite knowledge peculiar to Deity itself." *Eccles. Polity*, bk. V. ch. liv. § 7.

“presence of conjunction” may be ascribed to it. “And forasmuch as it is by virtue of that conjunction made the body of the Son of God, by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it a *presence of force and efficacy* throughout all generations of men. Albeit, therefore, nothing be *actually* infinite in substance but God only in that He is God, nevertheless as every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ; it hath no measured certainty of limits, bounds of efficacy unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application*.”¹

III. *The Return to Judgment.*

The concluding words of the Article, **Until He return to judge all men at the last day**, merely repeat the substance of the corresponding clause in the Creed, “from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead,” without in any way explaining or elaborating it. It does not appear that there was any special form of false teaching on this subject, which the statement was intended to combat. Errors with regard to eschatology are plainly and directly condemned in Articles XXXIX. to XLII. of the series of 1553, but in the Article before us the mention of the judgment is probably introduced incidentally rather than polemically, as being the natural close of the dispensation referred to in the previous clause, “On the session at the right hand of the Father.” It will, then, be sufficient to notice here how the Article accurately follows Scripture—(a) in pointing to the Redeemer as also the Judge, and

¹ The subject of the presence of Christ as Man is fully considered in Augustine's *Epistola ad Dardanum*, “De Præsentia Dei,” Ep. clxxxvii.

(b) in connecting this judgment with His second advent, and not with the moment of each man's death.

(a) It is the teaching of Scripture that the second Person of the Holy Trinity, who has come as the Saviour of the world, shall also “come to be our Judge.” See S. Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 37, xxv. 31; Acts i. 11, x. 42; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2, etc.

(b) The time of the general judgment is not the moment of each man's death, but what Scripture terms “the last day.”¹ See S. Matt. xiii. 39 *seq.*, xxv. 31–33; Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 5, 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 9, 10, etc.

¹ See S. John vi. 39 *seq.*; xi. 24; xii. 48.